It has been my pleasure to represent you in Congress, and I wish to assure you that I have served you to the best of my ability. If I can be of any assistance to you, or if you desire detailed information on matters pending before Congress, please feel free to write to me at my Washington office, which is at your service throughout the year.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Marcus A. Earp, minister, Eutaw Methodist Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Be watchful, stand firm in your faith, be courageous, be strong. Let all that you do be done in love.—I Corinthians 16: 13, 14.

Let us pray.

O Lord our God, we pause to praise Thee for the life and the love which Thou hast given us. We praise Thee for opportunities to serve Thee and our fellow men.

Today, we remember the faith and courage of Christopher Columbus, who was willing to venture across uncharted seas because of his willingness to put a theory to a test. May we have such faith and courage.

Help us rediscover America and the opportunities therein. Bestow upon us the grace to discover Thy plan for this Nation and the courage to follow it. We need Thy guidance for without it we can do nothing. In the Master's name 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, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7648. An act to authorize long-term leases on the San Xavier and Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Reservations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8436. An act to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the dutiable status of watches, clocks, and timing apparatus from insular possessions of the United States;

H.R. 11775. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11777. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15748. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize a special 30-day period of leave for a member of a uniformed service who voluntarily extends his tour of duty in a hostile fire area.

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

S. 3035. An act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15941) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17787) entitled "An act 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."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3314) entitled "An act to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9985) entitled "An act 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."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10304) entitled "An act to provide for the mandatory reporting by physicians and institutions in the District of Columbia of certain physical abuse of children."

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

S. 2444. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Committee on Public Works, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for the construction and alteration of public buildings, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on October 6, 1966, approved the following projects which were transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Arizona: Tucson—(a) Federal Office Bldg.; (b) Post Office.

Arkansas: Batesville—Post Office, Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.

California: Los Angeles—Federal Office Bldg. Parking Facility (Supplement). W. Los Angeles—Post Office. San Ysidro—Border Station.

Florida: Jacksonville—Post Office.

Georgia: Atlanta—(a) Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.; (b) Post Office; (c) Post Office and Courthouse (Alt.). Griffin—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg. Rome—Post Office and Courthouse. Waycross—Post Office, Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.

Idaho: Porthill—Border Station (Revised).

Illinois: Alton—Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg. Carbondale—(a) Post Office; (b) Post Office (Alt.). Chicago—GSA Federal Records Center.

Maine: Waterville—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg.

Mississippi: Oxford—Post Office, Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.

Missouri: St. Louis—Post Office (Ext. and Alt.); Ordnance Plant (Alt.).

New Hampshire: Manchester—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg.

New York: Champlain—Border Station. Hyde Park—Franklin D. Roosevelt Library (Ext.). New York—Post Office (Ext.). Syracuse—(a) Post Office; (b) Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.

North Carolina: Charlotte—(a) Post Office; (b) Post Office and Courthouse (Alt.).

Ohio: Cleveland—Post Office, Customhouse and Courthouse (Alt.). Dayton—(a) Post Office (Rev.); (b) Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg. Mansfield—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg.

Rhode Island: Woonsocket—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg.

South Carolina: Florence—Post Office, Courthouse and Federal Office Bldg.

South Dakota: Rapid City—(a) Post Office; (b) Federal Office Bldg.

Texas: Fort Worth—Federal Office Bldg. Parking Facility (Supplement); Federal Center (Formerly Army Depot) (Alt.). Tyler—Post Office and Courthouse (Ext.).

Virgin Islands: Charlotte Amalie—Post Office, Courthouse and Fed. Office Bldg.

Virginia: Roanoke—(a) Post Office; (b) Federal Office Bldg; (c) Post Office and Courthouse (Alt.).

Washington: Wenatchee—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg. (Rev.).

West Virginia: Morgantown—Post Office and Federal Office Bldg.

Wisconsin: La Crosse—Post Office and Courthouse.

Washington, D.C.: (a) Pa. Ave. Annex and Grand Plaza Parking Facility; (b) Internal

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Revenue Bldg. (Ext.) (Federal Triangle); South Portal—Federal Office Bldg.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 985) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

TO AMEND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 TO PROMOTE SAVINGS UNDER THE AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING SYSTEM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6958) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

TARIFF TREATMENT OF ARTICLES ASSEMBLED ABROAD OF PRODUCTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11216) relating to the tariff treatment of articles assembled abroad of products of the United States with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

TO EXTEND AND IMPROVE THE FEDERAL-STATE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15119) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, 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 Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, KEOGH, BYRNES of Wisconsin, CURTIS, and UTT.

TRIBUTE TO DR. GEORGE W. CALVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friends and colleagues, I know that, like myself, you will always remember with fond recollection—and he will always be a treasured part of our memory—our distinguished physician in the Capitol, Dr. George W. Calver.

After a long and distinguished career Dr. Calver, who is one of my dearest friends and a friend of hundreds and hundreds of Members of Congress past and present, has voluntarily retired and has earned the retirement, which takes effect today, as a result of which the Congress will be deprived of a beloved physician, a valued friend, and a dedicated naval officer. I honestly do wish that Dr. George W. Calver might never retire, but in the exercise of his judgment he has voluntarily done so. I know that in retirement he will lead an active life, because he is possessed of a dedicated mind. In talking with him I know he is going to lead an active life in medical research, in trying to probe into and contribute toward the benefit of mankind in connection with making progress in solving some of the ills which afflict human beings.

Dr. Calver has been the physician of the House since 1928. His arrival was far from being accidental. Before he was assigned here three Members of Congress collapsed in a single month. One Member died in his office after 2 hours without medical attention because there was no physician in the House or the Senate. Soon after this tragic incident Representative Fred Britten, of Illinois, the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, conferred with Speaker Nicholas Longworth regarding the placement of a naval medical officer in attendance at the Capitol. On December 5, 1928, Chairman Britten submitted House Resolution 253 of the 70th Congress which was agreed to unanimously and which, *Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby requested to assign a medical officer of the Navy to be in attendance at the Hall of the House of Representatives during the session of such House. Lieutenant Commander Calver then—now vice admiral, receiving his last promotion only recently, which he richly deserved—Lieutenant Commander Calver then was serving at the old Naval Dispensary in Washington. He was assigned by the Secretary of the Navy to this duty on December 8, 1928. Three years later, in 1931, Congress prohibited Dr. Calver's transfer. I know about it because I was one of those who made a contribution in this respect. Thus he became the first physician to administer officially to Members of Congress. It is impossible for me at this time to go into all of the details of the wonderful life of our dear friend. I shall insert further remarks in the RECORD in this regard and for that purpose I now ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UDALL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. No office space was supplied to Dr. Calver when he was first assigned. He carried his office with him—in his medical bag; his center of operations was the Democratic cloak room. By 1930, when he was ordered by Secretary of the Navy Wilbur to report to the Vice President for duty as medical officer for that body, the essential nature of his service was widely recognized. Members of Congress began to make rooms in the Capitol available to the attending physician. Representative Finis Garrett of Tennessee donated the room where the present office is situated, where our late friend Bob Perry had his desk. Representative Tilson, of Connecticut, gave what is today the physiotherapy room; and Speaker Garner, of Texas, made available space which has been used as the drug room. Speaker Rayburn was instrumental in partitioning the corridor to make available space for the current laboratory. The enclosure of the air well in the west central portion of the Capitol has recently permitted further enlargement of the facilities.

Like all great physicians, he believes in preventing illness, although he has always been prepared for any emergencies.

By and large—

He has said—

I deal with the major occupational hazard of Congress. I deal with nervous tension. Representatives and Senators are exposed to too much eating, too much talking, too much writing, and too many pressures from their constituents. As I meet new Members of Congress, I give them all the same advice. Give five percent of your time to keeping well, and you won't have to spend one hundred percent of your time getting over being sick.

He has given Members of Congress good care, good advice, and has always been a good friend, one who never breaks a confidence, a virtue on which men in public life place a very high value.

Heart ailments, aggravated by the periods of extreme tension which are part of the legislative process, as we all know to our sorrow, are by far the most common affliction in the Capitol, according to Dr. Calver. That is why he has been standing by during night sessions since 1928.

George Wehnes Calver was born in Washington, D.C., on November 24, 1887,

the son of Dr. Thomas Calver and Mrs. Lizzie Wehnes Calver. He attended Eastern High School and George Washington University, and was graduated from the George Washington Medical School in 1912. Entering the U.S. Naval Reserve on June 18, 1913, he was appointed an assistant surgeon, lieutenant, junior grade, and was transferred to the Regular Navy in the same rank on April 10, 1914. He became a medical director with the rank of captain on May 30, 1934, and was promoted to rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy on October 9, 1945. He was retired from the Navy on November 1, 1947, but continued on active duty as medical officer in attendance on the Congress.

His promotion to vice admiral, U.S. Navy, was confirmed by the Senate on September 30 of this year. It is from that post of duty and this high rank that he now retires.

His early naval career was one of achievement. In June 1913, he reported for instruction at the Naval Medical School, Washington, D.C., and on May 27, 1914, he joined the U.S.S. *Supply* for duty at sea. A year later he was ordered to Asiatic station, and served at Guam and Cavite, on Yangtze patrol on the U.S.S. *Palos* and U.S.S. *Galveston*, and at the naval hospital at Yokohama. During the First World War, he served at the Charleston, S.C., Naval Hospital.

He then served on the U.S.S. *Bridgeport*, the U.S.S. *Thomas*, and again on the *Bridgeport*. In Feburary 1922 he was ordered to the naval hospital, Norfolk, Va., where he remained until 1925. He then became senior medical officer on the U.S.S. *Henderson* for 2 years. On February 1927, he reported to the Naval Dispensary, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. There he served for 10 years, with additional duty from December 1928, in attendance at the House of Representatives during sessions of Congress.

From May 10, 1937, to July 14, 1941, he was assigned to the Naval Medical Center, Washington, D.C., with additional duty as attending physician at the Capitol. In 1941, he was relieved of duty at the Naval Medical Center, but continued to serve, first in the rank of captain, and from October 1945 in the rank of rear admiral, as medical officer in attendance upon the Congress. He also served as a consultant for the research division of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, before and during World War II.

He was transferred to the retired list of the U.S. Navy on November 1, 1947, but he has continued in an active duty status as medical officer in attendance upon the Congress.

Dr. Calver has received the World War I Victory Medal: The American Defense Service Medal; the American Campaign Medal; the World War II Victory Medal; and the National Defense Service Medal.

On March 15, 1916, Dr. Calver married Miss Jessie Willits, daughter of the late Rear Adm. and Mrs. Albert B. Willits, at Manila, Philippine Islands. Dr. and Mrs. Calver have two daughters.

Dr. Calver was elected a fellow of the American College of Surgeons in 1926, and a fellow of the American College of Physicians in 1931. He is a fellow of the American Medical Association, and a member of the District of Columbia Medical Society, the Southern Medical Society, the Association of Military Surgeons, the American Heart Association, and the Pan-American Medical Society. He holds a certificate from the American Board of Internal Medicine and is an honorary consultant of the Army Medical Library.

Dr. Calver's services to the Members of Congress have been invaluable. He leaves a host of patients and friends, a healthier Congress, an office far better equipped to serve the medical needs of the Members.

I speak for all of the Members of Congress when I thank Dr. Calver for his efforts and exertions in our behalf for so many years, for his unfailing good will and good spirits, and for his loyalty to us personally and to the great institution of which we are all a part.

May his utterly deserved retirement be a long, productive, and happy one. I wish him a fond goodby.

In Dr. Calver we have had a confidante, a friend, and one who has endeared himself to all. I know I extend the sentiment of all Members of the Congress of the United States in wishing for Dr. Calver and Mrs. Calver many years of future happiness and success. Happiness I know they will have, but I wish him success in his contributions toward relieving the ills of mankind and in bringing hope to those who are ill, sick, and suffering. I know I express your sentiments when I also say that we all hope that God in His infinite wisdom will continue to bless our dear friend Dr. Calver and bestow upon him and Mrs. Calver for countless years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], yielding to me at this time so that I may join with the gentleman in expressing our appreciation for the wonderful service Dr. Calver has given to the Members of Congress during his illustrious career on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, during my term of service in the House of Representatives, I, and hundreds of others in both the House and the other body, have been the beneficiaries of Dr. Calver's care and concern.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the tremendous improvements that have been made in the office that Dr. Calver has headed. He has improved the facilities tremendously and he has consistently had associated with him a fine staff of young doctors, and others, to assist him in the professional care of the Members, care which is carried on so effectively.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my personal best wishes to Dr. Calver and his wife in the months and years ahead. I hope and trust that they have many, many more years of a happy, healthy, and successful life.

Mr. Speaker, the House and the Senate, during the term of office of Dr. Calver, have been the beneficiaries of his concern and care during his service here at the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], in the sentiments which the gentleman has so eloquently expressed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate very much the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], the majority whip and acting majority leader.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include additional material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] yielding to me at this time.

In December 1928, Congressman Fred Britton introduced a resolution requesting the Secretary of the Navy to assign a medical officer to the House of Representatives. As a result of this resolution, the Secretary of the Navy, Dwight L. Wilbur, detailed Dr. George W. Calver to the Capitol. Dr. Calver was first given a locker in the Democratic cloakroom in which to keep his first aid equipment but after a relatively short time, was assigned the space which is now used as a reception room for his office. In 1929, Senator Copeland of New York introduced a Senate resolution requesting the services of a naval medical officer as physician to the Senate as well as the House. He specified a naval medical officer since a naval medical officer was already assigned to the House and he felt it desirous that the same medical officer be assigned to both Houses.

Dr. Calver recounts with some amusement the fact that 3 years following his assignment as Capitol Physician, his detachment for sea duty was requested by the Navy Department. It was at this point that Public Law 212, 72d Congress, contained the following statement:

> The detail of the present incumbent as Attending Physician to the Capitol shall be continued until otherwise provided by law.

Dr. George Wehnes Calver completed 53 years of continuous active duty in the Navy on August 4, 1966. He was commissioned on June 18, 1913, and entered active duty on August 4, 1913. He was promoted to the rank of rear admiral on October 9, 1945, and although was retired on November 1, 1947, he remained on active duty on the retired list. His interesting career prior to his attachment to the Capitol included service at the naval stations Guam and Cavite in the Philippine Islands; on the Yangtze patrol aboard the U.S.S. *Palos* and the U.S.S. *Galveston*.

During World War I, he served as the executive officer at the U.S. Naval Hospital, Charleston, S.C. He again became the seagoing surgeon in 1919 with successive duty on the U.S.S. *Bridgeport*, the U.S.S. *Thomas*, and again the U.S.S. *Bridgeport*. He became the senior medical officer on the U.S.S. *Henderson* in May 1925 and then in February 1927 reported to the U.S. Naval Dispensary in Washington whence he was assigned as attending physician to the Congress.

Dr. Calver has served as a consultant to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and has continued his interest in medical research during his tenure at the Capitol. He is a member of the American Medical Association. He has the rare distinction of being a fellow of the American College of Physicians as well as a fellow of the American College of Surgeons. He is a past president of the American College of Cardiology and a fellow of the American Geriatrics Society.

As the medical needs of Congress and the facilities available have increased, Dr. Calver's staff has grown.

Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the Speaker about Public Law 212, which the gentleman from Massachusetts helped pass in the 72d Congress. The gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished Speaker, was quite right about the language of the law. It said, and I quote:

> The term of the present incumbent as attending physician to the Capitol shall be continuing, until otherwise provided by law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has never been "otherwise provided by law," from the 72d Congress to the 89th Congress. The reason, of course, is quite obvious. Dr. Calver, over these many years, has endeared himself to the Members of this body and to the Members of the other body. He has served with dedication, way beyond the call of duty.

Mr. Speaker, I join with you and with the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], in wishing for Dr. Calver and Mrs. Calver, their children and their grandchildren, many years of happiness.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of a letter addressed to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] by Dr. Calver, dated August 9, 1966, in which Dr. Calver outlines the outstanding qualifications of his successor, Capt. R. J. Pearson, Jr., who has been assigned to the office here at the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Pearson is indeed a renowned physician, with splendid training for the office that he will occupy. We are very sorry to lose Dr. Calver, but I am happy that he is being succeeded by a very able man indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the letter to which I earlier referred containing the qualifications of Dr. Pearson.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 9, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Anticipating my retirement as Capitol Physician, some months ago I asked that Captain R. J. Pearson, Jr., be assigned to my office at the Capitol. I hope that Doctor Pearson's presence here will assure continuity of medical care of the Members of Congress. He seems to have been well accepted by the Members of both the House and the Senate.

Captain Pearson received his M.D. degree at Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia; interned at King's County Hospital, Brooklyn, New York, and trained in internal medicine at Grady Hospital, Atlanta, Georgia. Later, he trained for a year under Doctor Paul Dudley White at Massachusetts General Hospital in cardiovascular disease.

He entered the Navy in 1942 and upon his release practiced internal medicine in Jacksonville, Florida, for almost 5 years. He reentered the Navy during the Korean conflict in 1950 and has been on continuous active duty until the present time.

During his Naval career, Doctor Pearson has served as Chief of the Medical Service at the following Naval hospitals: Beaufort, South Carolina; Charleston, South Carolina; Portsmouth, Virginia, and as Chief of the Cardiology Service at the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland. He has written several papers on subjects related to heart disease. He has had teaching appointments on the cardiology staff of Georgetown University.

Doctor Pearson is a Member of the College of Physicians, College of Cardiology, American Medical Association and the American Heart Association.

He is certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine and by the Sub-specialty Board of Cardiovascular Disease. With his background as a practitioner, teacher and consultant in internal medicine and cardiology, I consider him well suited for the position of Attending Physician.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE W. CALVER.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the great remarks of our distinguished and gracious Speaker, as well as others of those who have made these well-deserved encomiums about our departing attending physician.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to what has been said, Dr. Calver has very assiduously inquired into the infections and the things which affect Members of Congress. He has become a heart specialist over the many years of great renown himself. Moreover, he has diagnosed those ailments which affect so many of us, such as the respiratory infections.

As the distinguished minority leader has said, he has provided young doctors and those of other competence who are authorities in these fields. Moreover, demonstrating the character of the fine physician he is, he has provided for us here, as our acting majority leader has said, the services of one of the outstanding heart specialists not only in the Nation, but in the world—Dr. Pearson.

Dr. Calver is leaving while he is vigorous, he is carrying out that admonition that he has told all of us to do, relax and enjoy it. And while he has a few years left—and I hope they will not be few, I hope they will be numbered in the tens and twenties—I trust that he will relax. But he is leaving us with a great doctor, a great physician, and one well worthy to follow in his footsteps.

Mr. Speaker, along with you and those others of us who have said these well-deserved things about Dr. Calver, I am so very happy that I can add my humble remarks because he has performed a job well done. I hope he will have following winds and nothing but fair and tranquil seas for the rest of his well-deserved life on this earth.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished Speaker—himself in the well of the House—yielding to me in order that, as one of the "doctors in the House," I might present greetings to Admiral Calver of the Medical Corps of the Navy on his retirement from active duty in attendance on the Congress. He is truly the St. Luke of the Congress.

Certainly Dr. George Calver for years has administered with competence, confidential communication, and with scientific acumen to the Members of Congress. He has worked in preventive medicine as well as in curative advice and prescriptions. He is a man of men. He is also a man of medicine.

I first knew him in association with a White House physician, Adm. Ross McIntyre, who introduced him when I served in the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army during World War II.

Dr. Calver knows the difference between clinical, bedside, and laboratory research. He has applied this to the point where he himself has become a great heart specialist, and a master of electrocardiography, and in the study of the myocardium of that vital organ, et cetera.

I think that much is to be said for caring for those who care for the ills of the Nation, and one of the greatest things that I can say as a member of his profession, is that Dr. Calver certainly understands the need for doctoring the Nation's collective ills of Congress, as well as those selected to carry out this responsibility individually.

May he and Mrs. Calver and his entire family have "fair winds and following seas," with a long opportunity to enjoy his much-deserved retirement.

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

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much our beloved Speaker yielding to me at this time. I wish to join with the Speaker and the many others here who have paid tribute to the fine service that Dr. Calver has rendered to the Members of this body through the years, and to the operations of Congress, which I believe have contributed to our Nation.

You know in the practice of medicine, being in another profession myself—that is, in law—I have come to realize as most people do that confidence in your doctor is a big part of medical treatment. I do not think there is any question but that Dr. Calver's friendly attitude and the friendship he has had with Members of the House have played a big part in his success in rendering the much-needed services that Members of this body have received through the years.

I join with you, Mr. Speaker, and with our other colleagues today in wishing

Dr. Calver and Mrs. Calver many happy years, with the hope that he will have time to be with us on occasion so that we may continue to enjoy his fellowship.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest and with complete approval to what has been said by my colleagues with reference to the retirement of Dr. Calver and his service here. Fortunately, I believe most of their observations were objective in nature.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as the Members know, 4½ years ago on a Good Friday, I had a most serious operation. I had the good wishes and prayers of every Member of this House, and you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure they did much to pull me through what was not supposed even to be an even chance.

All my life I had paid no attention to doctors and people like that. I do not believe I ever had dandruff, let alone any serious illness. But 4½ years ago I learned two things—to admire and respect doctors and the great profession of medicine.

Second, I learned never to turn your back on a nurse—believe me. That being the case, when I came back to the House with the help of God and your interest, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, Dr. Calver met me at the door. For years he had been urging me, as he has been urging you, to have a physical examination at least once a year. Of course, you pay no attention to it—and you do not—and I did not, either. Well, I do now. I learned the hard way. So every 6 months he has been on the telephone to be sure that I have a complete hospital checkup.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have resented during the last 3 or 4 years the efforts of certain amateur invalids in this House of Representatives to "queer my act." I insist on being the local invalid, but it is getting increasingly difficult. Thanks to Dr. Calver and the young men who have served with him, I am able to be on my feet and still breathing—and that puts me way ahead.

So my observations, and my admiration and tribute this morning, Mr. Speaker, to Dr. Calver are strictly and entirely personal. And it is from my heart.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to add my small voice to what is being said on the retirement of Dr. Calver.

About 3½ years ago I had a stomach ailment and surgery was considered. I went to the good doctor and he said, "We are going to treat you conservatively." Although I might be a liberal politically, I am very happy that we have some conservative doctors when it comes to medicine because he put me in the hospital and he treated me without surgery and I am now walking around with one less scar. Since I have plenty of political scars, I do not relish any additional medical scars.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Calver is a great and wise man. I think his wisdom is coequal with his medical skills and that is what makes a great doctor.

I certainly want to join my colleagues in wishing to him many more years and may they be golden years of contentment and happiness in his retirement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Mrs. THOMAS].

Mrs. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I too would like to join with you, our beloved Speaker, and our colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. Calver.

I extend to him and Mrs. Calver my very best wishes on his retirement.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add my voice to the tributes being paid here to a man who has devoted many years of his life to maintaining the health of the Members of this legislative body.

As a member of the medical profession myself, I have had a unique opportunity during my 22 years of service as a Member of the House, to observe Adm. George Calver's abiding interest and concern for the health of Members of the Congress.

I have been proud to consider myself both a friend and a colleague of Dr. Calver. Every Member of this House who has availed himself of Dr. Calver's services can truthfully say that he has done his best to live according to the Oath of Hippocrates. When not actually treating one of us in his office, he has been a constant visitor to the Speaker's Lobby where he could keep an eye on all of us. Many in this House have benefited by his timely observance and checking on little warning signals that have led him to prescribe either advice or medicine in time to avert serious illness. By so helping to keep Members in health and on the job, he has rendered great service to the Congress and to the country.

Admiral Calver in leaving us, will carry with him the gratitude of not only his friends who serve here today, but also the appreciative memories of the many former Members who benefited from his skilled practice. It is a great honor for me to join in paying tribute to this selfless man who has devoted the greater part of his medical career to both the military service and this great legislative body. May his future years be filled with the happiness he deserves for himself and his family.

Mr. McCORMACK. During the course of a chat I had the other day with Admiral Calver I said, "Admiral, you are voluntarily retiring, but you will always be a part of the House. I hereby confer upon you the designation and title of 'Physician-Emeritus of the House of Representatives.' "

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by the able and distinguished gentlemen preceding me, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, majority whip and now acting majority leader the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, minority leader, and others expressed my feelings concerning our great friend, Adm. George W. Calver.

Dr. Calver was being considered for the place, "House Physician," when I came to Washington the latter part of 1928, preceding my being sworn in as a Member in early 1929. It has been 38 years that Dr. Calver—first as "House Physician," next as "Physician for the Congress," and next as "Attending Physician for Congress"—has served the Members of Congress in such a fine, patient, considerate, and professional way. He has always been available when a physician was needed. It would be almost impossible for anyone to enumerate the number of instances that Dr. Calver has been of great help to the different Members of the Congress.

I believe that the greatest tribute that a Member of Congress can pay concerning a colleague is that "he is highly regarded and highly respected by the Members of Congress who have served with him." In this case, I can say the same thing about Dr. Calver. He is held in high esteem—highly regarded and highly respected—by every Member of Congress since he first accepted the place.

We are all anxious for Dr. Calver to get a much needed rest and enjoy retirement and for this reason we cannot insist that he continue to serve us after so many decades of honest and faithful service. Since Dr. Calver is leaving us, we are fortunate in that another fine physician is being assigned to take his place—Dr. Rufus Judson Pearson, who has a distinguished career as a member of his profession as well as a great citizen of our country. I am glad to join others in welcoming Dr. Pearson to this important place.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join with others in expressing best wishes to our friend, Dr. George W. Calver, our esteemed Capitol Physician, as he takes leave from the position he has filled with such outstanding professional skill during these past many years.

Dr. Calver is known by every Member of this House as a wise and kindly physician—a professional man of great learning and competence—who has zealously sought to protect and preserve the health of all of the Members for many years.

The wisdom and experience of Dr. Calver are apparent in these sage suggestions—"The Commandments of Health"—which appear on a plaque on the wall of his office:

I. Eat Wisely
II. Drink Plentifully (of water)
III. Bathe Cleanly
IV. Exercise Rationally
V. Accept Inevitables (Don't worry)
VI. Play Enthusiastically
VII. Relax Completely
VIII. Sleep Sufficiently
IX. Check Up Occasionally

P.S. Give 5 percent of your time to keeping well so that you won't have to give 100 percent getting over being sick.

I know that the admiral—my good friend, Dr. Calver—will himself henceforth apply these rules and that he will enjoy many more years of good health and happiness.

We wish for him all the best and every success as he leaves us.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the oldest Member of this body, hale and hearty at 84, I am especially indebted to Adm. George W. Calver.

As physician to the Congress he has been the dependable protection of the Members of this and the other body against the tugs and stresses of a job that keeps no hours and never goes on vacation. Every Member of every Congress since Dr. Calver came to Capitol Hill has been the beneficiary of his keen watchfulness.

I look back over the years since I came here in 1949, even then 67 years old, and I wonder if I would be here in the flesh in the closing days of the 89th Congress if it were not for Dr. Calver.

In the fall of 1949 I was victim of the first serious illness since the Spanish-American War. For 7 weeks I was at the naval hospital at Bethesda, and almost every day Dr. Calver came to see me. I cannot forget his care, his attention to my every need. Dr. Bartholomew Hogan, later Surgeon General of the Navy, was then the head of the naval hospital, and Dr. James Fitzgerald, now in private practice in Washington, was on the hospital staff. During the years they have remained close in my regard, warm in my affection, and it was through Dr. Calver that I came to know them.

I look back over the years and there is not a time since I came to the Congress that Dr. Calver was not at my side, when some impairment of my health threatened, slight or more serious.

With such a stalwart engineer of wholesome living by my side, Mr. Speaker, it is not strange that I bounded gaily into the eighties and held the pace of the years with health and cheer. I owe so very, very much to Admiral Calver. His image is enthroned in my heart as surely it is in the heart of all my colleagues. Our good wishes and our prayers will go with him and his wife in the years of a retirement so richly and so nobly earned.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a very fine and outstanding gentleman, our distinguished congressional physician, Dr. George W. Calver. His many years of unfailing dedication to our health, his good spirits and good will, have earned him the warm friendship and affection of the entire Congress. He has indeed been a good friend to every Congressman who has served since Dr. Calver assumed his responsibilities at the Capitol.

Dr. Calver has been the "Doctor in the House" since 1928, when his base of operations was the Democratic cloakroom.

Although we will no longer have the cherished services of Dr. Calver, we can be grateful that he is leaving us as monuments of his efforts a fine staff of young doctors and assistants, and greatly improved facilities to help maintain our health.

I have been proud to consider myself a friend and a colleague of Dr. Calver and wish to express my personal best wishes to both him and Mrs. Calver and pray that they have good health, happiness, and good fortune in abundant measure in the years ahead.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Dr. George W. Calver, our longtime distinguished physician in the Capitol, has retired, but pleasant memories of him and his good work will long remain.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to have known Dr. Calver throughout my service here.

Mrs. Mahon and I will continue to treasure our friendship with Dr. Calver and his charming wife. We hope they will have a long and pleasant future of relaxation and enjoyment.

We all hope and feel certain that Dr. Calver will carry with him a great deal of personal satisfaction derived from the knowledge that he has been of so much help to so many people for so many years.

He knows more about lawmakers than lawmakers know about themselves. I join in the salute to Dr. Calver.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is always sad to say goodby to an old friend and today is no exception as we mark the retirement of Dr. George W. Calver, our distinguished physician. For the more than 22 years that I have been privileged to be a Member of this body I have also been privileged to know Dr. Calver. I do not mean in a strict professional sense only, I mean as a warm person who is deeply concerned about his fellow man. He and the Navy have given us the best in medical care and at the same time devoted many hours to helping us relieve the tensions and strains that go with the job. And always we knew that in dealing with him we never had to fear a breach of confidence—a rare thing in this city. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Calver now leaves us and retires from the Navy as a vice admiral after serving with distinction for some 53 years. Let us wish him Godspeed and many happy years of retired life. He has my thanks once again for the many nice things he did for me over these years.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of Dr. Calver's retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SHIPMENTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the wire services report that the Commerce Department has listed 400 commodities that may now be shipped to Russia and other Eastern European Communist countries, including machinery, chemicals, and other manufactured items. This, of course, includes Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Poland.

I would like to call attention to a State Department report, which shows that in 1965 Poland exported $4 million worth of goods to North Vietnam, twice the export level of the year before. In 1965 Czechoslovakia shipped $9.7 million worth of goods to North Vietnam, and that, too, was twice the level of 1964. And we may reasonably expect that these countries are increasing trade at a rapid rate with North Vietnam.

To me it is unbelievable that at this time we are dropping trade barriers to the countries which form the veritable arsenal for the North Vietnam forces our boys must fight.

Here are the official recent figures on trade with North Vietnam by Czechoslovakia and Poland:

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Exports	Imports
Poland:		
1962	1.9	2.9
1963	1.3	2.9
1964	2.1	5.2
1965	4.0	5.1
Czechoslovakia:		
1962	4.7	7.4
1963	5.7	4.9
1964	4.5	5.0
1965	9.7	7.2

SPEECH OF BELOVED SAM ROSE AT UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS ENCAMPMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, due to the demands of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, running deep into October, I was unable to meet with my comrades at the 68th national encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans at Lansing, Mich. This was a great disappointment to me. The bonds that unite us in the oldest of the Nation's active veteran organizations is very strong.

James H. McElroy, the able and tireless adjutant general of the United Spanish War Veterans, has sent me a copy of the speech of Sam Rose at the encampment and this I am including in my remarks. General McElroy writes:

Mr. Rose had been with the Veterans Administration more than 48 years at the time of his retirement on October 31, 1965, and had been the personal representative of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs of the Veterans Administration at our National Encampment for the past 20 years. He is known as "Mr. VA," and has received the highest award for exceptional meritorious service in the Veterans Administration.

You and I know that he has been the best friend that the United Spanish War Veterans has ever had and we will never be able to repay him for all the services he has rendered

our comrades and their dependents these many years.

The address of the beloved Sam Rose follows:

This is an occasion I have been looking forward to for some time. When an organization as important in American life as the United Spanish War Veterans reaches its 68th National Encampment, any man as deeply interested as I am in Veterans' Affairs would feel both proud and honored to be a part of such an Encampment.

First, I would like to take just a moment of your time to pay my respects to a great man—your fine Adjutant General, James H. McElroy. He has given you such splendid leadership in the Nation's Capitol. He is a wonderful combination of youthful energy with wisdom of maturity. I have been privileged to know him well for a number of years. His friendship is one of the treasures I shall always value most devotedly.

Now, let's talk about the United Spanish War Veterans. I have always had a warm spot in my heart for the United Spanish War Veterans. I can tell you that the Nation salutes you, the Nation honors you and it holds you in great esteem! Is it any wonder? Yours is a proud heritage! You belong to a Volunteer Army that rushed to your country's service. You served with valor and distinction. You earned your place in the annals of American History.

I have a very special feeling about coming here. I don't consider the United Spanish War Veterans as just another veterans' organization. I think of you as something very special, very unique. There is not another organization such as yours! Therefore I feel privileged to address your National Encampment. Your organization has made so many significant contributions to the life of our nation—and has given added dimensions to the word "patriotism."

The way I see it, you are both "Old Timers" and the "New Timers" of America.

Sure, you are "Old Timers" and proudly so! The war you fought is more than two-thirds of a century in this country's past. That's not yesterday by any means. But even though your war was a long time in the past, I still consider you "New Timers" because that war really ushered in the modern era in which we now live. It really was a turning point in American history. It marked the end of one era and the beginning of another. It was page one of an exciting drama that is still going on . . . a drama that began with you, each of you!

It is the drama that includes the development of the automobile and the development of the airplane, and we all know how those two means of transportation have changed human life. It is the drama of flights to outer space and to the moon, and who knows where next? It is the drama of the development of the atom and the development of the United Nations . . . and who can tell which of the two is really more important? It is the drama of better health and longer life for the people of this country. It is also the drama of the potential for bigger and more devastating wars, a dream that defies all our dreams, and outshoots the wildest flights of our imagination.

This is the drama that you had so much to do with, by your outstanding service around the turn of the Twentieth Century. You helped bring about this exciting new age. No wonder you are different! No wonder I call you "New Timers" as well as "Old Timers"!

But that's not your only claim to fame. There is something even deeper and longer lasting than that. Let me quote something that is familiar to all of you:

"Americanism is an unfailing love of country; loyalty to its institutions and ideals; eagerness to defend it against all enemies; undivided allegiance to the flag and a desire to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and posterity."

How many times have you repeated those simple but stirring words? How many hundreds of times?

Those words, which you repeat in unison at every meeting of a Camp, symbolize another side of the greatness of the United Spanish War Veterans. It is the greatness of stability, of lasting values, of a deeper meaning of America.

Those words mean the same today as they meant when they were first penned many, many years ago. Those words represent the very opposite of change in America. They represent the stability of America, the eternal truths of America, the greatness that George Washington dreamed of, that Thomas Jefferson wrote of, that Abraham Lincoln gave his life for and that our own great President Lyndon Baines Johnson strives night and day to achieve.

No matter how many drastic changes occur on the face of this land, the stability represented by these words shines forth eternally.

Wars come and wars go. Political parties rise and fall. Styles change. Attitudes of our citizens change. The ebb and flow of history go on and on and on—and thru it all remains the underlying stability of our land, as represented by your great words and great sacrifices.

And so you and your organization stand for the changes of American life. And you also stand for the eternal verities of American life. That is why America thinks so highly of you and thru a system of Veterans' Benefits, a way has been provided for your health and welfare.

You have earned your place in the hearts of your countrymen and in the history books that will continue to be written long after all of us are gone. You will forever be a part of our Nation and a reason for her greatness.

Now, I must stop. I don't want to be like the speaker who went on and on until he eventually emptied the hall. There was only one man left, and he said to that man, "You're a real southern gentleman," to which the man replied, "I'm not; I'm the next speaker."

I take my hat off to the United Spanish War Veterans and to all that you represent. May you always be blessed in all that you do.

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. 352]

Adams	Celler	Dyal
Albert	Clancy	Edmondson
Andrews, Glenn	Clevenger	Ellsworth
Annunzio	Collier	Evans, Colo.
Arends	Conyers	Fallon
Aspinall	Corman	Farbstein
Baring	Craley	Farnum
Bingham	Culver	Fisher
Brock	Davis, Ga.	Flynt
Brooks	Dickinson	Foley
Cabell	Diggs	Fulton, Tenn.
Callaway	Dingell	Giaimo
Carey	Dorn	Gilligan
Cederberg	Dow	Goodell
Grover	Duncan, Oreg.	Gross
Hagan, Ga.	Mackay	Rogers, Tex.
Hanley	Martin, Ala.	Roncalio
Hansen, Idaho	Martin, Mass.	Rosenthal
Hansen, Iowa	Mathias	Roudebush
Hansen, Wash.	Matsunaga	Schmidhauser
Harvey, Ind.	Minish	Scott
Hébert	Moore	Sickles
Helstoski	Moorhead	Steed
Herlong	Morrison	Stephens
Hicks	Morton	Stratton
Holland	Moss	Sweeney
Howard	Multer	Taylor
Huot	Murphy, N.Y.	Teague, Tex.
Irwin	Murray	Thompson, N.J.
Jacobs	Nix	Thompson, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien	Todd
Keith	O'Hara, Mich.	Toll
Kelly	O'Konski	Trimble
Keogh	Olsen, Mont.	Tunney
Long, Md.	Ottinger	Tuten
Love	Powell	Waggonner
McCarthy	Price	Walker, Miss.
McDowell	Pucinski	White, Idaho
McMillan	Purcell	Wilson, Charles H.
McVicker	Reinecke	Wolff
Macdonald	Resnick	Wydler
Machen	Rivers, Alaska	
	Rodino	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 308 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

HOUR OF MEETING 11 A.M., THURSDAY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 51) to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 51, with Mr. McFALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, it had agreed that the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment as printed in the reported bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 10, through page 2, line 6, strike out the last sentence of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as "A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore", dated July 1966, and bearing the number "LNPNE 1007–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."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL as a substitute for the committee amendment: On page 2, line 6, strike out "the Committee amendment." and insert "The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as 'A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore', dated September 1966, and bearing the number 'LNPNE–1008–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."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his substitute amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the amendment is offered as a substitute for the first title. The area of the proposed national park is established by reference to a certain map. The question in my mind is this: Possibly the Chair cannot state it, but maybe the gentleman who has offered the amendment can make it clear. I do not know, from simply referring to another map, what additional lands, if any, would be included within the confines of the national park, if the same is finally adopted.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. In recent years it has been customary for the Interior Committee, in reporting bills of this kind, rather than to have a several-page metes and bounds description, to describe new national park units by means of an official map on file with the Department of the Interior. That is what my amendment would do. I have asked that the map that the amendment refers to be brought into the Chamber. It has been out in the Speaker's lobby.

I will explain, if I am recognized to do so, what lands are added by the amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I must add that while what I am about to say is not quite a parliamentary inquiry, a lot of people who live up in that area will take a look at the map and they will not know whether they are in or out of the park. I do not want to quarrel with the Interior Committee. I have had plenty of quarrels with them already. But I must say, even though it may take a little more time, that we ought to let people know exactly who is in and who is out. I think that would be a good idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear as I begin that this is not an official committee amendment. The chairman of our committee could not be here today. The chairman of the subcommittee is not in the Chamber today. This is an amendment which I had always proposed to offer. It is an amendment which I sponsor in my own individual capacity. I do not present this as an amendment approved by the committee or a majority of the committee.

I am happy to say that the amendment is supported by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the ranking minority Member, and the amendment is supported by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS].

Now, what will the amendment do? To my right is the official map to which the amendment refers. If the amendment carries, the boundaries of the national lakeshore will be as delineated by this map. As the bill now stands, the units shown in orange on this numbered map are in the lakeshore.

My amendment would add the so-called Inland Steel property or west beach property here together with approximately 1 mile of beach frontage along through the town of Ogden Dunes.

So, in addition to the areas now in the lakeshore, if this amendment is agreed to we would have another 2 miles of beach front added to the lakeshore, as well as the 478 acres of the Inland Steel land.

This Inland property, let me make clear, is vacant land. It is unoccupied. There are no structures on it. The Inland Steel Co. has held it for many years.

The point was made yesterday that some sand had been hauled off and taken off into Illinois, which I regret, but that was about 50 years ago. This is beautiful dune lakeshore land.

We are displaying pictures here in the Chamber which I hope the Members will look at before they vote on this amendment, for they will give some idea of what this amendment will do.

In addition to that, the amendment will make one minor change, I will say for the benefit of my friend from Indiana. The Furnessville Cemetery, which is a slight indentation in the back part of the proposed lakeshore, will be taken out, so we will not have any cemetery in the lakeshore. I know that will be a comfort to my friend.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Are you going to take out that Swedish church which has been there for about 100 years?

Mr. UDALL. I am not familiar with the Swedish church. We tried, in the committee, to make improvements and changes, and to take out things which should not be in. I believe the bill is far improved from the Senate version.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. As the bill now stands, there is the right of access to the people now. Why go further than that?

Mr. UDALL. As the bill is now written, this area is totally out.

Mr. HALEY. I understand that.

Mr. UDALL. The lakeshore would end at this point.

Let me say further that this will not interfere with the port. The port is at this point. There would be a corridor of almost 3½ miles wide for industry.

There is a steel mill here. There is a steel mill in this area.

This is really the key to a meaningful national lakeshore, because this will take off the pressure from the dunes over here and will enable the mass use of the lakeshore in this area, so that we can really preserve the essence of the Indiana dunes up through the State park and up through the areas which will be preserved.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. This is going to take Ogden Dunes Beach?

Mr. UDALL. We will take a right-of-way through Ogden Dunes, about 1 mile.

Mr. HALLECK. How wide a beach?

Mr. UDALL. Approximately 100 feet deep.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman have any idea what the Inland Steel property is worth or what the riparian private rights are worth to those people?

Mr. UDALL. The cost of this amendment has been estimated by the National Park Service appraisers at something like $4.7 million for the Inland Steel property and about $700,000 for the necessary easements through Ogden Dunes. We would add something on the order of $5½ million to the cost of the bill.

I will have an additional amendment to cover that, if this amendment should be agreed to.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I want to ask about the Swedish church. Will that be torn down?

Mr. UDALL. I will check with the staff on that. I am not sure of the status of the Swedish church. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] could answer that. I would be happy to yield to him, to do so.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, in any event the church would not be torn down.

Mr. UDALL. The National Park Service would preserve the church, and perhaps do as good a job as is being done now. It would be in the national lakeshore.

Mrs. BOLTON. How old is the church?

Mr. UDALL. I cannot answer the lady's question. I know it is very old and very valuable.

Mrs. BOLTON. Some of these national park systems and Army Engineers and all the rest have all too little regard for the old things they destroy.

Mr. UDALL. The National Park Service does?

Mrs. BOLTON. It certainly means to have. To that I agree.

Mr. UDALL. If this is in the lakeshore it will be preserved.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UDALL. Let me make two or three additional points before I conclude.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. UDALL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that point?

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

Mr. HALL. My question is very simple. I should like to have the gentleman relate the acreage involved in the Inland Steel property and the riparian rights through the Ogden Dunes Park on the shoreline, to the dollar estimate he gave for the acquisition.

Mr. UDALL. The 478 acres is $4.7 million for the Inland Steel property. The Ogden Dunes strip is about 100 feet wide and 1 mile long. I do not have the acreage. It will cost about $700,000 for the necessary fee rights.

Mr. HALL. That would be a total of what?

Mr. UDALL. $5.4 million.

Mr. HALL. $5.4 million for roughly, let us say, 500 acres, which, of course, comes out to more than $10,000 an acre. Is that correct? For acquisition costs?

Mr. UDALL. We are told by the appraisers that these are the current values in the area. This is what we will have to pay if we are going to save this area.

Mr. HALL. Thank you, that is too expensive at best.

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

Mr. UDALL. Let me make these points first, and then, if I do not have any time left, my colleague, I am sure, can get time himself under the 5-minute rule.

This area that I propose to add was in the Senate bill. It was a part of the compromise, the great compromise, where we would have a port and a lakeshore. This is vacant land. Inland Steel will not lose anything. They will be paid in full. We will not lose anything, but we can save by putting this in the national lakeshore. It will take pressure off and really save this as a beautiful national lakeshore area and enable us to save the dunes. I urge all my colleagues to support us in the passage of this amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. If I have any time left, I will be glad to yield to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Thank you for yielding. May I ask this question: From Gary eastwardly in Indiana what percent of the beach shoreline is private and public? I understand in the city of Gary you have Marquette Park, which has a public beach. I know because I used to go there when I was a boy.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. It was the highest dune in point of altitude along the southerly shores of Lake Michigan. I know they have a public beach there and a State park with a beach in Indiana and they also have a public beach at Michigan City. However, I do not know nor can I recall whether there is any other public bathing area from Gary, Ind., along Lake Michigan to St. Joseph, Mich.

Mr. UDALL. Let me answer this question, because this is a very crucial point. Our testimony showed that in 44 miles Indiana has on this beautiful lake, 65 percent of that acreage, 65 percent of it, is now zoned or used for industries, steel mills, and things of that kind. Another 30 percent is in private hands with "Keep Off" signs, and only 5 percent of that 44 miles is available for public use. That is what we are trying to correct here.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on the subject of public beaches?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I have the figures here from the Coast Guard maps on the public beaches. Hammond has four-tenths of a mile. Whiting has four-tenths of a mile. East Chicago has four-tenths of a mile. Gary, from U.S. Steel to Porter has 3.5 miles. Johnson Beach has one-half of a mile. Dunes Park has 3 miles and Michigan City 1 mile. Beverly Shores has four-tenths of a mile. That adds up to 9.6 miles of public beaches on Lake Michigan out of Indiana's 40 miles of shoreline.

Mr. UDALL. Much of which is polluted, and if we do not pass this bill, a lot more will be polluted, I am told.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know how much is polluted over there, but let me lay that one thing to rest right here. The Gary-Hobart Water Co. draws its water from a point next to this.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The Gary-Hobart Water Co. draws its water from the very area those people were arguing up there the other day at the hearing on our port would be polluted. You do not dare to pollute that water. In addition, it has been demonstrated and proven that Bethlehem Steel, which is adjacent, will put the water back in the lake more pure than it came out. So all of this talk about pollution is just a bunch of baloney.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the major points of discussion during consideration of this legislation concerned the inclusion and administration of the noncontiguous areas.

In the subcommittee, I offered an amendment to strike the Mud Lake unit—and that title describes it well—the Billings Lake unit, the Blue Heron unit, and Pin Hook Bogs; but it was defeated.

Interestingly, the Department of Interior is willing to pay more money per acre for these mudholes and swamps than the Corps of Engineers is willing to pay for the best river bottom land in the Melvern Reservoir area in the State of Kansas.

In the full committee the chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], offered an amendment to strike all of these units with the exception of Pin Hooks Bogs. Lo and behold—it carried.

In the subcommittee I offered an amendment to strike the West Beach unit, the Burns Bog unit and the Ogden Dunes area. This area is 4 miles away from the remainder of the lakeshore. That amendment was defeated.

In the full committee the chairman of the committee offered an amendment to strike the Burns Bog unit—and it carried—and my amendment to strike the West Beach unit also carried.

The exclusion of these noncontiguous areas reduced by 5,276 acres the land to be acquired at a savings of approximately $11,170,000 to the Federal Government.

The facts are that the cost will at least double this amount—witness what has happened with respect to the Point Reyes project in California—originally authorized for $14 million—now up to approximately $60 million.

Today we are getting a demonstration of what the proponents of this bill want to do.

By amending this bill—and referring to the map LNPNE–1008–ID, my colleague from Arizona is attempting to make the West Beach unit a part of the lakeshore.

Mr. ROUSH's amendment adds the Burns Bog unit.

Now, why did the committee delete the West Beach unit and the Burns Bog unit? This land is now owned by the Inland Steel Co.

I have no interest in Inland Steel—I am interested in trying to give Indiana a lakeshore—and also preserving that area not needed and not contiguous to the remainder of the lakeshore for industrial development and for the State of Indiana.

Now the question arises: Does Inland Steel intend to develop this area? All I know is what Inland has told the committee, and I must assume that the officials of that company are honest men.

On April 7, 1966, Mr. Frederick Jaicks, president of Inland Steel, testified as follows:

It is our present intention that by or shortly after the time that the proposed Burns Waterway Harbor is in commercial operation as a public port, Inland Steel's property will be devoted to industrial use.

If you will examine the map, you will find that one major highway and three major railroad lines separate the West Beach area and the Burns Bog unit.

Hundreds of freight trains and passenger trains travel over these lines each day.

Anyone trying to use the West Beach unit must pass over these lines each day.

Now what are we going to do—relocate the railroad lines and highway—of course not; that would be prohibitive. Build underpasses and overpasses? Well, that would be the sensible thing to do.

But let me tell you something—the Department witnesses estimated that 80,000 people and 8,500 cars would use the West Beach unit each Sunday.

I submit that it will take a dozen overpasses and underpasses to meet this problem.

Yesterday, my colleague from Arizona told you there were times when the traffic was backed up for 5 miles trying to get into the State park.

I submit that if West Beach is added, it will be backed up to the Chicago Loop.

Yesterday I advised the committee that in the Interior Committee the proponents agreed that West Beach unit was the heart of the project but since the so-called heart is separated from the remainder of the project by 4 miles—they now refer to it as the key to the project.

To include it would call for dual administration. The State of Indiana opposes its inclusion and so do I.

Now, let us examine the Burns Bog unit.

You have seen some snapshots—presumably taken in this area. The Department says it wants to save the dunes—it wants to create trails.

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 the dunes area at the present time.

A little bit has come 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.

And then Mr. ASPINALL added:

What would you have trails in that kind of place for?

The proponents are trying to sell you this project under the label "we are saving the dunes."

Mr. Chairman, 738 acres are involved in this amendment—and the Department witnesses tell us that in fact there are only 17 acres of so-called dunes in the whole area.

The amendment and the substitute should be defeated.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I know that there has been much said in this debate about saving the dunes, and I seem to note from the debate some sort of odium attached to the proposition that recreation areas should be preserved.

Is the gentleman opposed to preserving recreation areas in this part of Lake Michigan?

Mr. SKUBITZ. No. In fact, I have supported the establishment of a lakeshore project there, but I am opposed and was opposed to these additional areas that we would add.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSH

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: Page 2, line 6, strike out the period at the end of Mr. UDALL'S amendment and add the following: "excluding therefrom the one mile of lakefront known as Ogden Dunes Beach and adding thereto the area known as the Burns Bog Unit as shown on a map with the same title, dated January 1965 and bearing the number 'NL–ID–7001A' which map is also on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that all of the units of this proposed national park are fixed by reference to a map, is it in order to offer language in indefinite terms that would undertake to alter that?

The gentleman from Arizona offered an amendment which referred to another map, which is a matter of record.

I do not know and I do not know whether anybody else knows just what is meant when reference is made to Ogden Dunes or Burns Bog units.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would reply that the Chair is not in a position to construe the amendment. The amendment technically is in order and it is up to the Member offering an amendment to construe the amendment for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I do have here a copy of the map referred to in my amendment.

My amendment does two things with regard to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

First of all, my amendment deletes from his proposal the area known as the Ogden Dunes Beach.

My amendment also causes to be included in the lakeshore, the area known as Burns Bog.

This means an additional 374 acres to that which the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] proposes to be included in the bill.

This would cause the bill to more nearly conform to the bill which passed the other body.

It provides a larger area for recreation and conservation in the particular unit that we have come to know as the Inland Steel property.

I do not want to mislead the House. But the Governor of Indiana has testified that he is for a Dunes Park. He is for a port. He is not for a park which would include noncontiguous areas. This would include the Inland Steel property which is a noncontiguous area.

In this regard some of us who are proponents of this park are at odds, as far as our opinion is concerned, with the Governor of Indiana. It is an honest difference of opinion.

But this is a valuable addition to the proposal which is before the House at this time. This particular area lies closest to the population center.

I would call your attention and refer to the aerial photo which is the chart at the far end on my right.

You will observe that there are no improvements in this area. There are no buildings. There has been nothing done by Inland Steel except during the early course of their ownership they mined the dunes.

There are still dunes remaining. One of the purposes of securing these color photos which you see before you, all of which describe areas and portray areas within the Inland Steel property, is to show to you that there are still valuable dunes to be saved.

I have in my file also copies of letters from Dr. Jerry S. Olsen and Dr. William C. Ashby who have received their doctorates in ecology from the University of Chicago on work done in the Indiana dunes. Both of these men call attention to the scientific and conservation features of this particular area and say they are worth saving.

The question has been raised that this would be difficult to administer. This is certainly not unique in the history of national parks; to have a noncontiguous area or to have several noncontiguous areas involved in one of these parks.

I call your attention to the list of parks which can be found on page 419 of the

hearings before the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation which began on April 4 of this year. They list many of them—Acadia National Park in Maine, Cape Cod National Seashore, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, Channel Islands National Monument.

And there are numerous others which have the same problem to contend with. I believe we cannot say they have been delinquent in their administration nor have they been too difficult to administer.

I think it is important that we include—I might say I think it is very important that we include—in this bill this property known as the Inland Steel property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roush amendment and in favor of the Udall amendment. In reference to the Roush amendment, which I oppose, it startles me that anyone who would be in favor of this national lakeshore would offer such an amendment.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH] by his amendment would take out a mile of beach for lakefront, which the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] is attempting to put in. He would add several hundred acres of ground which are south of the railroad tracks, and separated by all of those main railroad lines which were referred to by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ]. The amendment offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL], is really in preservation and establishment of a lakeshore, which is what the bill would do. It is an attempt to provide an area on Lake Michigan where people from the great metropolitan area can come. There is absolutely no reason for including the lands of the Inland Steel Co., south of the main line of the railroad tracks. That area could provide very little in the way of recreation.

But the part that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] wants to put in, and the reason I support his amendment, is that his amendment would actually preserve some of the dunes that have been referred to. I certainly hope that the Members of this Committee will defeat the Roush amendment, because most of the property that he wants to put in is not contiguous, and the property that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] wants to put in, is on the lakefront and will be available for the recreational enjoyment of all the people.

It is true that it is expensive. Our colleague from Kansas has said it costs more money for this land than for good bottom farmland in Kansas. I can tell my good friend from Kansas, that if he had his farmland up on this lake, he would get a lot more money for it. Location is what makes this land valuable.

Some people say we should not take Inland Steel's property. Inland Steel has owned this property for, I understand, over 60 years, and they have never done anything with it except take sand off it. Now, they come along and say that one of the reasons we should not take it is because we should give them 5 years to develop it. If they have had this land all that time and have not been able to develop it, it is time the Federal Government should step in and make it available to the people.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. My colleague misunderstood my statement. When I spoke of $400 an acre, I was talking about the Mud Lake unit and the Pin Bog unit, which are nothing but swamps 2 or 3 miles from the lake shore. The Department of the Interior was willing to pay over $400 an acre for that land. That is more than river-bottom land in my State costs.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope the Roush amendment is defeated and the Udall amendment is adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Just in case any of the Members now present were not here yesterday and did not hear some of the things that I had to say at that time, I am going to say again very briefly—and I hope my friend from Chicago will listen; I am sure he will—that the proposed national park is altogether located in my district except one little unit way over in La Porte County, which is 4 or 5 miles from the park.

Why anybody put that in I do not know. That is just like when they started this measure and it passed the other body. It had a lot of these back line areas 3 or 4 miles away, with absolutely no use for anything in it, but it is good, expensive property that one day we can use out our way. The State of Indiana has been protecting 3 miles of the best dunes for more than 40 years. The other dunes that are left are already protected by zoning and ordnances. This expensive bill is not needed to save the dunes.

I am against the bill.

I am against this amendment.

These conflicting views here have put me back of the eightball, in a way. I am not for putting the Ogden Dunes Beach in here. I am not for putting the Beverly Shores Beach in here. I am not for putting in the Dunes Acres Beach.

If the Members will look at the map, they will see they are just about equal types of communities.

But I certainly am not for this amendment.

The gentleman from Indiana referred to what our Governor had to say. He made it real plain. He said:

> The tract of land just east of the Lake Porter County line now owned by Inland Steel Co. is not contiguous to the major portions of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore project and therefore the State of Indiana is not interested in having this land acquired.

Let me add one further word at this juncture. When the Inland Steel representatives appeared and testified they said they were for the park but, "We do not want in it. We do not think we belong in it."

That did not quite fit my view about what ought to be done in this circumstance, but in any event that was their position.

For them it must be said that, if anyone wants a bathing beach, I guess they have a bathing beach. As I pointed out, right now there are almost 10 miles of public bathing beaches in existence in Indiana. We are getting ready, if this bill is passed—and I hope it is not—to take miles and miles of what are now private beaches.

If we should take away the riparian rights from those property owners—and some of those homes are worth $150,000 or more—we can get our pencils out and figure what this is going to cost.

If we should ask Inland Steel about a price, if we should say, "We want your property,"—800 acres, or whatever acreage the gentleman from Indiana would take—and asked them to put a price on it, they would not put a price on it. If they did, it would not be $4 million. It would be closer to $10 million, in my estimation.

And what about these private beaches? Nobody can tell for sure what sort of valuation is going to be placed upon this frontage. I know that those lakefront lots up there are selling now at fabulous prices.

I just hope that all these amendments will be defeated. In saying that I certainly do not want to be in the position of urging that Ogden Dunes Beach be placed in here. That would be just compounding the whole situation and making it worse.

As a matter of fact, if these amendments should be adopted and if all of these areas should be put back in the bill it would be much worse. The committee in its wisdom did not.

A while back I received a letter from the president of the board of trustees, town of Ogden Dunes, in which the writer said, among other things:

> Hundreds of our citizens took little or no interest in "Save the Dunes" or for that matter, far more important public issues than these. Now, however, when we are suddenly, and for the first time, threatened with the loss of our beach front, which could have a tremendously detrimental effect on all the aspects of our community life, particularly on our property values, our citizens are not expressing themselves, and surely they have a right to be heard before this sudden inclusion in the bill becomes law.

This letter was written at a time when the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was considering the bill, but the comment is as timely now as it was then.

I am sorry that the great chairman of this committee is not here. I am sorry that the chairman of the subcommittee is not here. They were in attendance at the hearings. They know what it is all about. When they reported this bill they did not have any of those areas in it.

Now, something was said here yesterday about how I am just a provincial guy and I just represent a few people up there in my bailiwick. That is not quite true. The Secretary of Interior said he never saw less zest for a national park than there is in respect to this one, and I believe that is exactly right.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can vote shortly on this very important matter and resolve once and for all what I think is at the heart of and is the key to this whole proposal. Before we do I believe that something should be made clear with regard to this amendment. The gentleman from Indiana suggested that it is too bad the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee are not here, and it is too bad. However, if you are suggesting that there is doubt about their position on this bill, yesterday both of them requested me to extend their remarks in the RECORD. You will find that in the very first part of the debate yesterday afternoon. They both support the bill. Let us have that very clear.

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

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not mean to indicate that they are not supporting the bill, because I know they do. They voted to report the bill. But the point that I wanted to make, I would like to say to the gentleman and to the Members here, is that apparently they were not averse to the amendments that were adopted in the committee to take out some of these areas.

Mr. UDALL. I was there, and I would quarrel with my friend from Indiana particularly with reference to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS], who signed a letter 2 days ago saying that he supported the Udall amendment, which we are now considering. The suggestion was made, also, that we are going to buy up a lot of homes. In Cape Cod, at Point Reyes, at Padre Island, and I am reminded by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE], at Fire Island, we worked out a very nice procedure, which says that all we take is an easement down to the water. We take the shoreline for public use and people can keep their homes, and in this bill they can keep them forever. If they want to sell to the Government, they can still do it and keep up to a 25-year interest or a lifetime interest in the property. We will not be buying up a lot of expensive homes.

The question here really is, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] pointed out, whether we will have a meaningful lakeshore and take these 2 additional miles. My Indiana friends have complained about Chicago being for this bill. The testimony showed that in Chicago 80 percent of the waterfront is publicly owned, whereas in this beautiful 40 miles or at least what was once a beautiful 40 miles of lakefront we already have 65 percent in industrial use, according to the testimony given in the hearings, and 35 percent more being private homes with those "Keep Off" signs. They are just as thick as a forest in here. This bill would change that. Only 5 percent of all the Indiana land in Lake Michigan is available for the public. I cannot understand—I simply cannot understand—why some of the people of Indiana—they are a minority I am sure—when the Federal Government is willing to come in here and spend up to $26 or $27 million to save one of the really choice and beautiful areas of this country and provide them with really gorgeous lakeshore bathing beaches, would come in here and fight the bill. I will never know quite why they have fought the bill as hard as they have.

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

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. I think it should be made clear that the people of Indiana have not come in here and fought this bill or fought this idea of a national park which down through the ages will do American honor to our State. Some people from Indiana have opposed it and not many.

Mr. UDALL. Not at all, and your colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH], yesterday made it very clear in what I thought was one of the fine speeches made in this Congress when he stated that two Senators and five Members of the House and many organizations and conservation groups and citizens of Indiana have supported this bill. It is just a small group in one area that is against it.

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

Mr. UDALL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Following what Mr. JACOBS said, I would like to say that I took a survey, which I do every year in my congressional district, and sent out about 165,000 postcard questionnaires which contained 10 questions. One of the questions in the Third District of Indiana, which touches upon the area under consideration, was this: Do you favor legislation that would make possible both a national dunes park and a port in northern Indiana? Seventy-three and nine-tenths percent of the citizens in five northern Indiana counties answered yes to that question. I think that is an indication that in this part of the State there is strong support for both a national dunes park and a port.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Let me make one other quick point here. We are now finally trying to do something here in the Midwest and in the East in the way of national parks. We have largely done it in the West before. In Chicago, for every 1,000 people in the Chicago metropolitan area within 40 or 50 miles, there are only 11 acres of public outdoor recreational areas which these people can use.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, in this great area, for every 1,000 people, there are only 11 acres provided for public outdoor recreational areas.

Mr. Chairman, one would think that New York City would be in the very poorest position in relation to the acreage involved. However, New York and Philadelphia have not 11 acres; they have 17 acres. San Francisco has 19 acres for every 1,000 people.

And, my friends, the city of Los Angeles has 167 acres.

Mr. Chairman, this area is one of the neediest as for areas of public outdoor recreation in the country. We are trying to do something about it.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I must oppose the Roush amendment. I was previously for including the south area, and made efforts trying to get it back in.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and I decided that the best approach was to take the most acres and shoreline available to the people involved, and I urge that the Roush amendment be voted down and that my amendment be agreed to.

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

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas City if I have any time remaining.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] tell the committee what the cost would be if we were to adopt the Roush amendment?

Mr. UDALL. I think it is substantial. The cost of my amendment is $5.4 million.

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Arizona will yield further, how much is the cost involved?

Mr. UDALL. It will cost an additional $3,740,000 for the Burns Bog unit from which you have to subtract $700,000 for the Ogden Dunes frontage because the Roush amendment, if adopted, would take that out.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, how much would it cost if we adopted the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]?

Mr. UDALL. It would cost—the total cost of my amendment, if adopted, is $5.4 million. The total cost of the Roush amendment would be $8.4 million.

Mr. SKUBITZ. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this bill authorizes the expenditure of $23 million, I believe, and it is now up to $31 million, if this amendment is adopted?

Mr UDALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is $21 million now and if my amendment carries, it will be $27,900,000. However, if the Roush amendment carries, that involves another $4 million and, so, the total would be up to $31 million.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Ogden Dunes area is involved.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. UDALL. I yield further to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SKUBITZ. If, therefore, we accept this bill, what we are doing is purchasing really a part of the Ogden Dunes area; is that not correct?

Mr. UDALL. No; we are actually purchasing an area of about 100 feet wide through the town of Ogden Dunes, in order to make this a public beach property under supervision of the National Park Service.

Mr. SKUBITZ. And, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that this area is 4 miles away from the remainder of the lakeshore?

Mr. UDALL. It is approximately 3.5 miles away from the Ogden Dunes area.

Mr. SKUBITZ. And, the Inland Steel property is involved therein?

Mr. UDALL. Yes, and those represent the best dunes in the entire area, and we cannot have them unless we adopt this procedure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we would like to have a little bit, just a little bit, of those dunes preserved for future generations.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that there are only 17 acres of dunes in the West Beach area?

Mr. UDALL. I do not know that the committee said that, but in all of our national parks we have buffer areas, in order that we may be able to protect them. Also, the dunes as an ecological unit is not just the shore, sand, and beach. There is a real, vital progression of life and flora and fauna, all based on the lake, but proceeding back from it. This is the totality the scientists want saved.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know very little about this dunes controversy. I come from the State of Mississippi, and I doubt that I shall ever have an opportunity or occasion to visit this dunes area.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which I have learned during the 20 years that I have been a Member of Congress, and that is "congressional courtesy." Another thing, Mr. Chairman, with regard to this bill I learned, as stated by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ], yesterday, if this bill is passed, you are going to take over property located in the State of Indiana, at the expense of the Federal Government, and appropriate it to the use and enjoyment of the people of Illinois.

And you are doing it over the objection of the Representative who is the only voice in the Congress the people of that area have.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course I will yield.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I might say the people of that area also have two Senators, two U.S. Senators who, incidentally, are for the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say that the State of Indiana has two U.S. Senators, to speak for the State, but the affected area must speak through its Representative in this body. Over in that other body they indulge in a practice known as senatorial courtesy. I think it is about time we started doing the same thing, and give the same indulgence to our colleagues in the House that they give each other in the other body.

Regardless of how much merit or how little merit there might be in this bill, the mere fact that the Representative from the area in which this national lakeshore park is intended to be located rises in opposition on behalf of his people and says "Do not put it here," I intend to vote against this legislation.

Now, whether or not he has correctly interpreted the wishes of his people in the affected area, the people in his area will have a chance to express their views on November 8, 1966, when he comes up for reelection. And until they express themselves otherwise, I intend to oppose this kind of legislation.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. UDALL. The philosophy the gentleman has expressed is interesting to me. I raise this hypothetical question: Suppose a fellow Congressman had in his State an area with a big hole in it, and it was called the Grand Canyon, and you had a project to build a dam near that area, and other Members of Congress came in and wanted to give you advice on whether or not you could build a dam in that area. Would the gentleman think they would have no right to give advice on that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say that if the Representative was opposed to the dam being built in his district at Federal expense I would oppose it.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The gentleman from Arizona had something else that he was pretty much interested in recently. I recall that he briefed us on that project in the Rayburn Building recently, and he sold me on the merits of his project, and I intend to support it if and when it comes up in the House.

But if the gentleman had stood up and said "This is in my district, and I oppose it, and you will be forcing it on me and on my people, and they do not want it," then I think as a matter of courtesy, we should defer to the wishes of his people, as expressed by their Representative in this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADDEN was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I am very much in favor of a Dunes National Park, and a port on the south shore of Lake Michigan. I am very much in favor of protecting adjacent areas for expansion of industry. I am also very much in favor of preserving the few remaining miles of available beach for present and future enjoyment and recreation of the public. About 9 million people will concentrate in an area within 1 hour's drive of the Dunes National Park when it is created.

I think this bill is one of the most important bills, as far as the Indiana Calumet and Chicagoland region is concerned, of any bill you have voted on in this session, or in many previous sessions.

I was comptroller of Gary, Ind., back in 1935 and 1936, and we had a small city park located on Lake Michigan beach. In the summer evenings traffic would extend almost half a mile, bumper to bumper, on roads leading to the park. The Dunes State Park was inaugurated in 1924. In the last 40-odd years the State of Indiana has neglected and omitted any expenditures of any consequence to provide a suitable Dunes State Park for the millions living in the adjacent area.

During the summer and into the fall, if you drive to the present Dunes State Park and try to get in, you will be blocked off because the cars are bumper to bumper stretching out for a mile or more away from the entrance. Today there is acre upon acre in Dunes State Park that the State of Indiana should have converted into parking space many years ago.

The people from northern Indiana have tried to persuade different State administrations to expand, improve, and modernize the park. Many State administrations, both Republican and Democratic have ignored the requests.

Two weeks ago after this agitation and discussion of National Dunes Park, legislation became active our State government announced, quote. "We are going to spend $2,250,000 on Dunes State Park." End quote: After 40 odd years—if that is not deathbed religion, I would like to see an example of it.

I have every confidence in Governor Branigan but Governor Branigan will be going out of office in 2 years. Only a 4-year term of office is allowed the Governor in the State of Indiana. Who is going to follow Governor Branigan? What is going to happen after Governor Branigan retires? We will be back in the same situation that we are in today.

Here is this magnificent beach and dunes area that is being neglected and its full benefit is being denied to the people. There are thousands of acres for industry in this area without taking over 94 percent of the beach and dune area south of the Inland property.

There are only two fresh-water beaches that can compare with the dunes area—one is on the Baltic Sea in Europe and the other one is in the northern part of Italy. That statement was made by one of the witnesses who testified for this Dunes State Park.

Let me clear up another statement that was made here by my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Yesterday he made a statement about labor groups being opposed to establishing this Dunes State Park.

I have a statement here from the head of the AFL–CIO in the State of Indiana which was submitted to the Interior Committee. Dallas Sells, Indiana presi-

dent of the AFL–CIO testified before the Interior Committee, I hereby submit this statement:

INDIANA STATE AFL–CIO,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 11, 1966.

Hon. RALPH J. RIVERS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RIVERS: The Indiana State AFL–CIO believes strongly that the creation of a Federal port and the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park is essential to the economic growth of northern Indiana.

It is uncertain whether the dunes area will get the additional recreation space it needs if there is not cooperation between Federal and State Governments. Indiana government has shown no interest in expansion of facilities in that area in the past decade.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, April 6, 1966, said editorially "The State's sudden interest in expanding its dunes park comes at a critical time. It comes when a national park is close to reality. The timing must be more than a coincidence. Never mind their value as a recreational area; never mind their unique value to naturalists; never mind the pressing need for open space and recreational facilities for an expanding population; never mind the strategic location of the Indiana dunes as a recreation site for large concentrations of population; never mind tomorrow."

Union-management collective bargaining contracts now make it possible for more leisure hours through shorter workweeks and pension programs. This alone warrants the preservation of historic acreage such as that contained in the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore Park site.

If there is a question concerning the right of easement by Secretary of Interior for national trails, this could be easily clarified in the law.

We look with some misgivings about the raping of the land that took place during the time of our forefathers, and can expect future generations to have somewhat the same misgivings about our actions and decision if we allow all of the natural resources and beauty of this country to be placed beyond their reach.

If positive action is not taken by this session of Congress in regards to this proposal for a national park, it may be too late. It is imperative that we consider the needs of tomorrow as well as the desires of today. We feel it is regrettable that certain individuals and groups with financial interests in the lakeshore area are spreading misformation and distortion as to the legislation now under consideration. The proposals are at best nothing more than a compromise between those who have little interest in recreational facilities and those conservationists who see the growing need in our society for such additional facilities.

We agree with Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, JR., in his statement "that the bill with the changes suggested by the Honorable J. EDWARD ROUSH would in his words '* * * allow maximum development of the areas while providing an overall plan for recreation, and conservation to supplement the industrial area.'"

I would be grateful if this letter were made a part of the official record of your hearings on H.R. 51.

Sincerely,

DALLAS SELLS, *President.*

Yesterday I called the attention of the Members to various conservation organizations not only in the State of Indiana but throughout the country that have endorsed the Dunes State Park.

They are as follows: Izaak Walton League, the Audubon Society, the Prairie Club, the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy, Chicago Academy of Sciences, Friends of American Landscape, Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, Garden Clubs of Indiana and Illinois, Conservation Club of Chicago, Wild Flower Preservation Society, Wildlife Preservation Society.

Millions of people all over Indiana and the Nation belong to those organizations.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has made the point that passage of the bill would be an offense to our good friend, CHARLIE HALLECK, because a section of the dunes is in his congressional district.

A very narrow piece of land, called Porter County, protrudes north from the main part of Congressman HALLECK's district and provides contact with Lake Michigan.

Part of the district of my colleague, Congressman BRADEMAS, is in this dunes park or beach area. So I do not take too seriously statements about encroaching upon CHARLIE HALLECK's district.

I predict it will not be many years until air pollution and water pollution problems will be completely solved. I do not think it will make much difference in a few years whether a park is located next to an industry, because those problems will be troubles of the past.

A few minutes ago my good friend, CHARLIE HALLECK, said that we drink the Lake Michigan water we are taking from the lake. But I point out that the Gary Hobart Water Co. have pipelines extending way out into the lake about 4 miles to get away from the industrial waste and pollution.

In deference to my good friend, Congressman ROUSH, I should like to say that the most practical amendment offered here is the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL]. I think it is a sensible amendment because it would retain more of those beaches along the lake and less of the hinterland which could be utilized for industry and business.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

I have some sympathy for the position of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], because I have traveled this path personally. There is a new national seashore called the Fire Island National Seashore in my district. I have some sympathy for the position that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], took when he spoke about congressional courtesy. I want to assure you the first bills to establish the Fire Island National Seashore were not introduced by me. I wanted it controlled locally. I wanted the local government to have the park and preserve the area. But I found, as I think I see in this situation, that the local government was not doing that which the local government might have done. I opposed extending that national seashore in my own district, and having done that, as I look at the developments, as I look at the population pressures, as I look at the increasing population and the lack of recreational facilities, I am not all so darned sure I am right.

Mr. ROUSH in his amendment is seeking to expand the size of this national lakeshore. That is what he is seeking to do. Of course, it is going to cost more money when you expand the size of this lakeshore. But if it costs more today, it will cost twice as much more in a decade and four times as much more in a generation.

When we legislate on the national level recreation areas we have to think not just of what it will cost today, but we have to think of what it will mean in a decade and what it will mean in a generation. I believe the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will mean a tremendous benefit to the people of this area.

I am not going to visit this lakeshore. I am not going to be one of those who will benefit from it. But if we can expand this lakeshore at this time I believe the money will be well justified, and I support the amendment.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to tell my good colleague from New York that if the Roush amendment would do what he said it would, I would support it and so would the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall]. What the Roush amendment would do is to take away from this bill a mile of lakeshore. That is what we are trying to preserve. This is what the Udall amendment would accomplish.

Mr. PIKE. I have walked this path before.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. It would take away a strip 100 feet wide and 1 mile long. I also have walked this path in my own national seashore, and I know that a strip of lakefront in front of a developed community largely will be used by the inhabitants of that developed community and will not mean much to the population at large.

The area is what is important, in my opinion. The area is what is to be added by the Roush amendment.

I urge the adoption of that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH], to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 13, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 42, noes 25.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The question now occurs upon the committee amendment, as amended by the substitute.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

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

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

[Roll No. 353]

Albert	Grabowski	Nix
Andrews, Glenn	Gross	O'Brien
	Grover	O'Konski
Annunzio	Hagan, Ga.	Olsen, Mont.
Arends	Hanley	Ottinger
Aspinall	Hansen, Idaho	Pickle
Baring	Hansen, Wash.	Powell
Bingham	Harvey, Ind.	Price
Blatnik	Hébert	Pucinski
Bolling	Helstoski	Purcell
Bow	Henderson	Reinecke
Bray	Herlong	Resnick
Brooks	Hicks	Rivers, Alaska
Callaway	Holland	Rodino
Carey	Howard	Rogers, Tex.
Clancy	Huot	Roncalio
Clevenger	Irwin	Rosenthal
Collier	Keith	Roudebush
Corman	Kelly	Schmidhauser
Craley	Keogh	Scott
Culver	Long, Md.	Sickles
Davis, Ga.	Love	Smith, Va.
Dickinson	McCarthy	Steed
Diggs	McDowell	Stephens
Dingell	McMillan	Stratton
Dorn	McVicker	Sweeney
Dow	Macdonald	Taylor
Duncan, Oreg.	Mackay	Thompson, N.J.
Dwyer	Mackie	Thompson, Tex.
Dyal	Martin, Ala.	Todd
Edmondson	Martin, Mass.	Toll
Ellsworth	Martin, Nebr.	Trimble
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Tunney
Fallon	Miller	Tupper
Farbstein	Minish	Tuten
Farnsley	Moeller	Walker, Miss.
Fisher	Morrison	White, Idaho
Flynt	Morton	Williams
Foley	Moss	Willis
Fulton, Tenn.	Multer	Wilson, Charles H.
Gialmo	Murphy, N.Y.	
Gilligan	Murray	Wolff
Goodell	Nedzi	Wydler

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, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 305 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 7 through 19, strike out the first two sentences of section 2(a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"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. This authorization includes, in the case of lands adjacent to Lake Michigan in the town of Dune Acres, the acquisition of easement only, such easements being those that the Secretary deems necessary to assure public access along the beach adjacent to the waters of said lake."

Mr. UDALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the committee amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL as a substitute for the committee amendment:

On page 3, line 1, strike out "the committee amendment," and insert "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."

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a simple, technical and conforming amendment necessitated by the passage of the substitute amendment we voted upon just before the quorum call.

There are three populated areas: Beverly Shores, Dune Acres, and Ogden Dunes. In the original bill we actually took beach frontage through the town of Beverly Shores. In the amendment just passed we took the beach frontage through Ogden Dunes. This amendment will make sure we treat Dune Acres in the same fashion and actually take the beach frontage there instead of merely having access to it, as in the present bill.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. The purpose of the substitute amendment is to provide uniform treatment for all three communities affected by this bill?

Mr. UDALL. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment to the committee amendment, offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now occurs on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the remaining committee amendments except for the last one which occurs on page 12, line 24. I ask unanimous consent further that all of the remaining committee amendments be considered en bloc and be printed at this point in the RECORD and be considered subject to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 3, lines 11 and 12, strike out "with the consent" and insert "by donation".

Page 3, line 19, strike out "Secretary." and insert in lieu thereof: "Secretary which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal within the States of Indiana or Illinois."

Page 4, lines 3 through 11, strike out all of subsection (b) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary may enter into contracts requiring the expenditure, when appropriated, of funds authorized to be appropriated by section 10 of this Act, but the liability of the United States under any such contract shall be contingent on the appropriation of funds sufficient to fulfill the obligations thereby incurred."

Page 5, lines 4 through 14, strike out all of subsection (a) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(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 during all times when an appropriate zoning agecny 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."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "October 21, 1963," and insert "January 4, 1955,".

Page 6, line 5, strike out "amount of the" and insert "amount of".

Page 6, line 13, strike out "thereto." and insert "thereto or public use thereof.".

Page 10, line 6, strike out the last sentence of section 7(a).

Page 12, lines 11 through 15, strike out all of section 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this Act shall deprive the State of Indiana or any political subdivision thereof of its civil and criminal jurisdiction over persons found, acts performed, and offenses committed within the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore or of its right to tax persons, corporations, franchises, or other non-Federal property on lands included therein."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the last committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 24, strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$21,700,000".

AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL: Page 12, line 24, after "than", strike out "$21,700,000" proposed to be inserted by the Committee amendment, and insert "$27,900,000".

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

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, pursuant to House Resolution 1024, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first so-called Udall amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Udall amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "the Committee amendment," and insert "The lakeshore shall comprise the area within the boundaries delineated on a map identified as 'A Proposed Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore', dated September 1966, and bearing the number 'LNPNE–1008–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."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that 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. However, the Chair will call the attention of the Members of the House to the unanimous-consent request which was made by the gentleman from California on Tuesday that any votes on the bill, H.R. 51, be the first order of business on Friday, October 14, 1966.

And, according to that unanimous-consent request, which was adopted, further consideration of the bill is postponed until Friday next.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana withdraws his point of order.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISORY ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3158) to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, 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. 2232)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3158) to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, 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 disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with the following amendments (page and line references refer to the House-engrossed amendment):

Conference amendment number (1): Page 14, line 9, strike "Such" and all that follows through the period in line 12 and insert: "Such hearing shall be private, unless the Board, in its discretion, after fully considering the views of the party afforded the hearing, determines that a public hearing is necessary to protect the public interest."

Conference amendment number (2): Page 20, strike lines 17 through 19 and insert:

"(2) The term 'State' includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(3) The term 'territory' includes any possession of the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(4) The terms 'district', 'district court', 'district court of the United States', and 'judicial district' shall have the meanings defined in section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code."

Conference amendment number (3): Page 35, line 21, strike "Such" and all that follows through the period in line 24 and insert: "Such hearing shall be private, unless the Corporation, in its discretion, after fully considering the views of the party afforded the hearing, determines that a public hearing is necessary to protect the public interest."

Conference amendment number (4): Page 47, strike lines 4 through 6 and insert:

"(B) The term 'State includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(C) The term 'territory' includes any possession of the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(D) The terms 'district', 'district court', 'district court of the United States', and 'judicial district' shall have the meanings defined in section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code."

Conference amendment number (5): Page 61, line 11, strike "Such" and all that follows through the period in line 15 and insert: "Such hearing shall be private, unless the appropriate Federal banking agency, in its discretion, after fully considering the views of the party afforded the hearing, determines that a public hearing is necessary to protect the public interest."

Conference amendment number (6): Page 70, line 17, insert: "in connection with the granting of any application or other request by the bank," immediately before "or any written agreement entered into".

Conference amendment number (7): Page 73, strike line 18 and all that follows down through line 9 on page 75 and insert:

"TITLE III—INCREASE IN INSURANCE LIMIT

"Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

"SEC. 301. (a) The first sentence of section 3(m) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(m)) is amended by changing '$10,000' to read '$15,000'.

"(b) The first sentence of section 7(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1817(l)) is amended by changing '$10,000' to read '$15,000'.

"(c) The last sentence of section 11(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1821(a)) is amended to read: 'The maximum amount of the insured deposit of any depositor shall be $15,000.'

"(d) The fifth sentence of section 11(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1821(l)) is amended by changing '$10,000' to read '$15,000'.

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall not be applicable to any claim arising out of the closing of a bank where such closing is prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation

"SEC. 302. (a) Section 401(b) of title IV of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1724(b)) is amended by changing '$10,000' to read '$15,000' each place it appears therein.

"(b) Section 405(a) of title IV of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1728(a)) is amended by changing '$10,000' to read '$15,000'.

"(c) The amendments made by this section shall not be applicable to any claim arising out of a default, as defined in section 401(d) of the National Housing Act, where the appointment of a conservator, receiver, or other legal custodian as set forth in that section becomes effective prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"Administrative Authority

"SEC. 303. (a) Section 3(m) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(m)) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end: "For the purpose of clarifying and defining the insurance coverage under this subsection and subsection (l) of section 7, the Corporation is authorized to define, with such classifications and exceptions as it may prescribe, terms used in those subsections, in subsection (p) of section 3, and in subsections (a) and (l) of section 11 and the extent of the insurance coverage resulting therefrom."

"(b) Section 405(a) of title IV of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1728(a)) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end: 'For the purpose of clarifying and defining the insurance coverage under this subsection and subsection (b) of section 401, the Corporation is authorized to define, with such classifications and exceptions as it may prescribe, terms used in those subsections and in subsection (c) of section 401 and the extent of the insurance coverage resulting therefrom.'"

Conference amendment No. (8): Page 75, line 14, strike "1968" and insert "1972".

And the House agree to the same.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
SEYMOUR HALPERN,
JAMES HARVEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
EDWARD V. LONG,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
JOHN TOWER,
STROM THURMOND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3158) to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

In addition to technical and clarifying changes, the House amendment made several substantive changes in the Senate-passed bill. The substantive changes, and the action of the conferees thereon, were as follows:

The House amendment would have terminated the supervisory powers conferred by the bill on June 30, 1968. Under conference amendment number (8), the termination date is postponed to June 30, 1972, but this is by no means intended to preclude early congressional scrutiny of operations under the provisions of the bill and further amendment of the powers of the agencies or extension of the expiration date.

The House amendment would have increased the maximum insurable amount of accounts and deposits in Federally-insured banks and institutions to $20,000 per account. Under conference amendment number (7), the maximum insurable amount is increased to $15,000. It is the understanding of the conferees that the adequacy of this increase should be given further congressional attention within a reasonable time.

The House amendment would have provided that administrative hearings under the provisions of the bill be public unless the agency concerned, in its discretion, determined that private hearings would be in the public interest. Under conference amendments Nos. (1), (3), and (5), it would normally be expected that hearings will be private, but the agency is granted authority, in its discretion, to hold public hearings where necessary to protect the public interest.

Conference amendments Nos. (2), (4), and (6) make technical or conforming changes in the amendment of the House. Conference amendment No. (7), in addition to containing the substantive change from $20,000 to $15,000 in the insurance limit, also contains a clarifying change with respect to the effective date of the new insurance coverage, providing that the increase in insurance would be effective with respect to savings and loan institutions for which a conservator or receiver was appointed after date of enactment, and to banks closing after such date.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
ABRAHAM MULTER,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
THOMAS L. ASHLEY,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
SEYMOUR HALPERN,
JAMES HARVEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on this conference report.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us the conference report on the bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured savings and loan associations and insured banks. This bill was passed by the House on October 4, after an amendment substituting the language contained in H.R. 17899. H.R. 17899 was substantially similar to the bill passed by the other body, except for title III increasing the Federal deposit insurance from $10,000 to $15,000. Also, title IV of H.R. 17899 provided for a termination date of June 30, 1968. The bill was amended on the floor in several respects. The most important amendment was further increasing deposit insurance to $20,000.

Because of the opposition to titles I and II, providing for cease and desist and officer removal authority, advanced by the Independent Bankers Association of America, the National League of Insured Savings Associations, and the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the House approved this legislation on the understanding that it would be temporary except for the insurance increase. While supporting the insurance increase, these organizations made the very valid observation that legislation as important as this should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress because of its far-reaching effects. In order to accommodate the supervisory agencies who are very anxious for this increased authority, the House acted without further delay.

The bill as passed by the other body provided for this new authority on a permanent basis and made no provision at all for an insurance increase. Yesterday, after agreeing to a conference requested by the other body, the House conferees unanimously agreed that the new authority would expire on June 30, 1972, and that the deposit insurance increase, which of course would be permanent, be $15,000 instead of the $20,000 as provided in the House-passed bill. While preferring a shorter trial period for the cease and desist and officer removal authority than as agreed upon by the conferees, I must remind my colleagues that the bill as passed by the other body contained no insurance increase and the $15,000 agreed upon is the same as that reported out by your Committee on Banking and Currency on September 24. So, I think that this is certainly a reasonable solution to the differences between the two houses. I also bring to the attention of my colleagues the language in the conference report, insisted upon by the House conferees, that the Congress will carefully scrutinize administration of the new law as experience is gained, as well as considering a further increase in the insurance ceiling without necessarily waiting until 1972.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. HOLIFIELD submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15963) to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes.

CHAMIZAL BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11555) to provide a border highway along the U.S. bank of the Rio Grande in connection with the settlement of the Chamizal boundary dispute between the United States and Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and disagree in the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], since the Committee on Public Works is now in conference on water pollution legislation, and has been for the past 2 weeks, could the gentleman from Illinois indicate when the gentleman contemplates a conference with the other body on this bill?

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will yield, on either Monday or Tuesday, we have to go to conference with the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the other body.

Mr. CRAMER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would hope this would be done in a manner so that it will not interfere with completing these lengthy water pollution conferences presently underway.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Florida will yield further, we hope to do that.

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

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

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KLUCZYNSKI, WRIGHT, and CRAMER.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9167) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to enable the courts to deal more effectively with the problem of narcotic addiction, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am sure that the distinguished chairman has cleared this request with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH]?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, he has.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman has cleared it?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] has conferred with me on all of this.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, ASHMORE, GILBERT, McCULLOCH, and McCLORY.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HAYS. 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. 354]

Addabbo	Flynt	Nix
Albert	Fogarty	O'Brien
Anderson, Tenn.	Foley	O'Hara, Mich.
Andrews, Glenn	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Konski
Annunzio	Gilbert	Olsen, Mont.
Arends	Gilligan	Ottinger
Aspinall	Goodell	Pickle
Baring	Grabowski	Pike
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Powell
Bingham	Gross	Pucinski
Blatnik	Grover	Purcell
Boland	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Bow	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Bray	Hanna	Reinecke
Brooks	Hansen, Idaho	Resnick
Burke	Harvey, Ind.	Rivers, Alaska
Cahill	Hébert	Rodino
Callaway	Helstoski	Rogers, Tex.
Carey	Herlong	Ronan
Clancy	Hicks	Roncalio
Clark	Holland	Rosenthal
Clevenger	Howard	Roudebush
Collier	Huot	St Germain
Cooley	Irwin	Schmidhauser
Corman	Jarman	Scott
Craley	Keith	Slack
Culver	Keogh	Steed
Davis, Ga.	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Davis, Wis.	Long, Md.	Stratton
Dent	Love	Sweeney
Dickinson	McCarthy	Taylor
Diggs	McCulloch	Tenzer
Dingell	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Dow	McMillan	Todd
Duncan, Oreg.	McVicker	Toll
Dwyer	Macdonald	Trimble
Dyal	Mackay	Tunney
Edmondson	Mackie	Tuten
Ellsworth	Martin, Ala.	Vigorito
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Walker, Miss.
Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga	White, Idaho
Fallon	Miller	Widnall
Farbstein	Minish	Willis
Farnsley	Morrison	Wilson, Charles H.
Feighan	Moss	Wyatt
Fisher	Multer	Wydler
	Murphy, N.Y.	
	Murray	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 289 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BURTON of California. 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. 355]

Adams	Frelinghuysen	O'Brien
Addabbo	Fulton, Tenn.	O'Hara, Mich.
Albert	Gathings	O'Konski
Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	Olsen, Mont.
Anderson, Tenn.	Gilbert	Olson, Minn.
Andrews, Glenn	Gilligan	Ottinger
Annunzio	Goodell	Pepper
Arends	Grabowski	Pickle
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Pike
Aspinall	Green, Pa.	Poage
Bandstra	Griffiths	Powell
Baring	Gross	Pucinski
Barrett	Grover	Purcell
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Quie
Bell	Halleck	Rees
Bingham	Hamilton	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hanley	Reinecke
Boland	Hanna	Resnick
Bolling	Hansen, Idaho	Reuss
Bow	Hansen, Wash.	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Hardy	Robison
Bray	Harvey, Ind.	Rodino
Brooks	Hawkins	Rogers, Tex.
Brown, Calif.	Hébert	Ronan
Cahill	Helstoski	Roncalio
Callaway	Herlong	Rosenthal
Carey	Hicks	Roudebush
Celler	Holifield	Roush
Clancy	Holland	Roybal
Clevenger	Horton	St. Onge
Cohelan	Howard	Scheuer
Collier	Hungate	Schisler
Conte	Huot	Schmidhauser
Conyers	Irwin	Scott
Corman	Jacobs	Senner
Craley	Kastenmeier	Shriver
Culver	Keith	Slack
Daddario	Kelly	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Stephens
Dent	Kirwan	Stratton
Denton	Kluczynski	Sullivan
Derwinski	Krebs	Sweeney
Dickinson	Long, Md.	Taylor
Diggs	Love	Tenzer
Dingell	McCarthy	Thomas
Dorn	McDowell	Thompson, N.J.
Dow	McEwen	Thompson, Tex.
Dulski	McMillan	Todd
Duncan, Oreg.	McVicker	Toll
Dwyer	Macdonald	Trimble
Dyal	MacGregor	Tunney
Edmondson	Mackay	Tupper
Edwards, Calif.	Mackie	Tuten
Ellsworth	Madden	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Ala.	Ullman
Everett	Martin, Mass.	Van Deerlin
Evins, Tenn.	Martin, Nebr.	Vigorito
Fallon	Mathias	Vivian
Farbstein	Matsunaga	Walker, Miss.
Farnsley	May	White, Idaho
Farnum	Meeds	Widnall
Feighan	Minish	Willis
Fisher	Moorhead	Wilson, Charles H.
Flynt	Morrison	Wolff
Foley	Mosher	Wright
Ford, William D.	Moss	Wyatt
Fraser	Multer	Wydler
	Murphy, N.Y.	
	Murray	
	Nix	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 227 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

OBSTRUCTION OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 1007 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 1007

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. 12047) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. 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 Un-American Activities, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around here long enough to know what is going on. I have had some previous experience in this matter of filibustering. But I must say that I think this is not a very appropriate subject to practice the art.

Mr. Speaker, certainly I raise no objection to any man exercising his privileges as a Member of this House of Representatives.

However, I do feel that a matter of this importance, affecting the security of these United States, and offering the type of support—insofar as the internal affairs of this country are concerned—to over 300,000 of our splendid young men who are fighting on the ground, in the swamps, and in the air and on the sea and in the jungles of Vietnam is overriding.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the fact that this war is not the most popular war in which this country has fought. Some people believe we should not be involved in it. Perhaps we should not. But, that is not the question involved here.

The question involved here is are we going to sustain these young men that we are drafting and sending over there into that miserable land to fight?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of you have read even one page of the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities and who have seen there on the record what happened and what was carried out and perpetrated upon that committee by a well-organized, but a very small minority group in this country?

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. This bill proposes to do only one thing.

And, I am going to read that purpose, with your permission. It is very short:

The purpose of the bill is to protect the United States and its Armed Forces against intentional injury by prohibiting and prescribing penalties for certain conduct, including (a) the solicitation, collection, and delivery of any money, property, or thing to or for the use of any foreign power or organization involved in armed conflict with the United States, whether or not a formal state of war has been declared by Congress, and (b) the obstruction of the movement of personnel or supplies of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the aim toward which this legislation is directed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this great House of Representatives are elected by the people of their respective congressional districts; we all have neighbors at home who have been sent over there to fight this war, who among us are willing to say by their vote here that they do not want to give these splendid young men our wholehearted support? Well, they say that this is not a war.

But, Mr. Speaker, I implore the Members of the House to go with me in their mind's eye—and one does not even have to do that, because one sees the television, for instance.

You see it televised. We are fighting this war now in our living rooms, we are getting the reports, we are viewing the scenes, and we see these boys going through these swamps and these marshes, and being shot down out there.

Ask them whether this is a war or not. They do not raise any question whether it has been declared or not. So, my friends, what they are asking for is that you who are responsible—and we are responsible—for sending them over there, give them the support they are entitled to.

I happen to be one of that group in this country, maybe it is small, but who believes that if this country is to be destroyed, if this Republic is to pass into oblivion with all of its freedom and its heritage, it is going to come from within rather than from without.

You are just asked to pass upon this simple and plain question: Are you going to give them that support?

I do not know what you are going to do, but I do not want to go back into my congressional district in a few days from now and face the mothers and fathers and the loved ones of these boys who are over there fighting under the flag of the United States. I do not want to go back there and tell them that the Assistant Attorney General, as will be pointed out, I am sure, said that we had laws that would cover this, and therefore we did not need it.

Yet, neither the Attorney General of the United States, nor anyone else who appeared before this committee during these hearings, pointed out that any prosecution has ever been made or attempted to be made of these acts of vandalism and of obstructionism of our Armed Forces by these Communists and their sympathizers.

I would rather be on the safe side and pass the law, whether it is necessary or not, than take any chances on it.

My friends, again I want, in conclusion, to call your attention to the reprehensible conduct of this small but well-organized group out on the west coast. According to the testimony before the committee they tried to sabotage not only the delivery of the necessary essentials of warfare, but actually laid down upon the railroad tracks and tried to obstruct the movement of troops.

If this were a declared war that would be treason, and subject to the penalty of death. Yet we quibble about this thing.

If this bill serves no other purpose, if it is passed by this Congress, it would serve notice upon this group that they could no longer get away with this sort of thing.

My friends, I do not know what those others may think in this matter, but there has certainly been no debate in my own mind about it. I am going to vote every opportunity I have to back those boys up as long as they are over there.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the resolution, House Resolution 1007, will provide an open rule with 2 hours of general debate in the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12047, entitled "Obstruction of Armed Forces."

The purpose is clearly set forth in the report on the bill, which is to prevent injury to the Armed Forces of the United States by prohibiting certain conduct including the solicitation, collection and delivery of money, property, or anything for the use of any foreign government or organization involved in armed conflict with the United States, whether or not a formal state of war exists; and the obstruction of movement of personnel or supplies of the Armed Forces of the United States.

Penalties are imposed by the bill upon conviction for either: first, rendering assistance to hostile forces, or second, obstructing military personnel or transportation of supplies.

The Department of Justice opposes the bill, contending that current laws, the Trading with the Enemy Act and Foreign Agents Registration Act, are sufficiently broad to prevent the movement of either money or other property from the United States to the Viet Cong.

They also believe that the Federal and States laws are currently adequate to stop anyone from interfering with the movement of either troops or supplies.

The Treasury, the Army, and the Departments of Commerce and State have all indicated that they believe the bill is unnecessary and that current laws are adequate.

There are no minority views.

I join with the gentleman from Mississippi in taking the position rather to be safe than sorry.

I think if the bill is not necessary, we cannot harm anything by passing it.

Mr. Speaker, I will go back a number of years to relate my experience when I was with the FBI teaching national defense matters throughout the United States to law enforcement officers. One of the subjects was sabotage. This was before we had actually declared war.

The sabotage statute starts out with the words: "When we are at war."

I remember one day in school when one of the officers said, "Mr. SMITH, we are not at war." It did not dawn on me that we were not at war. At that time we were investigating all over the United States in connection with national defense industries. Had anybody blown up a plant such as happened in the Black Tom case before the First World War, we could not have prosecuted them under the sabotage statute. But nobody thought of that during the many years that we were teaching this particular statute.

A call was made to Washington and within a few days the Congress of the United States passed a National Defense Act. I suppose some of you were here at that time. The act was directed toward injury to a national defense facility regardless of the fact that "war" had not been declared.

Maybe we do not need this law, but we cannot always foresee everything that is going to happen. I cannot see how this is going to harm anything and, of course, it might help in case we get into a situation where the present laws do not provide for the kind of action that this bill will provide for.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, under the terms of this bill, if the President of the United States were able to arrange that all of our war prisoners in North Vietnam could be released in return, let us say, for a few cases of polio vaccine; would that be illegal?

Mr. SMITH of California. I cannot answer your question.

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

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

Mr. POOL. That would be the action of the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and it would not be subject to this act.

Mr. JOELSON. Federal officials are definitely exempt from this?

Mr. POOL. The Chief Executive of the United States—the President of the United States—certainly.

Mr. JOELSON. I have one more question, and I am only asking this for the purpose of information. Is there anything in this act that would inhibit or prohibit the activities of the Red Cross?

Mr. POOL. No.

Mr. JOELSON. At the proper time I will offer some amendments, and I hope they will be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule and I will support the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHELAN. 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. 356]

Adams	Gallagher	O'Brien
Addabbo	Giaimo	O'Hara, Mich.
Albert	Gilbert	O'Konski
Anderson, Ill.	Gilligan	Olsen, Mont.
Anderson, Tenn.	Goodell	O'Neill, Mass.
	Grabowski	Ottinger
Andrews, Glenn	Green, Oreg.	Pepper
	Green, Pa.	Pickle
Annunzio	Griffiths	Pike
Arends	Gross	Powell
Ashley	Grover	Pucinski
Aspinall	Hagan, Ga.	Purcell
Baring	Halleck	Rees
Barrett	Hanley	Reid, Ill.
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Reid, N.Y.
Bingham	Hansen, Iowa	Reinecke
Blatnik	Hansen, Wash.	Resnick
Boland	Harvey, Ind.	Reuss
Bolling	Hawkins	Rivers, Alaska
Bow	Hébert	Robison
Brademas	Helstoski	Rodino
Bray	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks	Hicks	Roncalio
Brown, Calif.	Holland	Rooney, Pa.
Cahill	Horton	Rosenthal
Callaway	Howard	Roudebush
Carey	Hungate	St. Onge
Clancy	Huot	Scheuer
Clevenger	Irwin	Schmidhauser
Collier	Jacobs	Scott
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Slack
Corbett	Keith	Smith, N.Y.
Corman	Kelly	Smith, Va.
Craley	Keogh	Steed
Culver	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Daddario	Kirwan	Stratton
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Sweeney
Davis, Wis.	Latta	Taylor
Dent	Long, Md.	Tenzer
Dickinson	Love	Thomas
Diggs	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	McDowell	Thompson, Tex.
Dorn	McMillan	Todd
Dow	McVicker	Toll
Duncan, Oreg.	Macdonald	Trimble
Dwyer	Mackay	Tunney
Dyal	Mackie	Tupper
Edmondson	Martin, Ala.	Tuten
Evans, Colo.	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Everett	Mathias	Ullman
Evins, Tenn.	Matsunaga	Van Deerlin
Fallon	Meeds	Vigorito
Farbstein	Minish	Walker, Miss.
Farnum	Mize	Watts
Feighan	Moorhead	White, Idaho
Fisher	Morrison	Widnall
Flynt	Morse	Willis
Fogarty	Morton	Wilson, Bob
Foley	Moss	Wolff
Ford, William D.	Multer	Wyatt
	Murphy, N.Y.	Wydler
Friedel	Murray	
Fulton, Tenn.	Nix	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 248 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. POOL. 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. 12047) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 12047, with Mr. KING of Utah 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 Texas [Mr. POOL] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 12047, would, in short, prohibit the solicitation, collection, and delivery of any money or property for the use of any foreign power engaged in armed conflict with the United States, and would prohibit the obstruction of the movement of personnel and supplies of the Armed Forces, where the intent is to injure the United States or its Armed Forces.

At the outset, let me emphasize what should be apparent on the face of the bill. This bill is concerned with overt criminal activity only, not mere expressions of opinion. Sending aid, or attempting to send aid, to an enemy of the United States is an overt act; it is not mere dissent. Obstructing the movement of Armed Forces personnel and supplies is an overt act; it is by no stretch of the imagination mere dissent. The sponsors of this bill recognize the right of every citizen to disagree with and to criticize the domestic and foreign policies of the U.S. Government. We do not believe, however, that the Constitution gives any citizen in a time of actual, though undeclared, war, the right to assist the enemies of this country by sending aid to them, or at any time to sabotage the movement of personnel and supplies of the Armed Forces.

The committee held several days of hearings upon this bill, both investigative and legislative. Both phases of the hearings were revealing and informative.

You will undoubtedly recall the particularly well publicized accounts of the hearings. Some of the press reports, I believe, were misleading, if they conveyed the impression that the committee permitted itself to be baited, learned nothing, or failed to maintain itself with dignity. On the contrary, despite the planned disruptions which occurred—despite the efforts of seven lawyers to confuse the issues and the committee—I think it can be fairly said that the committee had the hearings under control at all times. Indeed, the conduct of the hostile witnesses and their lawyers was most enlightening. It was a type of visual evidence described by Professor Wigmore as "demonstrative evidence," which was very convincing.

The investigation reveals the existence of a well-organized and concerted effort by Communist groups, and their affiliates, to solicit and deliver money and property to North Vietnam and the Vietcong, and in certain instances to obstruct the movement of supplies and personnel of the Armed Forces.

I will not at this time review the evidence in detail. The record has been printed and you have before you the committee's report. I do wish to point out, however, that despite the positive evidence of the activities related, the Department of Justice has instituted no prosecutions. Although the executive agencies have taken the position that there is "no need" for new legislation, they have confessed their inability to prosecute. Our review of the existing Federal law makes clear that present law is inadequate to provide an enforcible base for many of the activities described. It is evident to us that, quite apart from any question of the Department's disposition to prosecute, a basic reason for the failure to prosecute was the absence of effective legislation and regulations. These weaknesses have been pointed out in the committee's report and are further revealed in the record of interrogation of witnesses who appeared for the executive agencies.

This bill in no way prohibits the giving or sending of gifts or aid to our captured personnel. Nor does it prohibit the giving of medical or other aid for humanitarian purposes, provided it is channeled through the U.S. Government or its Armed Forces. In no other way can we be assured that such aid will be applied for proper purposes.

The International Committee of the Red Cross has no delegate in North Vietnam. It is not even permitted to inspect prisoner of war camps. If gifts, money, or aid is transmitted to the International Red Cross for the Vietcong-occupied areas they have said that they can only pass such aid on through the Vietcong representative in Moscow. If such gifts are intended for North Vietnam they are turned over to Hanoi.

The facts indicate that medical aid, even though intended for the civilian population of North Vietnam, is applied for the use of the Communist armed forces. Experience over the years with Communist dictatorships demonstrates that foreign aid is applied not for humanitarian but for political purposes only. Moreover, the sending of aid for the use of the North Vietnamese will release equivalent supplies for its armed forces.

Let me give you a case in point. I have before me a report dated August 18, 1966, appearing in the Los Angeles Herald Express Examiner. Lance Corporal George R. Carter, age 19, of Anaheim, Calif., a member of L Company, 3d Batallion, 3d

U.S. Marine Division, took part in Operation Hastings. Company K had been decimated, and Company L, to which Carter belonged, went in to remove the bodies of American dead which had been lying in a rain-soaked field for 3 days. Here is what Carter wrote to his wife:

> The next morning, we moved over to K Company area. And you won't believe this.
>
> We found medical supplies marked Berkeley, Calif., that the V.C. were using. Good American men were dying over here because of the V.C. and Berkeley is helping them.
>
> What a low piece of scum they are.

Commenting on this letter, Carter's mother said:

> At other times, he's written criticisms of the marchers. It really upsets him to get newspapers over there and read about it.
>
> He knew about the marchers before he went into the Marines, but he didn't notice it then as much as since he's gone overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I say that we cannot in good conscience permit this situation to continue.

There is no reason to believe that these initial efforts, by the fifth column within, to defeat and demoralize our troops and our people, have run their full cycle. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that we have witnessed only the beginning. As the situation of the enemy abroad becomes more critical, we may assume that their cohorts in our midst, who aid and abet them, will intensify their efforts. Unless we take preventive measures, we cannot predict, nor shall we who propose this legislation assume responsibility for, the devastating yet probable consequences that may ensue because of the failure to take timely action.

Mr. Chairman, in reporting this bill, the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities have been unanimous in urging passage of the bill as amended. We have not had one dissenting vote as to the contents of the bill or its necessity. There are no differences between the majority or minority members of the committee on this serious issue. General Hittle, who testified in support of the bill on behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, said that in a sense the only thing wrong with this bill is the fact that it is long overdue.

If this Nation were involved in a formally declared war, the legislation proposed by the bill would probably be unnecessary. However, in the present situation of actual as distinguished from declared war, it is a startling fact that our Nation and our Armed Forces are not protected against certain deliberate activity intended to defeat and destroy our Nation and its Armed Forces

Existing legislation appears in part to be geared to a by-gone stage in international relations. In the present epoch, however, we are faced with somewhat novel concepts to which we must adjust our laws.

The Communist strategy is to expand the area of conquest by deceit and subterfuge rather than open confrontation. This is so because Communist forces are presently inferior to those of the free world. By a process of piecemeal conquest, the Communists hope eventually to shift the balance of power. It is a long-range program and a goal toward which, we must agree, they have moved with some measure of success.

A principal technique of Communist aggression is the so-called "war of national liberation," for which elaborate doctrines have been evolved and adopted by Communist powers. It involves the clandestine financing and arming of Communist cadres previously established within target nations, and the secret infiltration thereto of troops and revolutionary cadres from adjoining or neighboring Communist bases. It is in fact naked aggression by one state upon another, but concealed by an appearance, although not the reality, of civil war.

A curious situation has resulted. The aggressor does not declare war, because by such a declaration he would be openly confessing his aggression. We on the other hand, do not declare war in defense of the victim, because we do not want to prolong the war. Meanwhile, our troops wage war without the protection of the wartime treason and other statutes.

I believe we may reasonably assume that our Nation will be afflicted with the consequences of this strategy for decades to come. We must update our laws, just as we have done in the instance of our military training and strategy, to cope with these efforts by those who would destroy us.

What is at issue, of course, is the security of the United States. In resisting these aggressors, our armed forces have been employed at great sacrifice. Upon their success depends all that we hold dear in life. The bill H.R. 12047 would extend to our Armed Forces the protection to which they are entitled.

I repeat, as is apparent on the face of the bill, this bill does not seek to stifle criticism of the Government or its policies. It in no way infringes upon the process of debate. It does, however, seek to stay the hand of him who would wield the dagger and plunge it in the backs of our sons while their faces are turned toward the enemy.

General Hittle made this point clear when he said:

> What is actually involved here is a very simple equation in military power and that is: That if an enemy is stronger, the extent to which he is stronger means that he can kill more of our troops and to the degree therefore that assistance to the enemy helps him and strengthens him, that results in killing U.S. troops, and that is not an abstract thing. That is somebody's son perhaps in this room, perhaps the kid next door or the boy down the street, and when we think of it in these terms nobody has that right.

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

Mr. POOL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 12047, which would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 to protect the United States and its Armed Forces against those who would impede, hamper, and obstruct our war effort in Vietnam.

This is a most urgent matter and Congress has a duty to act before we adjourn.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has amply demonstrated the need for this legislation and the American people overwhelmingly support the purposes of the bill. It is interesting to see who and which organizations are opposing this bill. It is the same minority of our citizens which opposed the Internal Security Act in the beginning. It is the same vocal, leftwing element which always seems to find justification for coddling the enemy, playing footsies with communism, and seeing weaknesses in our own national policy.

It is incredible to me that while much of our national energy is directed toward prosecuting the war and our Defense and State Departments are devoting so much toward carrying out our national policy, the Justice Department is opposed to congressional efforts to bring to justice those who are interfering with the prosecution of the war. This is the same Justice Department which has refused to prosecute these peaceniks and leftwingers who have been causing disturbances in various parts of the country. The Department has taken no action either because they do not have the laws or because they will not take action. We are proposing here to give them the law—and Congress should see that it is used.

This is a problem which is bigger than the war in Vietnam. We have in this country today a group of people whose first love is not America but who seek every way they can to undermine the great institutions which we hold dear. Their interest is not in seeing that these are preserved but some of them actually seek to undercut our form of government. What kind of person would turn his back on American boys in Vietnam and help the enemy? What is the motivation of those who seek to send money and supplies to the people who are waging the war against us? We are in Vietnam supposedly to help the South Vietnamese maintain their freedom; we seek no gain ourselves. Yet, those who oppose this bill would have these "freethinkers" continue to aid, support, and encourage our enemy while our boys in Vietnam remain under fire. In my opinion, this would be criminal.

I commend Chairman POOL and the members of his subcommittee for their diligence in bringing up and preparing this all-important bill and particularly the manner in which this investigation was conducted.

We must stop coddling subversive elements and organizations in our country whose real purpose is to cripple our war effort and help the Communist conspiracy in their effort to take over the free nations of the world.

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

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

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

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

Mr. YATES. The bill would be operative against foreign powers, organizations, or groups which are engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of

the United States. To what countries or organizations or groups does that refer? Are there other nations than North Vietnam to which the bill would refer?

Mr. POOL. It would apply also to the Vietcong.

Mr. YATES. Suppose Russia had sent men to North Vietnam, to train them in the use of the SAM sites, and the Russians actually were firing at our planes as they came over. Would this be applicable to Russia?

Mr. POOL. What kind of case are you talking about now?

Mr. YATES. Russia has supplied North Vietnam with so-called SAM ground-to-air missiles. Suppose the Russian technicians were firing at our planes. Would it apply to Russia, then?

Mr. POOL. No. I do not think it would apply to Russia because Russia has stated that these men are not permitted to fire at our planes.

Mr. YATES. Suppose there were Russian volunteers who went into action?

Mr. POOL. If they were Russian volunteers it would not be an action of the Russian Government.

Mr. YATES. It would have to be an action by the government, then?

Mr. POOL. Well, if you want to use the Russian Government as an example, yes, it would have to be an action of the Russian Government.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the position of the Justice Department, legislation designed to prevent irresponsible conduct by "peaceniks" and other publicity-hungry misfits is certainly in order as it relates to the movement of essential war material much needed by our Armed Forces.

H.R. 12047, recommended by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, applies to situations such as developed on the west coast where some of these characters stretched themselves out in front of supply trucks and trains, in an effort to prevent the movement of supplies and troops.

If the Department of Justice has doubts as to the necessity of this bill due to present statutes, the question occurs why no prosecutions were authorized.

As long as this administration has committed our troops in Vietnam, this Congress has a duty to take whatever responsible steps are necessary to supply them, without interruption.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

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

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

Mr. YATES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. YATES. Some months ago one of our distinguished Senators said, if the newspapers reported him correctly, that he supported furnishing blood to the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. Would that be permitted under this bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would assume it would not be permitted under this bill if he directly solicited blood rather than offering an off-the-cuff opinion as I recall he did.

Mr. YATES. Suppose in a meeting of a group that was discussing the question as to whether or not blood or medical supplies might be sent to our adversaries and someone got up and said "We think blood ought to be sent to our adversaries," would that be prohibited by this bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. No. As the gentleman from Texas said at the start, any inquiry or any discussion into these matters affecting the aiding of an enemy would not be prohibited by the bill but only direct and overt acts. If they raise money to be sent to the enemy, of course, that is covered, but you could discuss it all you want.

Mr. YATES. Would that be considered to be a solicitation under the act? What would be considered to be a solicitation under the act?

Mr. ASHBROOK. When a person or an organization would directly endeavor to induce or to raise money and then in turn turn the money over to one of the groups or nations considered in this bill.

Mr. YATES. An expression of an opinion by itself or a statement by the Quakers, for example to the effect that they thought they should send blood to the North Vietnamese, would this be a violation of this act?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It came up a number of times in the committee, and it is my clear understanding this would not in any way be so considered. For the legislative history, I also yield to the chairman of the subcommittee for his observation, which I am sure is the same.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I offered an amendment in the committee which was adopted by the committee striking out all language referring to urging, counseling, or anything that might possibly violate the first amendment; that is, the freedom of speech guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. YATES. And the term "solicit" as used in the act refers not to verbal or written expressions by themselves but, rather, to an act?

Mr. ICHORD. That is right. The act of actually soliciting funds and collecting funds. It is the act that is referred to in the bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would add for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois that we have gone further, also, and have even said it has to be with the intent of aiding an enemy or impeding our Armed Forces. So even if it is for humanitarian purposes, it is not covered. It has to be with the intent of aiding the enemy.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. YATES. The phrase, however, appears in the language to which the gentleman just alluded, reading as follows: "or advantage such foreign power, organization, group, resident, national, member, or agent."

I would assume if such gift did get through, if it were some blood or some other thing of value, it would advantage the other side, would it not?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Only if that was with the intent of doing it. We might assume anything they would send there, if there is no Red Cross supervision, might be used by the enemy. But if it is not sent with that in mind, if the Quakers want to send it to boys in the prisoner of war camps and it finds its way into the Vietcong in some way, it certainly could not be sent with the intent of aiding the Vietcong.

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

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

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I have one additional question which I would like to direct to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] mentioned the fact that certain medical supplies had gotten into North Vietnam and did contain information indicating that they came from Berkeley, Calif.

Was there evidence as to how these supplies got there?

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

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

Mr. POOL. They had printed information on the packages showing that they came from Berkeley, Calif., information on the boxes of medical supplies, to the effect that they were designed for that destination and were found in a Vietcong camp. I do not know as to how they came to be there. That is a rather hard determination to make. That is why we ought to accept the evidence they offer instead of our own conjecture.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I agree that we should prevent this kind of thing, but the question is whether the supplies were actually sent in violation of the law.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I do not know about that.

Mr. NEDZI. I believe that is a very crucial point in this determination and in the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YATES. May I ask the chairman of the committee, this question: Is it possible that the supplies he mentions were captured in one of the conflicts between the South Vietnamese and the Vietcong, or possibly through the black market?

Mr. POOL. No; they were found in Vietcong camps and they carried shipping labels marked "Berkeley, Calif.," and it was on all of the supplies in that particular batch.

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

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

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman for his edification that we have one of the greatest research laboratories in the world located at Berkeley, Calif.; namely, the Cutter Laboratory, which deals in the very commodities about which the gentleman is talking, and I remember another question which was raised——

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, the Cutter Laboratory's name was not on these boxes. I remember that very definitely.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, the point is this: If they were medical supplies, they could quite possibly have been from some research laboratory other than in Berkeley, Calif., but I insist upon the fact that it should be made quite clear that this would not condone it in any way, but if it were found in the hands of the adversary, this is one thing. It is quite possible that they could have been captured, this medical equipment.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I believe the committee is confident of the fact that these articles came from Berkeley, Calif., and were found in the hands of the Vietcong. This is based upon the opinion of many who appeared before the committee and who have access to this information due to the fact that they have been collecting these things. And it is our best opinion that they came from that source.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. How did they get there?

Mr. COHELAN. If there is no evidence to that effect, I would merely say that the designation of "Berkeley, Calif.," is not overriding, but there has been some very serious activity and there has been some evidence of this participation, but can the committee be sure that it is limited to Berkeley, Calif.?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, I understand that and I appreciate the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] defending his constituency. But in this instance, the supplies which were captured had "Berkeley, Calif." written out upon them, and they did not have anything with reference to the fact that they may have come from the Quartermaster Corps, the Army supply center, or anything like that, or from any medical depot.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlemen of the House will permit me to discuss these matters during the course of my time, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. POOL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are interested in a very good debate on this subject.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, there is some concern that in one way or the other, directly or indirectly, this bill may adversely affect labor-management relations and, specifically, that it may prevent a union from striking, or it may prevent a company from locking out its employees.

I understand that there was no such intent envisioned during the drafting of this legislation.

However, I would like to have the gentleman's assurance that this bill in no way will affect labor-management relations.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that it is very clearly not intended. However, I will yield to the chairman of the committee for further response to the question.

Mr. POOL. This question was brought up in the committee and based upon my understanding thereof, it does not touch upon any questions which the gentleman raises with reference to labor-management relations.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman in the well very much for yielding.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, the point about labor-management relations—is that what the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. POOL. There has been an amendment drawn up by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and insofar as I am concerned, based upon the knowledge which I have of it, it is acceptable to us.

Mr. Chairman, we are not trying to get labor-management mixed up in this thing.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say in response to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have in my hand a letter from the Industrial Union Department in which they say that the International Security Act amendments embodied in H.R. 12047 are detrimental to the rights and liberties of the American citizens, and would do nothing to our Nation's ability to prosecute the war in Vietnam. They oppose the bill.

It is signed by Jack Conway, executive director.

Mr. KARTH. I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I am not really concerned in their position in regard to this bill and the intent of the bill. My question was directed to whether it affects labor-management relations.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is the unanimous opinion of the committee that it would not and should not be covered in this legislation, and in support of that, in order to buttress this view, we will accept an amendment later that will clearly set this matter straight.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. I take this time to thank the gentleman for yielding, for permitting the House to get this exchange of information, on a bill that is so highly controversial and which many of us believe is so very ambiguous.

I read the report. In looking at the activities cited and efforts to collect funds, I was impressed that there was not a great deal of money collected.

The examples given are of a Haverford student who collected $200, and then returned the money because he felt it violated the Treasury regulations.

There was another group that collected the sum of $100. Another example is a group that collected $250. Then there is another example of the collection of $1,500, which was transferred to a bank in Czechoslovakia which in turn transferred it to the Far East.

Then our Treasury Department in turn charged the bank in Czechoslovakia the $1,500.

Is there actual evidence that the committee received that there was any substantial shipment of money that went to our adversaries, or things of any kind of value which would justify the type of penalties that are proposed in this bill?

What evidence did the committee have that does not appear in the report that anything of value were getting through?

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I might say that when I am recognized, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that I will read into the RECORD three letters, one from the Wells-Fargo Bank and two from the Obchodni Bank in Czechoslovakia, which are proof that the money was transmitted to the Vietcong representatives in the city of Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Mr. YATES. Is that the item to which the report refers?

Mr. ICHORD. Yes. I shall read that into the RECORD when I am recognized.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I think the gentleman from Illinois has raised several good points. And I think he must frankly realize that there is no possible way an investigating committee can know all of the amounts that have been collected or disbursed. And the fact that we can only name several instances—and that the total might well be $10,000 or $12,000—certainly would not derogate the need for the law.

We have no possible way to know how many comparable forms of aid have been received by the enemy. We do know that there are these efforts to try to

raise the money and to put it into the hands of our adversaries.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the reason I think this is important is that the report shows clearly that all—and I use the word "all"—all agencies of our Government which are responsible for protecting our Government from the actions which this bill seeks to prevent are opposed to this bill. They say there are adequate laws on the books at the present time.

Is that not correct?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is correct insofar as it is their position. It certainly would not be our position. For example, I would only add one point. The Export Control Act affords some degree of supervision over funds or materials to be sent outside of the country, yet there is nothing to prevent the soliciting of materials and funds within this country, which is one point to which this bill would direct itself. So there is a void there that is not presently covered by law which, in the judgment of this committee and, we hope, the mandate is going to be overwhelmingly, that this will be the view of this body.

So there are several areas that the present law does not cover. Then again some of us might have a different point of view as to how current regulations are being administered. I happen to think they are being administered in a way that would in fact encourage what the President has already said he wanted, and that is to increase east-west trade. That may not be what a majority of this Congress wants. But we should do what we think is right and not necessarily what a Government agency such as the Treasury or the Commerce Department or other agencies of the executive department determine to be right. We are a separate branch of Government and should act as such.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would it not appear that the solicitation or collection of funds for the purposes stated in this bill that are limited to use in this country are not going to aid a foreign enemy?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would not agree with that at all. I have no way of knowing. But we do have direct evidence that they are endeavoring to get it in the hands of the enemy. We run into certain kinds of road blocks. I, myself, happen to be one who believes that this body should say that it is illegal to raise money with the idea in mind of aiding an enemy of the United States.

Mr. YATES. But did this committee find from its examination of responsible officials of this Government any instances that present laws were being violated?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I think they have received evidences of that—yes.

Mr. YATES. It does not appear in the report, if that is true.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It certainly came out in the hearings.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. The money that went to Czechoslavakia was a clear violation of the law.

Mr. YATES. Was that not corrected by an action of the Treasury?

Mr. POOL. It did not keep the $1,500 from going to the Vietcong and that is what we are trying to stop. That is the point. They might have a credit overseas but they got the $1,500.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and ask his forgiveness for the presumption. This is the first question I have ever asked in this House of Representatives.

Did I understand that it is the committee's sense as to the labor amendment to be adopted that you could stop military transportation, trains, or trucks carrying supplies to our men in Vietnam if it is done under color of a labor dispute?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is, in effect, a strike?

Mr. WALDIE. Well, whatever it is—if the action that stopped a truck or a train taking the supplies to troops was in furtherance of a labor dispute, is it the understanding of the committee, and do I understand the committee says that is not within the provisions of this act and not prohibited thereby?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is correct. The President would have other means of stopping that kind of activity at his command and other provisions of law. This provision of law, if enacted, would not cover that type of situation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my wholehearted support to H.R. 12047 and to urge the House to enact this sorely needed legislation. I have an identical bill which I introduced with Mr. POOL, H.R. 16175.

No doubt there will be a small number of Members who will oppose it. One of their arguments, I am sure, will be that every executive branch agency which submitted a report on the bill said it was not needed, that we had all the laws needed in this area.

But the hearing record clearly shows that the reports on the bill from the executive agencies were not accurate in this respect, that there are serious gaps in existing statutes, gaps which permit both citizens of the United States and aliens resident in this country to engage in overt acts with the clear intent of aiding the enemies of the United States in this time of actual war.

In his testimony before the committee, the Deputy Attorney General stated that the Vietnam obstructionist movement is a propaganda effort. Of course it is, in part. Communists of all varieties and their fellow travelers in the United States have engaged in a massive propaganda effort on the subject of the war in Vietnam. This is clearly evident from the appendices in the committee's hearings, compiled by the staff, which contain numerous statements on the U.S. role in Vietnam by Communist Parties, groups and leaders, here and abroad, and Communist doctrinal statements on so-called wars of national liberation. These make it abundantly clear that propaganda on Vietnam is today one of the principal efforts of Communists everywhere.

But the thing I want to stress is that right here in the United States, it is much more than a propaganda effort. It is a carefully planned operation, with hard-core Communist revolutionaries at its core, bringing into direct action thousands of persons who have taken concrete steps to undermine our prosecution of the war in Vietnam and to give assistance to the Vietcong and the Communist government of North Vietnam.

What have these people done?

They have collected blood.

They have collected funds—funds, by the way, which have actually reached the Vietcong.

They have collected medical supplies—medical supplies which our troops have found on the battlefield in the hands of the Vietcong.

They have engaged in massive efforts to obstruct the movement of trains carrying Armed Forces personnel destined for Vietnam and trains and trucks transporting munitions of various types for Vietnam.

I, for one, cannot see how anyone can classify these large-scale operations as mere propaganda.

It is my view that the massive propaganda effort of the Communists in this country—and worldwide—has done more to injure the United States and help the Vietcong than the instances of overt aid I have mentioned. Yet, the bill before us does not touch these propaganda efforts. It has been most carefully worded to avoid attaching a criminal penalty to anything that could be construed as mere dissent or policy protest. Not a single witness called in the committee's hearings was subpenaed merely because he disagreed with our policy in Vietnam. Each and every one had engaged in overt acts to aid our enemies.

It was also stated by the Deputy Attorney General that the Department of Justice had no information indicating that funds collected for the Vietcong in this country actually reached the Vietcong.

But the fact of the matter is that medical aid committees in California deposited $1,500 for the Vietcong in a bank in Prague. When the Treasury Department learned of this and notified the U.S. bank through which the funds had been transmitted that this was a violation of regulations, the U.S. bank, as well as the Department of State, tried to correct the situation.

The U.S. bank wrote to the Prague bank, asking it to stop payment on the drafts totaling $1,500. The Communist-controlled bank in Czechoslovakia wrote back that the drafts had already been cashed. The U.S. bank asked the Prague bank to try to recover the money from the persons who had cashed the

drafts. The Prague bank did this—or at least it said it did—and then wrote to the U.S. bank that the payees "have declined to repay the amounts in question."

The Deputy Attorney General testified:

I would like to note, first, that this money did not in fact reach a hostile foreign power.

Obviously, however, this money, having been cashed in Prague by an agent of the Liberation Red Cross, must have reached the Vietcong. The fact of the matter is that the committee's hearing record makes it very clear that the only way we can be sure of halting aid to the Vietcong by Communist groups in this country is to make the initial collection of such funds a criminal offense. Trying to prevent these funds from reaching our enemies, after they have been collected, is just too difficult.

Being practical about it, how much chance does our Government have of preventing U.S. dollars from reaching the Vietcong as long as it permits Communists to openly collect funds for this purpose? It is all too clear that in a carefully planned covert operation, the Communists, through a series of cutouts, could easily get the money they had collected to some member of a Communist diplomatic delegation in the United States for transfer to the Vietcong through diplomatic pouch. The chances of uncovering an operation of this type and obtaining a conviction are indeed slim.

The only thing to do is to nip it in the bud, as I said before, by prohibiting the initial collection of such aid.

As far as interfering with the movement of our Armed Forces personnel and supplies is concerned, I do not feel that I need comment at any length. We cannot sit back and do nothing when Communist groups can contribute to the death and injury of our fighting men overseas by sabotaging, or attempting to sabotage, the flow of the weapons and munitions they need to prevent their being slaughtered by a ruthless enemy.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

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

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding. In the event the U.S. Armed Forces should become a part of a United Nations peacekeeping force, would the provisions of this bill still remain operative?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The point has not come up. I would have to defer to someone on the committee.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that there is some discussion about providing a U.N. peacekeeping force in Vietnam. Certainly in the past the United States has furnished members of its armed services to peacekeeping forces in various parts of the world. In the event the other side of the peacekeeping force were to become engaged in an armed conflict with the United Nations peacekeeping force, of which the United States were a member, would this act apply?

Mr. ASHBROOK. On page 4 the language appears: "or group engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States."

Were our Armed Forces to be placed under U.N. command, I would assume that they would come under provisions of the proposed legislation; but I frankly admit, for purposes of legislative history, the point has not been brought up and I would not be sure.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. I was working here on another subject and was not paying attention. What was the question?

Mr. YATES. In the event a peacekeeping force is created by the United Nations, and the United States becomes a part of the peacekeeping force, would the bill be operative with respect to so-called enemies of that peacekeeping force to require the operation of this act against that group?

Mr. POOL. If it is an armed conflict, yes.

Mr. YATES. It would be an armed conflict against the United Nations force.

Mr. POOL. Still we would be involved. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee could probably answer that question better than I could. It is a question of what is armed conflict. What do you mean by the question?

Mr. YATES. Again what I am saying is that in the Congo and in Cyprus the United States lent its military assistance to a peacekeeping force of the United Nations. Our Armed Forces were involved in that. There was fighting against Congolese. This act would make operative certain actions in the event our Armed Forces should become involved. The question I am asking is whether or not the act would be operative against a United Nations peacekeeping force of which the United States was a member.

Mr. POOL. If there is no armed conflict, I would say no. If there is armed conflict, yes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for making a very persuasive speech in behalf of this legislation. This legislation does not apply to any speech that anyone might make regarding the prosecution of the conflict in Vietnam. Is that correct?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is absolutely right. If any of the boys want to picket the President, as they did recently when he visited New York, saying "Hey, Hey, L.B.J.," there would be nothing wrong with that. That is part of the right of free speech, as much as we might disagree with that manifestation of it.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If Stokely Carmichael should appear in front of the Capitol, address 100,000 people, and tell them to lie down in front of trucks, and so forth, he would not be included in the provisions of the proposed legislation?

Mr. ASHBROOK. He would only be included in those provisions of section 402 if he did what the gentleman has described. That would not be an exercise of free speech. He would be encouraging them to take an action which in section 402 we are describing as illegal. Section 403 action of this type would clearly be unpunishable.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. On numerous occasions I have written the Attorney General asking him why he did not prosecute Carmichael for violation of section 12 of the Selective Service and Training Act. He said he could not do so because, among other things, Carmichael was talking to a crowd and not persuading an individual, and that his action would have to be read in the light of article I of the Constitution, which provides for free speech.

So it is clear to me that the Attorney General has no intention of prosecuting—nor is he trying in any way to prosecute this fellow Carmichael.

I have a speech he made in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 5, where he has said everything under the sun against this country. Among other things he said, "When Johnson calls, you say 'Hell, no, I ain't going,' under the Selective Service Act."

So the great Attorney General, now the Under Secretary of State, says there is no provision under the law whereby Carmichael may be prosecuted under that act, because it abridges article I of the Constitution.

So this legislation here does not apply in any manner to any speech anyone can conceivably make.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is our opinion that it would, with the idea of inducing action or soliciting funds in mind as set out in section 402.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If anyone made a speech which led to an overt act included in the items under this proposed statute, he would be violating the statute, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe that would be the case.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Is this the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. POOL]?

Mr. POOL. I think so, certainly. If he asked them to commit the overt act, then he would be guilty of the violation.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe we are becoming confused. On page 4, line 22, there is language which has been stricken. The language which is stricken includes the words "urges, or solicits another to obstruct, impede."

Therefore, this is not the so-called free speech provision. This has been protected by striking out the language which would have impeded free speech, as I understand it. Therefore, I believe the gentleman's answer is wrong in relation to the meaning of the statute and the stricken language as we have it before us.

Am I right in that, Mr. ICHORD?

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield, as the author of the amendment I would say that the gentleman from California is absolutely right, because I offered the amendment striking all the language dealing with "urging, counseling, or advising" so that we would not

get into this grey area which might possibly infringe on the freedom of speech guaranteed by the first amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am as much confused now, since the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member have both given a different answer from that given by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Of course, I am for the bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not think it goes far enough. Would our position be different if we had a declaration of war behind us in the prosecution of whatever this is in Vietnam?

Mr. ASHBROOK. There is no question about that. We would not need a bill like this were there a declaration of war. This is, in effect, trying to bridge the gap that we have in the so-called conflicts, training missions, military actions, and so forth, which have all the same effect as war but are not declared wars. The treason statutes would come into effect then.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. In view of what the gentleman from Missouri said, then, there is a difference of opinion. If a man made a speech and urged a group to do overt acts, about which we speak, and which are included in the makeup of this proposed legislation—if anyone urged a person to do those things included in this proposed legislation he would not be in violation of the proposed legislation, in view of what the gentleman from Missouri has said. Is this the consensus of the committee?

Mr. POOL. I think I was wrong, in the fact that the original bill did provide that. With this amendment on, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] is right.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I wish we had a saving clause to protect us, if any part of this is declared unconstitutional. Irrespective of the length to which it goes, we need something like this, because of things against the war effort. The morale of our troops is being seriously affected. I have gotten thousands of letters—thousands of letters—in our committee about the effects of what these people are doing. We cannot enact this too soon for me.

I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would say I have a number of requests for time on my side, and I think I will yield the floor.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not want to, because we have taken most of the time on our side. I wish the gentleman would direct it to the chairman so he could take it on his time.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield as much time as he may need to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Louisana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out what, in my opinion, the Pool bill deals with and what it does not; what it does and what it does not do. Then I want to give illustrations of the types of acts that are made unlawful and which ought to be punished by this bill. Finally, I will point out the extreme care that we took to protect every conceivable first amendment right in reporting this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill would deal only with people who would commit open and overt acts of hostility against their Government and their country and, at the same time, would give aid and comfort to the enemy during open, hot, shooting war, declared or undeclared, such as we are involved in up to our necks in Vietnam at this time. Specifically this bill, the Pool bill, would make it unlawful for people, and would punish people, who interfered with the transport of troops, for example, to Vietnam. It would make it unlawful to, and it would punish people who would try to, stop boatloads and trainloads of supplies and ammunition and war materiel going to our boys fighting in Vietnam. Yes, my colleagues, some people have been doing just this sort of thing for a long time and nothing has been done about it. These people have been giving of their time, their money, and the prestige of their names to help the Vietcong and the Communists who are fighting our boys in Vietnam. Yes, some of these people have been giving of their blood to build up blood banks. For whom? For our boys? No. For the Vietcong and for the Communists fighting our boys in Vietnam during this war.

Now, my colleagues, let me refresh your memory. During the hearings on this bill you read article after article implying that this terrible Committee on Un-American Activities was fixing to make a law to send people to jail if they disagreed with the Johnson policy vis-à-vis Vietnam, or who advocated perhaps the stopping of bombing in North Vietnam, or pulling out of Vietnam.

Let me say affirmatively that under this bill people, of course, would still have the right to believe or not to believe in our policy vis-a-vis Vietnam or any other area in the world. They would still have the right to agree to disagree with that policy. They would still have the right to express that belief and that opinion freely, openly, and loudly and from the rooftops, from wherever they are, even from the top of this Capitol. The people would still have the right under this bill to dissent, to protest, to demonstrate, yes, and to remonstrate on any subject they please.

The fact of the business, Mr. Chairman, is that we bent over backward and stretched a point to protect every conceivable first amendment right in the Pool bill. Let me illustrate what I mean.

As drafted, the bill would have made unlawful those actions which I have described that people are doing and also would have made it unlawful to advise and counsel or urge or solicit others to do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], offered an amendment to delete and strike out the words, "advises, counsels, urges, or solicits another" to commit these specific offenses.

So, Mr. Chairman, now only those would be involved who would personally perform and give overt and open actions of hostility against their Government during a hot, open shooting war, and at the same time would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. Chairman, that is what the enactment of this bill would do.

Mr. Chairman, as I said during the hearings—and, oh, I used to go home every night and would hear on TV, and read editorials and comments of the various columnists, implying that what the horrible Committee on Un-American Activities was doing was attempting to interfere with right of expression and the right of dissent with reference to our policy in Vietnam.

Of course, my friends, this was bosh; it was hogwash. It was just as phony as a 2-foot yardstick and as phony as a $3 bill, and just as false as many other things to which I have to listen and endure as the chairman of this committee, with reference to matters said against this committee on other subjects.

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

Mr. WILLIS. Of course I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the chairman of this committee, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, ED WILLIS, and to the gentleman from Texas, JOE POOL, who chaired the subcommittee during the hearings on this legislation, and to the committee for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House for our consideration today. I have long urged action in this matter. I would like to go much further personally.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has a most difficult duty and it is my opinion that they have operated within their legislative authority.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this represents good legislation and is needed. No man can shirk his responsibility to our boys at war. As long as I breathe I never will. To me it is simple. We either support our boys or we support the Communists.

But, Mr. Chairman, the real purpose for which I arose is to say that I am particularly pleased to have ED WILLIS back in the saddle once again, speaking forthrightly for the good of these United States. He always does. His wisdom has been missed.

Mr. Chairman, we are all glad to have ED WILLIS really back at work in this House of Representatives again.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] for his most flattering remarks.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, last May it was my privilege to visit southeast Asia and to see with my own eyes, and walk among the magnificent young men

who are fighting for human freedom in Vietnam. Their dedication and their faith in the rightness of their mission was an inspiration to behold.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am concerned, and insofar as the one-half million Americans whom I represent in this body are concerned, we regret that there is any American or any Member of either House of the Congress who would not give absolute support to these American soldiers who are fighting in what I, for one, consider to be a classic contest of good versus evil and freedom versus tyranny.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have heard it said by a very good friend of mine in the other body—and I felt he was so right—that if this war should be lost—and it shall not be, but if it should be lost—it will not be on account of these boys who are fighting over there.

It would be lost right here in Washington, D.C., by certain people taking active steps and saying things contrary to the good of our fighting boys over there.

They will never lose a war, do not worry about that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank my distinguished chairman for his contribution with which I absolutely agree, and would say that indeed there has been evidence that the Vietcong have been encouraged to believe that American people are tiring of this conflict, are growing weary, and will withdraw from it, on the basis of statements made in high places from the Congress and elsewhere.

I regret that this is the case. I regret that there is any group of Americans who would, however high minded, however pure their motives, seek to in any way support an enemy—for if, in any way, we support him to that extent we give him strength with which to fight against our American soldiers.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Ohio was on the floor, and in the exchange that took place, it was clearly brought out that this bill in no way interfered with the right to dissent.

Do I understand that the gentleman is advocating eliminating the right to dissent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his question.

In answer to his question I would say absolutely not.

I regret that it is the situation that there is dissent, that there is protest, but this bill does not in any way move against the right to dissent, or the freedom of speech of any American citizen. I would say further that certainly one of the freedoms for which our servicemen are fighting is the first amendment, a very basic part of our Constitution, which does permit freedom of speech, to protest, to dissent. Indeed, this is one of the basic things for which they fight in Vietnam, and which we certainly would not seek to abrogate or to deny.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

I should like to point out that those of us who do not favor the Pool bill also support our fighting forces in Vietnam. The Pool bill is not a test of that support. And I suggest to the gentleman that he might want to refer to the speech that was made by the late Senator from the State of Ohio, Senator Robert A. Taft in 1951, when he said that the right to dissent, particularly in the field of foreign policy, is the privilege and the duty of every citizen of the United States. It is particularly applicable to the Members of Congress, he said. Members of Congress do have the responsibility of analyzing our foreign policy in our country and of speaking their views. And we have a right to dissent from this bill, as well.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois that I appreciate the questions he has raised today. I would never seek to imply that his questions are based on anything other than the desire for good legislation, nor would I by any means question the patriotism or the integrity of his questions. I believe the gentleman's desire is to do what is right for our country, just as it is my desire. So I appreciate the questions he has asked, not only of me, but of other Members today.

However, we are engaged in a war that is not popular, the conduct of which has been questioned by many Members on both sides of the aisle, many who feel we have not gone far enough, and fast enough, others who feel we should not be there at all.

I would simply say that while there is the right of freedom of speech, or to dissent from any Government policy, or to protest any policy of this Government, when such actions reach the point of actually interfering with the movement of American troops or supplies, or giving aid to an enemy engaged in armed conflict against the American forces, then we have gone past the point of the first amendment's exercise of free speech and are entering an area in which, in my judgment, no citizen has the moral right to move, nor should he enjoy such legal right.

This legislation does, as the chairman and others have clearly brought out, some very simple things. It prescribes penalties for moving against American forces, for impeding the movement of American forces and their supplies. It moves against acts to aid and abet a group or nation with which we are engaged in armed conflict.

It does not keep any citizen in any way from making a speech, whatever speech he may desire to make, or to lawfully assemble to protest any policy. Such a citizen can put on a Vietcong uniform. He can wave the Vietcong flag and march around the Capitol, and perhaps get 1,000 others to follow him; but if he does not interfere with the movement of troops and supplies, or actually solicit aid of some kind for the Vietcong or North Vietnam, this law would not touch him in any way.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Gladly.

Mr. YATES. Do the provisions of section 403 of the act which provide against the obstruction of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States apply as well to members of the National Guard when the National Guard is federalized to deal with a local disturbance?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would assume that these provisions would apply to the National Guard. But I will yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], the chairman, for a more expert answer.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. If they are a part of the Armed Forces of the United States. Yes, I think it would apply.

Mr. YATES. Then I take it, it would be the purpose of this act and the purpose of the committee to make this act operative against any obstruction made against any member of the National Guard who had been activated to Federal duty?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman is making it too broad. I would say that the entire bill deals with the intent to obstruct the Armed Forces to aid an enemy with which we are engaged in armed conflict. The gentleman is making it pretty broad and I would say that the language does not go that far.

Mr. YATES. But there is no exception drawn in the act for deleting that. The act is broad enough to cover that; is it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Again I must yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] for a more expert answer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield while the chairman is waiting.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am concerned about the same thing the gentleman from Illinois is concerned about. Section 403, in my opinion, and I am looking at the language of it because the language prevails over the colloquy on the floor here—the language clearly says that if any Armed Forces are carrying out military duty, let us say in a desegregation dispute in the South, for instance, and let us say they have been assigned to maintain order—if anyone—any citizen interferes with them while they are on foot or pushes them or in any other way impedes or obstructs them, that person is subject to a $10,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both.

Certainly this goes to the extent of being cruel and unusual punishment and you are really getting yourself into some trouble here. I am sure that people acting in an emotional situation and feeling very strongly that the National Guard should not be there or that the Armed

Forces should not be there might be so concerned that they will throw a pop bottle or do something in the way of an overt act that would be construed to be either impeding the free movement on foot or otherwise of these people while on duty.

Mr. YATES. I think the gentleman raises a very important point. Suppose a truck is in the path of one of the vehicles of the National Guard. In that case it would come within the provisions of the language that says: "operation, movement or passage of any facility of transportation.

Mr. POOL. Here is the language I want to call to the attention of the committee, and it is in black and white. They are trying to get this thing way out in left field here. This has to do with the intent to obstruct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield me some time?

Mr. POOL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN].

I want to ask you this question and point out what they are doing here. They are ignoring the plain language of the statute.

The bill says: "with the intent to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the United States, or any member of the Armed Forces, in preparing for, or carrying on, any military duty or activity."

Now, the National Guard is under the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. YATES. But not when they are federalized.

Mr. POOL. I know but it says what I just read and if they are federalized, then they are a part of the Army.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. POOL. Then they ought to be in it when that happens.

Mr. YATES. What does that mean?

Mr. POOL. They have to be considered as the Armed Forces of the United States when the National Guard becomes a part of the Army.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. When the National Guard is mobilized as it is at times to deal with rioting, this act would then become operative.

Mr. POOL. If they are trying to obstruct the Armed Forces, I do not care what they do, but if it is obstructing the Armed Forces, they will come within the act and it ought to be applied to them, certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] has given the gentleman the answer to his question.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I am very interested to hear the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] tell us that they are supporting a bill which would make it illegal for anyone to interfere with or attempt to interfere with, the National Guard or any part of the Armed Forces that is called out to enforce the desegregation of schools.

Mr. POOL. Did you intend that to mean that I might have thought otherwise on that question without this kind of statute?

Mr. RYAN. I hope I left no inference.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I should like to make one additional point in the time I have remaining. Without this legislation, there would be no legislation to prevent a person from soliciting funds for the Vietcong all over Washington provided that he is not apprehended in the transmission of those funds to our enemy. Such a person could collect all over town thousands of dollars, and there would be no law which could touch him, unless and until transmission to a "blocked national" was attempted, and this proven in court. The bill would simply nip such acts in the bud and strike at the source. It would make sure that these activities would not begin, activities which I think most Americans would define in the area of crime, such as actively soliciting and collecting funds to aid an enemy with which we are engaged in armed conflict.

This war is very real to our fighting men. And to the widows and orphans of those who fall in battle, it is very real. Yet the penalties prescribed herein are mild compared to the penalties already prescribed by law for these same acts in a declared war. As a very minimum, we owe our soldiers in Vietnam and their families the support and protection provided by this legislation. I urge its passage by this body.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I rise in favor of H.R. 12047, a bill which should receive the overwhelming support of the Members of the House.

Let me make clear at the outset for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois and others that H.R. 12047 is in no way aimed at stifling legitimate dissent against this Nation's policy in South Vietnam. A prohibition of legitimate dissent would not only not be the American way, but it would be illegal and void under the Constitution of the United States.

We may not agree with voiced dissent. We may not agree with demonstrations. But so long as they constitute a valid exercise of the right of free speech and the right of freedom of assembly, each of us has a sworn duty to uphold the Constitution of the United States. We have a sworn duty to uphold the exercise of freedom of speech, dissent and actions, regardless of how offensive we may consider such speech and actions.

Each of us might have different interpretations as to how far the right of free speech and the right of freedom of assembly should extend. No doubt each of us has different ideas as to what constitutes legitimate dissent. But I hope, Mr. Chairman, that there is no Member of this body who believes or holds the view that the acts of raising funds, the collecting of blood, money, and supplies and sending them to the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese, who are now killing the flower of American youth, are legitimate dissent. That is what section 402 of the Pool bill would prohibit.

I know that no Member of this body holds the view that that would be legitimate dissent. Such could not be the position of a true libertarian. That could be only the position of a libertine masquerading under the guise of a libertarian.

H.R. 12047 is not directed at lawful speech or lawful assembly. It is directed only at overt acts specifically intended and for the purpose of aiding and abetting the enemies of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much said both inside and outside the Congress as to what is contained in H.R. 12047.

Some people have made statements that H.R. 12047 contains provisions which are not contained in the bill at all.

Some people have questioned the constitutionality of H.R. 12047 without any concept of what the bill contains.

Others have had their statements taken out of context and have been misrepresented.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that many people in America will be surprised by the final vote on this bill to learn that this is really not a controversial measure.

The bill as reported by the committee with amendments cannot possibly be construed as violating the Constitution of the United States. All language such as "advising, counseling and urging" has been stricken from the bill by the amendment which I offered in committee and which was adopted unanimously by the committee.

So the bill deals only with overt acts. These acts must be committed with specific intent. This deals with specific, intent crimes, the specific intent to aid and abet the enemies of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Justice has said that this bill is not needed, that the existing law is adequate. I do not know whether the Department of Justice has changed its position since the hearings or not, but I unhesitatingly state at this time that the Department of Justice is in error. The present law is not sufficient. The present law is vague and inadequate.

I made the statement, when I received the report of the Department of Justice, that it was either in error or it constituted a prima facie indictment of the Department of Justice for failing to prosecute, because there have been transmissions of funds for the use of the Vietcong and there have been no prosecutions.

Now I can be more specific. The reason why there have been no prosecutions is that there is no statute to uphold a prosecution for the transmission of funds.

Before I yield to the gentleman, I want to clear up one error in the hearings. The representative of the Department of Justice, Mr. Clark, testified that to his knowledge there had been no funds transmitted to the Vietcong. I am sure

that Mr. Clark at that time was not aware of what actually happened. I speak of the $1,500 in the form of two checks, money raised by the Medical Aid for Vietnam Committee in Berkeley, Calif. A draft was drawn in favor of a Vietcong agent in Prague, Czechoslovakia. The money was cleared through the Wells Fargo Bank and the Obchodni Bank of Prague, Czechoslovakia.

I read into the RECORD at this time, Mr. Chairman, a copy of a letter dated June 20, 1966, to the Ceskoslovenska Obchodni Banka of Prague, Czechoslovakia:

GENTLEMEN: This refers to the following drafts drawn on you by our university office, in favor of Liberation Red Cross.

This is the Red Cross of the Vietcong.

No. 119119; date, January 24, 1966; amount, $500.00; No. 119172; date, February 24, 1966; amount, $1,000.00.

If payment of these drafts has not been made, we will appreciate your recording a stop payment thereon and arranging with the Union Bank of Switzerland, Zurich, to whom we remitted settlement, to refund the amounts to us.

Should payment have been made please endeavor to recover the payments from the payee and advise us of the results of your efforts.

We look forward to your report.

Sincerely,

GEO. W. SCHMITZ.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield me 5 additional minutes?

Mr. POOL. I can yield you 3 additional minutes. I am about to run out of time.

Mr. ICHORD. Then on June 29, 1966, a letter from the bank of Czechoslovakia which reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated June 20 concerning the above mentioned drafts, and wish to inform you that they were already cashed at our counters: draft 119119 on February 10 and draft No. 119172 on March 17, 1966.

As to your request that we endeavor to recover the payments from the payees we inform you that we have contacted the latter transmitting your request to them.

We remain,

Very truly yours,

———. ———.

(Signed an agent of the Czechoslovakian Obchodni bank.)

Then a letter dated July 4, 1966, also from the Obchodni bank, reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: We wish to refer to our letter of the 29th ult. informing you that the above drafts were cashed at our counters in February and March, resp., 1966, and that your request to refund the funds concerned has been transmitted to the payees.

After having contacted the latter, we regret to inform you that they have declined to repay the amounts in question.

We remain,

Very truly yours,

———. ———.

(Signed an agent of the Obchodni National Bank of Czechoslovakia.)

So, gentleman from Illinois, the funds were transmitted. They were received by the Vietcong. Let me point out to the gentleman from Illinois that the reason why there have been no prosecutions is there was not a violation of the law in that case. The only possible law now covering such transactions as this is the Trading With the Enemy Act. At the time this money was transmitted, the Vietcong was not designated by the U.S. Treasury as a blocked country or group of persons. Since that time the regulations have been amended and the Vietcong are designated as blocked nationals. But there was no law which this case violated. Under the present law I can go out and solicit and solicit and collect and collect and collect and collect funds for the Vietcong, for the North Vietnamese, but there is no possible penalty until those funds are transmitted to a blocked country or a blocked national.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are here today engaged in an exercise of futility and frustration with respect to this bill, H.R. 12047, to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Senator DIRKSEN has made it clear that this bill will not pass the Senate. Further, he has stated that the hearings that brought it forth were a "spectacle" that could "do Congress no good".

The New York Times article of Sunday, August 21, on this follows:

DIRKSEN SCORES UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES INQUIRY

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—"This spectacle can do the Congress no good," Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois said today.

The Senate Republican leader was referring to the four raucus days of hearings this week by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The announced purpose of the hearings, during which about 50 persons were arrested, was to provide the investigative basis for a bill to make it a felony to aid "any hostile foreign power" or person or group "acting in hostile opposition" to the United States armed forces.

Yesterday, after he had suddenly broken off the hearing, Representative JOE R. POOL, Democrat, of Texas, said that his bill would be reported out next week. He predicted it would quickly pass the House and Senate.

But today, Senator DIRKSEN made it plain that, regardless of the expected approval by the House, the chances of the bill's passing the Senate were exceedingly slim.

MANSFIELD SHARES VIEWS

Views similar to Mr. DIRKSEN'S were also expressed by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the majority leader. Mr. MANSFIELD expressed doubt that, considering the composition of the Judiciary Committee, the bill would ever reach the Senate floor.

Amid the tumult and the shouting of the subcommittee hearings the 50 persons later arrested were forcibly removed by Federal marshals from the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building.

Among those arrested were several of the 12 witnesses; a lawyer for two of the witnesses, Arthur Kinoy; and many student spectators in the audience who time after time interrupted the proceedings.

The witnesses had been subpoenaed by the subcommittee to tell of their activities in opposition to the Vietnam war. The activities had ranged from attempts to halt United States troop trains to the collection of money for medical supplies for North Vietnamese forces and the Viet Cong.

Mr. POOL'S bill would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 and would provide penalties up to a 20-year jail sentence or $20,000 fine.

Senator DIRKSEN speaks with some authority on the prospects of the bill in the Senate because he is the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill will be referred.

"When you draft a criminal statute that applies to the whole country, the utmost caution has to be exercised," Mr. DIRKSEN said.

"A criminal statute carries with it a penalty—a fine or prison sentence—and you don't lightly send a person to jail or fine him, you don't want a criminal statute to become a veritable dragnet."

The Republican leader went on to say that "when you talk about rendering aid to an enemy, or some country with which we are at hostilities, you must exercise caution to make sure it's carefully defined. This is a job for lawyers, and it is necessary to take a good look before a jump into the dark."

Mr. MANSFIELD noted that Senators loosely classified as "liberal" constitute a majority of the Judiciary Committee, and he doubted that they would report out a bill as vaguely drafted as the Pool bill.

Many Senators who are lawyers have the reservations and objections to the bill expressed last week by Henry J. Steiner, a Harvard law school professor.

The first section of the bill would impose criminal penalties on persons who give, or advise or solicit another to give, "money, property or thing" to "any hostile foreign power," or to any group of persons "acting in hostile opposition" to the armed forces.

Addressing himself to this section, Professor Steiner noted that there were several Federal laws that rigorously control export of money or goods to foreign countries or their nationals, including the Export Control Act of 1949 and The Trading With The Enemy Act. Both of these acts have criminal penalties.

Mr. Steiner also contended that the section was vague. The language, he said, does not make clear whether "the hostile foreign power" must be a nation that United States is actually fighting.

Does the phrase, he asked, encompass, "any country which actively opposes our policy in Vietnam?" And, he continued, "when is a group to which a person might contribute 'acting in hostile opposition' to the armed forces?"

Third, Mr. Steiner's chief criticism was directed at the inclusion within the bill's sanctions of those who "advise" others to give money or property in aid of a hostile foreign power. The bill thus reaches "behind conduct," he said, to speech, and this opens the possibility of a dangerous violation of constitutional rights.

The second section of the Pool bill provides penalties for those interfering with, or advising others to interfere with, the movement of troops or supplies.

Here again Mr. Steiner said that there were already laws dealing with such obstruction. If the present laws are inadequate, he said, they can be strengthened, but any new legislation should extend to overaction and not to "advice."

Many House members, as well as those in the Senate, take the same critical view of the Pool bill. However, House members have found it difficult—especially, in campaign years—to vote against bills favored by the Un-American Activities panel, particularly when the bills are directed against such activities as were definitely confessed last week by the witnesses.

To the utter confusion of the subcommittee, which had become accustomed to witnesses who took refuge from the outset in the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination, these young revolutionaries proclaimed their affiliations with the

Peking-oriented Progressive Labor Party and its former satellite, the May 2d Movement.

Unquestionably many House members believe, as Mr. DIRKSEN does, that the "spectacle" did not improve the House image, and they see little sense in providing the students of the New Left with a forum grossly out of proportion to its threat.

But few of those who feel this way will go so far as to demand that the committee be abolished or even to vote against the Pool bill. As in the past, they are expected to take the safe course of voting for a bill repugnant to them in the sure knowledge that the Senate will dispatch it to oblivion.

The Department of Justice says the bill is not necessary and legislation presently on the statute books will suffice. See committee report No. 1908 dated August 29, 1966, at page 8. The American Civil Liberties Union is depressed about the violations of civil liberties in repressing honest freedom of expression that could occur.

The New York Times in its editorial of August 22 has analyzed the House Un-American Activities Committee itself.

The editorial follows:

THE INCURABLE COMMITTEES

It is a measure of how low the House Un-American Activities Committee has sunk in public esteem that Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has joined those who condemn its unseemly spectacles and its legislative futility.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader, has agreed with Mr. DIRKSEN that the House committee's disorderly hearings last week did nothing for the good reputation of Congress. They also doubt the Senate would pass the bill which provided the legislative pretext for those hearings, presuming the House has the bad judgment to approve it.

Since members of the Senate rarely comment in this sharply critical vein about the work of "the other body"—as the House is termed in parliamentary discourse—they clearly recognize that the public is weary of the Un-American Activities Committee's antics. The Senators might well have extended their criticisms to include the Senate's own Internal Security Subcommittee which, though quiescent of late, is equally useless and has in the past conducted some unseemly hearings of its own.

The bill sponsored by Representative JOE R. POOL, Texas Democrat, who presided over last week's hearings, epitomizes what is wrong with the committee itself. Insofar as the bill to halt aid to the Vietcong deals with actions, its legal purposes have already been achieved by the Export Control Act, the Trading With The Enemy Act, and various statutes on treason and sabotage. Insofar as the bill deals with speech, it transgresses the First Amendment and is an unconstitutional invasion of the rights of citizens to express their ideas, regardless of what those ideas may be.

The House committee and the Senate subcommittee suffer from the incurable defect that in striking at what is "un-American" or harmful to "internal security," they strike at freedom itself. Since their hearings are superfluous in controlling overt illegal acts, they usually are devoted to attacking unpopular opinions and marginal political groups. Many of these very small organizations, like those which participated in last week's hearings, would never be heard of if the committees did not give them free publicity.

Any duly constituted committee of the Congress is entitled to respect. If a witness's rights are violated, there are remedies in the courts. But, as a practical matter, Congress cannot hope to command respect for a committee if that committee has a defective mandate and engages in political scrimmaging with witnesses who hope to profit by turbulence and publicity. Congress can cure this condition only by radical surgery that will get rid of these two committees.

Perhaps most difficult of all is the fact that a bill like this could have the effect of sending good Americans like the Quakers to jail simply because they act out of human motives. See the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, August 30, 1966, page A4587.

I cannot support this bill, Mr. Chairman, and it should not even be before us. While I am opposed to the activities against which this bill is allegedly aimed, there is no need for the bill itself.

Mr. YATES. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 12047, which would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. We are all by now aware of the fact that this bill is directed at activity of two types. First, it would prohibit the giving of assistance to any hostile foreign power. Second, it would prohibit obstructions to the movement of military personnel and supplies.

Our purpose as the most powerful nation in the world is without a doubt to preserve ourselves from within and without. To this end, we must prevent the flow of aid to hostile foreign powers during armed conflict and we must prevent interference with the movement of military troops and their supplies.

The question, however, is whether additional laws are needed for these purposes, and if so, whether H.R. 12047 best meets the need. The answer to both of these questions must be in the negative.

As to the first question, it need only be stated that there is no need for new legislation because already there are numerous laws, both State and Federal, which protect the national interest.

General criminal laws already in effect in the States, which would reach such conduct as is sought to be covered by H.R. 12047, include laws governing trespass, malicious mischief, assault and battery, unlawful assembly, disturbing the peace, and a host of others.

Federal laws adopted through the years and tailored to meet the different kinds and degrees of wrongdoings covered by the proposed legislation include our sabotage statutes, statutes concerned with trespass on military property, laws prohibiting movement in port areas during a national emergency, laws designed to prohibit or to regulate the dealings of American citizens or other people under U.S. jurisdiction with enemy countries, even to the making of gifts, statutes concerned with the exportation of articles, material, and supplies to any nation threatening the security of the United States, and a host of others.

I feel that these laws, both Federal and State, that are now in effect are adequate to protect the Federal interest and our Nation's security.

H.R. 12047, moreover, is undesirable for more reasons than the lack of necessity. In the first place, this legislation would inject Federal law and Federal enforcement into essentially State and local affairs. There is no need for this intrusion into traditionally State and local areas of jurisdiction. And since there is no Federal police force to enforce such a law, nor any indication in our country that State and local law enforcement will not meet its responsibility in the areas sought to be covered by H.R. 12047, the enactment of this legislation would create more problems than it would solve.

Second, H.R. 12047 reveals a dangerous potential for infringement on the constitutional right of free speech because it reaches advising, counseling, urging, and soliciting. The prohibitions in this legislation would raise serious first amendment questions.

Third, H.R. 12047 would severely damage the trade union establishment in our Nation, even though it is not aimed at it. When unions strike, their intention is to halt the manufacture and movement of goods until the strike is settled. Military material travels on every road and railroad and is being processed in half the factories of the United States. H.R. 12047, as a strikebreaking measure of tremendous potential, would hit a very large class of persons unintentionally.

Finally, the absolute prohibition against all assistance would prevent the arrangement of needed medical and other assistance for American prisoners of war. Medical and other assistance have proven to be valuable services in past conflicts when administered by such groups as the International Red Cross. Surely, we would not wish to outlaw or even curtail this humanitarian service.

Mr. Chairman, a tiny handful of extremists have been able to capture the headlines and propagandize as to their efforts, but what they have done can hardly be considered a threat to our efforts to protect freedom in Vietnam. The passage of this legislation can only serve to exaggerate and aid this handful of eccentrics in accomplishing their purposes. For these reasons I strongly oppose and urge my colleagues to oppose the enactment of H.R. 12047.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to make a long speech enunciating why this bill is deplorable. Indeed, I presume that this body has in mind a quick passage while holding its nose, secure in the knowledge that our indiscretion will be cured by quiet death in the other body; thus again reemphasizing the wisdom of our founders in providing a bicameral Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose there are occasions when the executive branch of the Government is completely wrong, when the responsible members of the press are wrong, when the leading constitutional authorities are wrong, when the Senate leadership is wrong, but it seems to me that when all of them say a bill

is bad, the House of Representatives ought to examine with care what they are about to do. I think we can all take pride in the record of accomplishment of the 89th Congress, but I would hate to see that record corrupted by passing a bill which we know to be unnecessary, unwise, unconstitutional, irrelevant, and unworthy of the time of this great body.

H.R. 12047 is ostensibly designed to stop shipments to our enemies and to stop interference with movement of our Armed Forces and materiel. Its real purpose is to throttle dissent. We have, as Mr. Ramsey Clark testified, a full panoply of laws to accomplish the stated purposes of the bill without the legal deficiencies of it, and without the dangers inherent to our own prisoners of war, to first amendment freedoms, and to labor's right to picket and strike.

This bill was the excuse for holding hearings which were an embarrassment to the United States and resulted in pictures, newspaper stories, editorials, and cartoons appropriate to such a fiasco. Following the so-called investigative hearings the Un-American Activities Committee received the views of the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Justice. Not a single witness from any of those Departments supported the committee's bill and indeed their opposition was unequivocal.

Mr. Fred Burton Smith, General Counsel of the Treasury, testified that section 402 is completely unnecessary because the Trading With the Enemy Act and the Foreign Assets Control Regulations are far more effective in dealing with such problems as exist than section 402. Section 402 would ban absolutely solicitations for the International Red Cross, which is in Mr. Smith's words—

> One of the very few ways we have have of helping our soldier prisoners of war over there, of getting some kind of assistance to them.

Mr. Smith also stated:

> This policy has been established in connection with the efforts of the Department of State to assist American military personnel who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam. A rigid ban against all solicitations of remittances such as is provided in the pending legislation might well interfere with this effort to assist our military people who are captives of North Vietnam.

Furthermore he said:

> It is the policy of the Treasury Department to administer these regulations very strictly in order to prevent any unauthorized foreign exchange accruals to blocked areas. We do not license any such transactions unless there is a clear-cut demonstration that it is in the national interest to do so, as in the example I cited earlier of assisting American prisoners of war.

Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, testified that there was no necessity for the bill insofar as the effect on morale of the Armed Forces. He stated and I quote:

> We do not have any evidence available to us, or reports by commanders in the field, that indicate that the morale of our forces has been impaired by the demonstrations of dissent to United States policy, by the publicized assertions of intent to assist our adversaries, or by the gestures of impeding the military effort.

Now let me turn to the position of the Justice Department. Mr. Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, said:

> There is no need for new legislation because a panoply of laws State and Federal, presently protects the national interest.

Referring to the Trading With the Enemy Act, he said:

> Its provisions are better adapted to prohibit the activity contemplated by H.R. 12047 than is that bill itself. . . . Present law avoids the pitfalls, the frustrations, and the ineffectuality inherent in endeavors to limit expression.

Section 402 was amended in committee to remove the words "advise, counsel and urge" but the word "solicit" is in the bill before us and therefore the following statement of the Deputy Attorney General is still pertinent in references to section 402(1):

> Without adding any meaningful protection, this language would jeopardize the purposes of the bill and fundamental rights of Americans by risking infringement of constitutional rights of free speech.

I have been talking mainly about section 402 up to this point and I would now like to direct your attention to section 403 which would make it a crime to attempt or to obstruct, impede, or interfere with, the movement of any member of the Armed Forces while on duty, or the loading, provisioning, and so forth, of any facility of transportation being used, or intended to be used, in whole or in part, for the transportation of personnel, supplies, or material of the Armed Forces.

This section virtually outlaws strikes in the maritime or transportation industry. Under 403, if a privately owned truck carrying vegetables is impeded by a picket line, and one head of lettuce intended for the Army is delayed, then those pickets are subject to a fine of $10,000 and 5 years in jail or both. This is what section 403 provides, and as Mr. Lawrence Speiser of the ACLU says in his memorandum:

> If a union knows that even a single soldier or a single case of supplies is on a train or a bus or even a streetcar, and it called a strike which would have the effect of obstructing or impeding or interfering with such movement, then Section 403 would apply whether or not the union has any position on the war in Vietnam or not.

Now we all know that there has been no successful interference with troop or materiel movements. There have been a few attempts and there have been convictions. The Deputy Attorney General said that in every jurisdiction of the Nation there are scores of laws applicable to conduct directed at members of the Armed Forces or military supplies. He was opposed to section 403 as undesirable and unnecessary and, in his words—

> Its excessive and indiscriminate penalty which would attach the same severe sanctions to saboteurs and sit-ins alike.

In conclusion, let me urge my colleagues on both sides to reject emphatically H.R. 12047.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 22, 1966]

BETRAYAL

The House leadership has foolishly scheduled the Pool bill for debate today—despite the fact that spokesmen for the Treasury, Justice and Defense Departments were unanimous in denouncing it as needless, senseless and of dubious constitutionality. The Pool bill, a characteristic expression of the philosophy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, would penalize protests against the war in Vietnam as the rendering of aid to a hostile power against which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities. It would, in short adopt the techniques of totalitarianism in place of the American tradition of freedom. In a real sense, a vote for this un-American bill amounts, in itself, to a betrayal of American ideals.

[From the Washington Post]

HUAC HEARINGS: AID TO THE ENEMY?

(By Marquis Childs)

In assessing the damage done by the House Un-American Activities Committee the effect of that wrestling match on the foreign audience ranks high. Those televised scenes of witnesses and attorneys being dragged from the hearing room are even now being shown in Peking and North Vietnam.

In the propaganda drive to hold the North Vietnamese in the war they are offered as evidence that the brutal hirelings of imperialism will go to any length to suppress the true representatives of the American people. In this propaganda exercise these representatives being trundled off to jail speak for a majority of all Americans.

That is a measure of the harm the hearings have done. They give a tiny splinter of peaceniks—by their own admission not more than 5000 in the whole country—an opening for worldwide exposure and martyrdom. Before that opening their attempt to dramatize their opposition to the war had fallen off almost to zero.

Whether the masters at the top in Hanoi and Peking believe their own propaganda no one can say. Shut away in their airtight ideological prison they seem to have an infinite capacity for self-deception. But, belief or merely cynical propaganda, the uproar in the committee room was a godsend to the Communists bent on fighting the war in Vietnam to the bitter end. See, they are saying, here you have it—only force holds free Americans from revolting against the military and the capitalists waging a war of aggression against the Vietnamese people.

Underscoring the damage is the fact that active opposition to President Johnson's policy in Vietnam has with the exception of the peaceniks all but subsided. Sen. J. William Fulbright, the most articulate of the congressional critics, in an interview the other day said in effect that opposition was futile since the Congress was more warlike than the President. He was saying to Hanoi that the Johnson Administration means to go through with the war no matter what the cost in escalation.

Aside from the Communist capitals, the damage elsewhere in the world and here at home cannot be discounted. The scenes of disorder and violence will have a powerful impact in Western Europe where the long-drawn-out tragedy of the war is equated by critics with a quality of recklessness and savagery in the American temperament. The fact that the disorder was begun by the witnesses is irrelevant for the foreign audience, since their martyrdom in being brought before the committee in the first place is established by the past record of what appears in European eyes to be a sinister inquisitorial body with no objective other than to harass anyone whose views are to the left of center.

It may be that past experience with the committee's wild divagations has blunted the effect at home. What, they're at it again? This cannot, however, be taken for granted. Despite the disclaimer of the acting chairman Representative JOE POOL of Texas, that there was no intention to deny the right of dissent the line between intellectual criticism of Vietnam policy and acts such as trying to stop a troop train will be blurred.

In a climate of concern as the consequences of the war bite deeper and deeper with the number of American troops close to the 300,000 mark the emotions generated in the hearing room can be infectious. The short way with dissenters—bounce them out and put them in jail—that was the lesson of the hearings shown on television throughout the Nation.

As for the cast of characters the most vengeful and satirical film-maker could not have improved on it. JOE POOL looks like an Alabama sheriff ready at the drop of a bull whip to throw his deputies around the courthouse. He is said to be delighted by the whole affair since it cast him in the role of Communist destroyer and thereby put his right-wing Republican opponent in Dallas in the shade. Such exposure on television was a boon that couldn't have been bought with all the campaign funds in Texas.

The young peaceniks were cast with equal verisimilitude. They were brash, rude, obstreperous, bent on causing as much trouble as possible given a golden opportunity to discredit Congress and the democratic process. That they were given the opportunity is the saddest commentary of all.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1966]

THE INCURABLE COMMITTEES

It is a measure of how low the House Un-American Activities Committee has sunk in public esteem that Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN has joined those who condemn its unseemly spectacles and its legislative futility.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader, has agreed with Mr. DIRKSEN that the House committee's disorderly hearings last week did nothing for the good reputation of Congress. They also doubt the Senate would pass the bill which provided the legislative pretext for those hearings, presuming the House has the bad judgment to approve it.

Since members of the Senate rarely comment in this sharply critical vein about the work of "the other body"—as the House is termed in parliamentary discourse—they clearly recognize that the public is weary of the Un-American Activities Committee's antics. The Senators might well have extended their criticisms to include the Senate's own Internal Security Subcommittee which, though quiescent of late, is equally useless and has in the past conducted some unseemly hearings of its own.

The bill sponsored by Representative JOE R. POOL, Texas Democrat, who presided over last week's hearings, epitomizes what is wrong with the committee itself. Insofar as the bill to halt aid to the Vietcong deals with actions, its legal purposes have already been achieved by the Export Control Act, the Trading With the Enemy Act, and various statutes on treason and sabotage. Insofar as the bill deals with speech, it transgresses the First Amendment and is an unconstitutional invasion of the rights of citizens to express their ideas, regardless of what those ideas may be.

The House committee and the Senate subcommittee suffer from the incurable defect that in striking at what is "un-American" or harmful to "internal security," they strike at freedom itself. Since their hearings are superfluous in controlling overt illegal acts, they usually are devoted to attacking unpopular opinions and marginal political groups. Many of these very small organizations, like those which participated in last week's hearings, would never be heard of if the committees did not give them free publicity.

Any duly constituted committee of the Congress is entitled to respect. If a witness's rights are violated, there are remedies in the courts. But, as a practical matter, Congress cannot hope to command respect for a committee if that committee has a defective mandate and engages in political scrimmaging with witnesses who hope to profit by turbulence and publicity. Congress can cure this condition only by radical surgery that will get rid of these two committees.

AND JUDICIAL PILLORY

Congressional annoyance at Federal Judge Howard Corcoran's short-lived attempt to enjoin hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was predictable and even understandable. What is less defensible is the hysterical tone a number of Representatives have been taking over the incident.

The irate Congressmen seem oblivious to the fact that a serious constitutional issue is involved here, one that cannot be settled by abusing the court. That issue is whether or not the procedures of the Un-American Activities Committee are constitutional to begin with, whether or not in the light of its record injunctive relief is necessary to protect citizens from probable injury. All that Judge Corcoran tried to to do was to postpone the committee's tempestuous hearings until that issue could be properly presented to the court.

To argue that his action breached the principle of the separation of powers is to contend that each of the three branches of Government is sovereign, its powers in no way subject to checks and balances imposed by the other two. Obviously that is not the case. Congress has the power to check the courts by fixing their jurisdictions, by financing their operations, by passing on the appointment of the judges and, of course, by changing the very laws which they interpret. In turn the courts may—indeed must—pass on the constitutionality of Congressional actions.

As we have previously made clear, we are glad Judge Corcoran's order was overruled by a special appeals court. But for Congressmen to behave as if the Judge had committed lèse-majesté is to assume a pose of absolutism which does them no credit. Representative CLAUDE PEPPER did well to remind his colleagues of what another judge, Lord Coke, said to the King who wanted to sit on his court: "The King, too, is under the law."

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1966]

USELESS HEARINGS

The opening of the House Un-American Activities Committee hearings on left-wing aid to the Vietcong proved as disorderly and unproductive as the work of this committee usually is. There is little reason to suppose that any information developed in these hearings could form the basis of a constitutionally viable piece of legislation.

The free-speech guarantees of the First Amendment offer wide protection for radical, inflammatory and antiwar talk—and no one who understands the essence of a free society would have it otherwise. Insofar as demonstrations interfere with the movement of troops or war materials, they can be handled under existing law. No blanket new legislation is needed to deal with treason or sabotage.

Despite our belief that neither the hearings—nor the committee—serve any useful purpose, we are glad that the three-judge Court of Appeals vacated a lower court order enjoining the committee from conducting its inquiry. Federal Judge Howard Corcoran may well have been within his legal powers in issuing the original restraint. As Representative CLAUDE PEPPER of Florida reminded his incensed colleagues in the House yesterday, each branch of government is under the rule of law and the courts are the final interpreters of the law.

But the injunction would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to enforce; and it placed the court in an unnecessarily awkward position in its relationship to Congress. The solution to the excesses of the Un-American Activities Committee must come from Congress, where the problem has its origins. The members of the House can expect an interminable round of futile and embarrassing controversies so long as they permit this committee to roam about with an inherently vague and unworkable mandate.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

HOUSE PROBERS' NARROW ESCAPE

Not unexpectedly, the House Un-American Activities Committee finds itself awash in waves of television, radio and newspaper publicity arising from the disorderly antics of Vietnam war protesters in and around its committee hearing room. It would be naive to believe that such attention is unwelcome.

Quite unexpectedly, on the other hand, the committee found itself taken to court in Washington to show cause why it should not be enjoined from questioning the critics of the Vietnam war whom it had subpoenaed. The injunction was sought on the ground that to question dissenters against the war would infringe on their constitutional freedom of speech.

By venturing to entertain the petition of the American Civil Liberties Union for such an injunction, the Federal district court of Judge Howard F. Corcoran went up and over the fence separating the powers of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government. He thereby gave Congress and a good many other citizens quite a turn.

"A court telling a congressional committee it can't hold a hearing?" exclaimed Speaker MCCORMACK. "We might as well not have any Congress at all."

While that is perhaps an unnecessarily despairing way to look at the matter, it is a good thing that the challenge to HUAC allowed by Judge Corcoran has been temporarily dissolved and its consideration by a panel of three Federal judges indefinitely postponed. A showdown between the courts and Congress on the right of a congressional committee to convene a hearing would be a conflict that in the end only Congress, as the source of the Judges' salaries and as the definer of their Jurisdiction to hear cases, could win.

Above and beyond that practical consideration is the principle that Congress itself should properly regulate and discipline the actions of its own committees when they trample on citizens' rights, as the Un-American Activities Committee has frequently done.

It is perfectly true, as the civil liberties lawyers urged, that inquisitional committees can inflict damage on witnesses and frighten other people into keeping silent while that is going on. But the preferable way to stop inquisitions by the Un-American Committee is for Congress to abolish it, not for the courts to attempt to do the duty of the House of Representatives.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Aug. 18, 1966]

AS WE SEE IT: HUAC'S HEARINGS RISK STIFLING VITAL DISSENT

In all, the opening sessions of a hearing by the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) on anti-Vietnam war protests have proved pretty much of a circus.

A federal district judge wholly misread the scope of his authority and tried to halt the hearings before they began, only to be overruled by a higher tribunal. A witness bounded into the hearing chamber Tuesday dressed as a Revolutionary soldier. The chairman swung his gavel with braggadocio as unruly spectators marched through corridors chanting slogans and scuffling with police. Federal marshals forcefully ejected an attorney yesterday.

That all this is so, however, should not obscure some of the fundamental issues which the hearing raises.

For the hearing appears clearly unnecessary and specifically aimed, as other HUAC hearings have been aimed, at harassing, intimidating and embarrassing those who hold views contrary to the committee's view.

Representative JOE POOL, the Democrat from Texas who serves as hearing chairman, has been candid enough about his purpose. Having introduced a bill making it a crime to aid the Vietcong and facing a stiff challenge in his home district back in Dallas, he wants to stir up some favorable publicity.

When the district judge mistakenly enjoined the hearing, POOL reacted angrily, asserting that he'd hold hearings anyway and that no federal judge could interfere with the Congress.

"I will go to jail and stay there until hell freezes over to prove my point," he announced to reporters.

Later, he confided that some friends told him he "couldn't do any better with the folks back home than by getting myself thrown into jail."

The decision of HUAC to hold hearings on anti-war protests follows the decision by the selective service system to reclassify college students who sit in at local draft boards as a protest against U.S. policies. This reclassification from 2–S and deferred to 1–A and eligible for induction is a palpable distortion of selective service laws and the Justice Department has hinted as much, but students reclassified have not yet been able to win reversals.

How wide will HUAC throw its net this time?

While this newspaper certainly doesn't favor aiding the Vietcong, it does favor free discussion which is vital to a free society. Will HUAC impinge on this freedom? To burn draft cards and to stop troop trains bound for Vietnam are clearly wrong, but there are laws enough on the books to take care of these things, as well as laws on sedition and treason.

For HUAC to hold hearings on anti-war protests risks stifling all forms of dissent about what even members of the committee must recognize to be one of the most controversial wars in American history.

And comical aspects of the sessions so far do nothing to reduce this risk.

THE CASE AGAINST HUAC

(By Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Dean, Boston College Law School

On the first day of the reconvening of Congress in January, 1945, a strange, unprecedented and tragic event occurred. On that day the first and only permanent investigating committeee was authorized by the House of Representatives.

Led by Mississippi's segregationist Cong. John Rankin, a coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans made the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) a permanent standing committee—over the dissenting votes of Cong. JOHN MCCORMACK and, in 1946, of Lyndon Baines Johnson.

From that day in early January, 1945, until last week HUAC has been engaged in some of the most unproductive and disorderly inquiries ever conducted by Congress.

The recent tumultuous hearings of HUAC on the activities of the "Vietniks" prompted even Sen. EVERETT DIRKSEN, in an unprecedented rebuke to a committee of the House, to state his firm disapproval of HUAC's tactics and his opposition to the legislation to be proposed by HUAC.

The injunctive relief given by Federal Judge Corcoran to the two individuals subpoenaed by HUAC was a last, desperate attempt to prevent the public harassment of American citizens because of their views on American foreign policy.

The reversal of Judge Corcoran's decision may have been erroneous; it certainly did nothing to resolve the grave question which Judge Corcoran faced: how can a citizen protect himself ahead of time from the devastating and irremediable harm to his reputation which will almost inevitably result from a session before the inquisitors of HUAC?

Despite the huge staff of HUAC and the protestations of its members and friends its achievements during the 21 years of its existence have been meager:

1—Only three pieces of legislation enacted in the last 20 years can be traced directly to HUAC.

2—The hundreds of pamphlets issued by HUAC have been consistently criticized by scholars and experts as misleading. The pamphlets have literally "fed" right-wing extremist groups.

3—In the last 15 years HUAC has asked and received House endorsement for its citations of contempt for 129 individuals but only nine of these citations have resulted in final conviction. The U.S. Supreme Court has reversed five convictions since 1961.

4—HUAC's abortive hearings on the Ku Klux Klan have led neither to new legislation nor effective prosecution of the Klan.

The reasoning which keeps HUAC in business comes to this: Communism is so terrible an enemy that any method of exposure is justified and should be retained.

It is this simplistic and indeed pernicious logic which prompts right-wing extremists and many others to brand anyone critical of HUAC as either subversive or "duped."

The fear of subversion and Communists appears to be so profound and even pathological among countless Americans that it submerges their beliefs in the right to a fair trial and the necessity of the separation of powers among the three branches of government.

It is, of course, these two key elements of American democracy which HUAC threatens to undermine.

The basic arguments against the continued existence of HUAC could be stated as follows:

1—If a person is to be accused of "un-American activities" (not merely opinions) he should be tried before a court of law and not before a congressional committee.

2—If Congress desires information about "un-American activities" (a term which Congress has never defined) it can acquire such information through its own committee on the judiciary and does not need a special roving group to inquire into "espionage," a subject which is already within the specific mandate of the House's Judiciary Committee.

Many well-informed Americans have long since concluded that the time has come for HUAC to be abolished. But political realities must be faced; on Jan. 27, 1966, HUAC received its requested appropriation of $425,000 from the House by a vote of 299 to 24.

In 1965 it received an appropriation of $370,000 by a vote of 358 to 29.

Congressmen think—perhaps erroneously—that voters back home would not approve of a vote to withhold funds from a House committee investigating "un-American" activities.

Indeed, it is humiliating to have to note that in both 1965 and 1966 not a single congressman from New England voted to diminish or eliminate the appropriation sought by HUAC!

Under the aegis of the long standing National Committee to Abolish HUAC a Massachusetts group has been reactivated in the recent past. Under chairmanship of Prof. Vern Countryman of the Harvard Law School the Massachusetts Committee to Abolish HUAC, based at 144A Mt. Auburn st. in Cambridge, is fighting an uphill struggle.

That struggle may possibly become a bit less difficult now that there is at least a discussion going as to the availability of an injunction by a Federal court against HUAC. But the widespread, emotion-laden and mountainous support in America for anything anti-Communist may well prevent the phasing-out of HUAC in the foreseeable future.

The least that the people of America can expect, however, is what Fr. Joseph Fichter, S.J., called for in the Boston Pilot on June 11, 1966—"a full and open debate in the Congress about the continued existence of HUAC."

After the unbelievable debacle staged by HUAC earlier this month the citizens of America are entitled to have at least an orderly inquiry by Congress into one of its committees, the very existence of which was described recently in a statement by 100 of the nation's leading constitutional lawyers as "unnecessary and unconstitutional."

[From the Pittsburgh Catholic, Aug. 25, 1966]

UN-AMERICAN

(By Msgr. Charles Owen Rice)

Supposedly it exists to uncover facts that might guide the House of Representatives in enacting legislation. Actually, its time-honored function is to harry suspected radicals and subversives. It bears a charmed life because it is "patriotic."

Martin Dies, a Texas congressman, was its first chairman, and for years, it was known as the Dies Committee, but now it gets its formal name, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Another Texan, JOE R. POOL, is today its happy, headline-making ring master.

JOE—I am not being unduly familiar, JOE is his name, not Joseph—JOE, white-haired, portly, anguished, indignant and patriotic, has been locked in televised combat with a prime mixture of oddities, idealists, headline-hunters of the left, and patriots of the left.

A few of these have engaged in un-American activities by anybody's definition, including their own, but hardly anyone would have heard of them, if Congressman POOL had not dredged them up and given them precious exposure on TV and the front page.

The pure patriots, right, left, or center, get small attention during these circuses. The extremists love HUAC although only the right-wingers among them admit it.

It suits the promoters of the ultra right that currency be given to the strongest and wildest statements and postures of the far left. They have a fine recruiting pitch as they declare: "We told you that such things went on. Our youth are being subverted and debauched, and you do nothing. Join your local chapter of 'Nuts and Riflemen for Defense' and save your country."

On the other hand the deadly serious ones of the left are also assisted in their recruiting efforts by the unfriendly publicity itself, although many of their idealists are sincerely outraged by the illegality and anti-Americanism of the whole HUAC process. It must be admitted, however, that among the victims of HUAC are those who get a lift out of the virtually painless, for them, martyrdom of being heaved out of the committee room.

Do not think for a moment that the committee is harmless merely because it misses the mark so often and is intellectually unspeakable. It has power and sharp teeth. It damages good people and good causes, and

is a constant threat to the dignity and freedom of those who dare to dissent.

The excuse for last week's hearing was a package of legislation designed to suppress agitation against the fighting in Vietnam. The legislation is two-pronged. One prong, for those who would aid the enemy; another, for those who hold back our military or military supplies.

Since we are not at war it was hard to define the enemy, so the definition was made very broad, any country, group or person, "in hostile opposition to the armed forces of the United States." You could break that law by giving a glass of water to a rioter or by sending a food package to a starving family. You would not even have to give the aid, just advise someone else to do it. For many reasons that stringent statute appears to be certainly unconstitutional, and the committee was harassing citizens in order to promote a law that it had no business dealing with. That is part of the reason Judge Corcoran issued his short-lived injunction against the hearings.

No one alleges that any significant material aid is being given to the enemy, but the committee, and many citizens, are outraged that anyone at all would so much as contemplate helping the Vietcong or the residents of North Vietnam. No American, they feel, should want to feed, to heal, or to soothe the population which our military are trying to bomb into submission in an undeclared war. Dissent is being made equal to disloyalty.

We already have legislation to deal with those who would truly aid a real enemy, and the proposal is not only bad but unnecessary.

The second prong, which would prevent interference with materiel destined for military use, could turn out to be the worse of the two. It makes military goods virtually sacred.

If that should become law it would hit idealistic pacifist groups of the sort that are encamped near the nuclear submarine base in Groton and of the sort that will strongly protest any resumption of nuclear testing. These idealistic souls do not really interfere with the movement of men and materiel but they do annoy as they offer their tokens of dissent. It would be shameful to treat them as criminals, but they would be criminals if HUAC had its way.

There is another class of people who do interfere with the movement and manufacture of goods, and who would be hit by the legislation, although it is not aimed at them. When unions strike, their intention is to halt manufacture and movement of goods until the strike is settled. Military materiel travels on every road and railroad and is being processed in half the factories of the United States. JOE R. POOL has chanced upon a strike-breaking law of tremendous potential. What irony if it passes! The trade union establishment has never been more warlike and less pacifistic than it is now, but who cares? The labor lobby had better get busy.

The House Un-American Activities Committee functions not as a legislative instrument, but as the voice of a muddled and angry segment of the citizenry. Let them find their emotional outlet somewhere else, and let us rescue the legislative process from further degradation by ending an ignoble experiment in un-Americanism.

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 28, 1966]

THE ROAD TO LOYALTY

"It is a fair summary of history to say that the safeguards of liberty have frequently been forged in cases involving not very nice people." —Justice FELIX FRANKFURTER.

The House Un-American Activities Committee's recent public hearings featured some of the most obstreperous witnesses imaginable—members of the pro-Peking Progressive Labor Party. Epithets like "murderer" and "fink" flew thick and fast from the witness stand. Other P.L.P. members, meanwhile, raised a hubbub in the audience.

Present and legal counsel for several of the witnesses were lawyers from the American Civil Liberties Union. A Globe reader (see Letters to the Editor column) asks why? Are the A.C.L.U. and the P.L.P. "birds of a feather,"? she inquires. "If P.L.P member Jeffery Gordon is a Communist and a traitor, what does this make A.C.L.U. members?" she asks.

The answer is that A.C.L.U. members are no more Communist than our correspondent.

The right of even the most despised person to legal representation under the Constitution apparently must be defended anew in every generation.

Consider that here in Boston, two men of the highest patriotism—John Adams and Josiah Quincy Jr.—were reviled for undertaking to represent British soldiers charged with murder in the Boston Massacre.

Quincy's own father was among those who questioned his action, writing that he was "under great affliction at hearing the bitterest reproaches uttered against you, for becoming an advocate for those criminals who are charged with the murder of their fellow citizens."

The son replied: "Let it be told, Sir, that these criminals, charged with murder, are not yet legally proved guilty, and therefore, however criminal, are entitled by the laws of God and man, to all legal counsel and aid. . . . I dare affirm that you and this whole people will one day rejoice that I became an advocate for the aforesaid 'criminals' charged with the murder of our fellow citizens."

Clarence Darrow, defending 20 members of the Communist Labor Party in 1920, stood fast against widespread hostility. He answered his critics in his summary to the jury:

"I shall not argue to you whether the defendants' ideas are right or wrong. I am not bound to believe them right in order to take their case, and you are not bound to believe them right in order to find them not guilty. I don't know whether they are right or wrong, and you don't know whether they are right or wrong. But I do know this—that the humblest and the meanest man who lives, I know that the idlest and the silliest man who lives, should have his say. I know he ought to speak his mind. And I know that the Constitution is a delusion and a snare if the weakest and the humblest man cannot be defended in his right to speak and his right to think as much as the greatest and the strongest in the land. I am not here to defend their opinions, I am here to defend their right to express their opinions."

The P.L.P. members haled before the House Un-American Activities Committee were not, of course, on trial for crime. But their need of legal counsel was no less imperative. Not only were they subject to possible criminal prosecution based on their testimony and conduct at the hearings, but the committee's free-wheeling inquiry placed in serious jeopardy their constitutional rights of expression, association, and privacy.

HUAC, in fact, is no friend of that freedom which our correspondent cherishes. The committee's coercive practices arouse not greater loyalty and patriotism among the people, but less. "You make men love their government and their country," Harvard's Zechariah Chafee Jr. wisely said, "by giving them the kind of government and the kind of country that inspire respect and love: a country that is free and unafraid, that lets the discontented talk in order to learn the causes for their discontent and end those causes, that refuses to impel men to spy on their neighbors, that protects its citizens vigorously from harmful acts while it leaves the remedies for objectionable ideas to counter-argument and time."

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I fail to see where my colleague from California is justified in the statement he made a moment ago when he said that he was surprised that the opponents of this measure were not given adequate time to express their opinions.

Certainly insofar as this side of the aisle is concerned—and the gentleman from Ohio needs no defense by me—but, as you will recall, of the one-half hour that he tried to speak, probably 20 minutes of that time was taken up by questions from those who oppose this particular measure.

I am sure the gentleman from California will further remember that the last speaker on this side of the aisle, and that speaker was opposed to the bill, was granted so much time as he may require, just a few moments ago. I am not going to take all of the 5 minutes allotted me because I presume that those who oppose this measure will have some further questions that they would like to propound to the committee.

But it appears that those who oppose this measure did not attend the hearings when the committee was considering this legislation. I was over there on a number of occasions. I do not think that this committee should be deceiving or deluding itself into the belief that we are dealing here with innocent, naive, idealistic kinds of people. They are purposely and maliciously committed to the Communist conspiracy.

I recall specifically that one young man in the hearings, who was a member of the Progressive Labor Party, or the May 2d Movement, admitted openly to the committee that he was a Communist, and he was proud of it, and he announced further that he was for the overthrow of the Government.

We are not dealing with innocent or eccentric people.

So I think, as we consider this legislation, it is not a matter of whether or not we are for free speech or whether or not a person has the right to dissent to the war in Vietnam.

I think this legislation really resolves itself into one simple proposition, and that is are we going to give support to our men who are over in Vietnam? Men who are over there because we, because this administration sent them there. They are not over there of their own volition.

I think it is absolutely incumbent that all of us support them to the "nth" degree, as far as I am concerned.

I have a member of my family over there. Forgive me for being deeply concerned about this, but God forbid that any Member would contribute whatsoever to the matter of demoralizing our men over there in what I think is one of the nastiest and dirtiest wars that we have ever been engaged in.

I do not think the question is "Why do we not pass this bill?" but I submit to the Chairman and to the Members

of the Committee that the question—and it undoubtedly has been asked through letters written to the eminent chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and others on the part of these servicemen—the question of them is, "Why have we not passed it some time ago?"

I close with this comment, that it is ironic indeed, even tragic, that there should be young men contributing to the demoralization of men of their very same age who are over there fighting and dying for them.

And some people are worried about the penalties of this bill. Why, I do not even see why the committee reduced the 20 years to 10 years. Those men who are fighting over there in Vietnam are not facing merely 10 or 20 years in the penitentiary but are facing death itself. Why should we be so sympathetic toward those Communists and their sympathizers who impede or try to obstruct our efforts over there?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, for giving me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we are being asked to vote for this bill today despite the fact it has been labeled as unnecessary, unwanted, or undesirable by every executive department that has been asked to comment on it. We are being asked to vote on it despite the fact that the other body has given every indication that it will not even consider it.

The majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, has stated that he doubted whether the Senate Judiciary Committee would report a bill so vaguely drafted.

The minority leader of the Senate, Mr. DIRKSEN, has warned that utmost caution must be exercised in drafting a criminal statute; that it must be carefully defined; that it must not become a "veritable dragnet." Unfortunately, this bill meets none of these tests.

Let me make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am completely opposed to the efforts that have been made by a few people in this country to send aid to North Vietnam and the Vietcong. I am completely opposed to the attempts that have been made by a few misguided zealots and true believers to interfere with the movement of U.S. troops and military supplies.

As Members know, some of these attempts were made in my district. I hold no brief for any unlawful activity.

But the crucial question for us to consider today is not whether this activity was right or wrong. The answer to this, in my judgment, is clearly the latter. Rather, the crucial question today is whether new laws are needed to prevent it.

Despite the committee's assertions, there is absolutely no evidence that new legislation is needed. A wide range of laws, both Federal and State, already exists to protect the public interest.

Both the Treasury Department and Department of Justice have pointed out that the Trading With the Enemy Act already covers and prevents the flow of aid to hostile forces. The American Law Division of the Library of Congress confirms this finding.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I only have 3 minutes and if the gentleman can get me a little bit more time later, I will yield.

Mr. ICHORD. I refer the gentleman and Members of the House to page 1334 of the record in which Mr. Clark, the Deputy Attorney General, admits in response to my questioning that the law is not adequate. It does not punish collection and solicitation of funds.

Mr. COHELAN. The Justice Department, in fact, has pointed out that the Trading With the Enemy Act is better adapted to prohibiting the activity contemplated by H.R. 12047 than is that bill itself.

Similarly, specific and workable laws already exist to prevent obstruction in the movement of military personnel or equipment. The sabotage laws protect military material and installations. The Port Security Act regulates movement in port areas. Trespass on military property is a Federal crime, as is a conspiracy by two or more people to prevent, threaten, or intimidate any person from entering the military service, or from discharging his duty.

These and other Federal laws are bolstered by State and local laws that reach conduct properly within their jurisdiction.

And what has the Department of Defense had to say about the need for this bill? Gen. William Berg, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Personnel, told the committee:

> We do not have any evidence available to us, or reports by commanders in the field, that indicate the morale of our forces has been impaired by the demonstrations of dissent to United States policy, by the publicized assertions of intent to assist our adversaries, or by the gestures of impeding the military effort.

General Berg went on to state that literature which had been circulated to military personnel, with the intent of inducing refusal to serve or refusal to follow orders, had "clearly enjoyed little success."

Mr. Chairman, a very clear case is thus made that this legislation is not necessary. But this bill is undesirable for other reasons as well.

The committee has removed some of the more blatant constitutional objections, but the vagueness and ambiguity of some sections continue to raise serious questions of infringements on, and violations of, constitutional rights.

Statutes which are vague and indefinite are, in themselves, unconstitutional. As the Court stated in *Lanzetta* v. *New Jersey* (306 U.S. 451 (1938)):

> No one may be required at peril of life, liberty or property to speculate as to the meaning of penal statutes.

But what could be more vague and ambiguous in scope or meaning than phrases such as, "or in any manner prejudice the interest of the United States" and "advantage such foreign power"?

It is also worth noting that the Justice Department included "soliciting" as one of the words in the original bill which would jeopardize fundamental constitutional rights of free speech, but this word holds an important place in the bill before us today.

Section 402, as reported to the House by the committee, and unless it is amended would endanger contributions to international organizations such as the International Red Cross, which does not ordinarily designate where it will distribute its funds and supplies. It might very well prohibit sending medical or other needed supplies to members of the Armed Forces or civilians held prisoner by hostile forces. It would certainly prohibit programs such as the collection of funds for tractors to exchange for the release of Cuban prisoners of war.

Section 403, reported to the House by the committee, and unless it is amended, could be utilized to make it a criminal offense for any labor union to engage in a strike or a slowdown. It would virtually outlaw strikes in the maritime or transportation industries, for this bill encompasses the obstruction or interference with "any facility of transportation being used, or intended to be used, in whole or in part, for the transportation of personnel, supplies, or material of [the] Armed Forces."

For all of these and still other reasons, Mr. Chairman, this bill should be rejected. It is unnecessary, as expert witnesses have testified, and it could be dangerous, as constitutional lawyers have warned.

And in the process of rejecting this bill, let us also consider the unseemly spectacle of the hearings that accompanied it. Senator DIRKSEN, in commenting on this, stated very clearly:

> This spectacle can do the Congress no good.

Clearly the House has a responsibility and an obligation to consider matters affecting the internal security of the United States. But this obligation includes a responsibility as well to protect the constitutional rights of all witnesses that appear before its committees.

In my judgment, both obligations could be better met if this committee were dissolved and its functions assumed by the Committee on the Judiciary, as is the case in the other body. I hope that this proposal, which I have made before, will be considered when the House adopts its rules next year.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD].

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, last year the Committee on Government Operations considered a bill, as I recall, it was H.R. 5665, which was a request to give the President the power to pay salaries for certain friendly foreign armies under certain combat conditions.

During the discussion on that proposed legislation, which ultimately was passed by the House, it became clear

that the Executive would have had this power under a declared war situation. But because there was, and is, an undeclared war situation, he lacked the power he felt he needed to conduct the war that we were in.

Earlier this week we dealt with an amendment to the defense appropriation bill dealing with the Reserves. The result was to give the Executive, again, certain powers to call up certain Reserve forces which he clearly could have, as I understand it, by a stroke of the pen—by Executive order.

We know that in the defense appropriation bill there are many billions of dollars currently being reprogramed with great flexibility by the Department of Defense because of the fact that the administration has underestimated the cost of the war in Vietnam. Here again we see the Congress yielding up its powers—this time power over the purse strings.

I cite these three things because I think the bill we are discussing here follows the same pattern. The bill today is another example of legislation giving the Executive greater power, greater flexibility, and greater authority in the absence of a declared war situation—in each case powers that the Executive clearly would have if this country were in a declared war.

How many other such examples of such legislation have been passed by this Congress and previous Congresses I do not know.

The penalties under this bill, I understand from the debate, would exist if there were a declared war.

The Congress is the people's branch of the Government. The drafters of the Constitution devised a delicate balance and check between the various branches of Government. When we in this Congress voluntarily continue to yield up what ultimately could be almost total authority to the Executive in any condition ranging from total peace to total war, we unnecessarily and unwisely deny the people of this country and our form of government the benefit of that check and balance which was so wisely put in our system.

I do not know what the desirable degree of congressional involvement in the whole foreign policy and national security decisionmaking process is. Or, conversely, I do not know precisely what specific powers the Executive requires under each different type of situation. I do know that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House and his committee have been attempting to push the pendulum back toward the Congress, and I applaud their interest.

I also know that regardless of what the desirable degree of congressional involvement—the people's involvement—in these matters may be, it is unwise for us to have arrived at this point today without thought, without study, without attempting to determine what powers the President should have in these various situations, and you can call them anything you like—intervention, limited wars, police actions, or quasi-wars.

I know it is wrong to have arrived where we have without systematic study.

I testified before the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress in June of 1965 urging that they give some thought to the question of what powers the legislative branch should retain and what powers should be given to the Executive in these various situations ranging from total peace to total war, and there have been many such instances since World War II. Unfortunately, they did not look into the question. I think it was most unfortunate that their final report totally ignored this question.

I also feel that it is unwise for this Congress to fail to immediately undertake such a study.

We have always said that we feel our system can support greater flexibility on the part of individuals in nonwar situations. Throughout our history we have recognized and given the Executive the greater authority necessary to deal with international conflicts.

This bill seems to say that the nature of war today is different. That it is unconventional and not clear cut as were World Wars I and II. And, as I read the bill, the conclusion seems to be that because of these changes we are being asked to move the pendulum away from individual freedom and say that the people should be denied the flexibility that we normally would give them in a peacetime situation—in an undeclared war situation.

I find problems in the legislation. For example, on page 3, section 402 states:

> Whenever any element of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be engaged in armed conflict abroad—

I would like to know, for example, whether the term "armed conflict abroad" would include, for example, what transpired during the last administration when we had advisers in Vietnam but we were being told that they were not engaged in armed conflict, and yet everyone knew that they were engaged in fact in armed conflict? I would like to know the meaning and use of the word "solicits."

I support portions of this bill and hold no brief for the activities the bill is designed to make unlawful. On the other hand, I am disturbed about some portions of the bill, specifically the draftsmanship and the apparent inability of the committee to agree on responses to questions of interpretation. I am concerned that according to the debate every agency of the executive branch to take a position on the bill, opposed the bill, and not a single agency supports it.

I would hope that at the minimum, the committee will amend the bill to assure that individual freedoms are not unnecessarily restricted, and that neither the executive branch nor the Red Cross are unduly inhibited in their efforts to assist and free American prisoners of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL].

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very definite support of this legislation and commend the committee for the very fine job that it has done. After having watched some of the hearings on this matter, it is inconceivable to me that anyone would support the type of scum, the type of trash that are seeking to undermine this United States of ours, and I certainly urge the passage of this legislation.

To respond to a question asked by the very distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Texas, along with 80-odd other Members, have a bill pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, that, if we can get it on the floor, will take care of Mr. Stokely Carmichael.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this time to ask the chairman of the committee some questions to clear up some confusion in my mind on section 403.

It says here:

> Whoever, within the United States or elsewhere, owing allegiance to or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with, or attempts to obstruct, impede or interfere with the free movement on foot—

And so on and so on—

> with the intent to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the United States, or any member of the Armed Forces, in preparing for, or carrying on, any military duty or activity, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

I should like to give the chairman a hypothetical question. Let us assume that a member of the Armed Forces walked into a tavern and became inebriated. He refused to pay his bill, and the tavernkeeper obstructed or impeded that serviceman from leaving that tavern. Would the tavernkeeper be subject to a $10,000 fine or imprisonment for 5 years?

Mr. POOL. There are two things there. He is not on duty, for one thing, and there is no intent.

Mr. CONTE. Certainly he is on duty. He has a night off from his base, but he is on duty.

Mr. POOL. He is not on duty in the sense of carrying out a military assignment.

Also, there is no intent to obstruct or impede or interfere with the United States or any member of the Armed Forces while he is carrying out a military duty.

Mr. CONTE. Suppose that he were driving a truck in a convoy, and was drunk, and was stopped by a State trooper. Would the State trooper be subject to a $10,000 fine or imprisonment for 5 years, or both under the proposed legislation?

Mr. POOL. I do not think so. Definitely not.

Mr. CONTE. I believe you should tighten up the language. It seems very loose.

A great deal was said here about the Communists who appeared before the committee. I also went before the committee and I watched these witnesses and heard the hearings. I can certainly sympathize with the chairman of the committee on the job he was trying to do. But, believe me, these "kooks" you dredged up never would have had a forum

if vou had not brought them in. Any service that might have been afforded the American public was lost in the glare of coast-to-coast and worldwide publicity that ensued.

One news source described the committee as "locked in televised combat with a prime mixture of oddities, idealists, headline-hunters of the left and patriots of the left."

These rabid publicity seekers achieved their goal, but I am sure you did not learn one thing that the FBI does not have in its files downtown.

I include the following material:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1966]

DIRKSEN SCORES UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES INQUIRY

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—"This spectacle can do the Congress no good," Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois said today.

The Senate Republican leader was referring to the four raucus days of hearings this week by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The announced purpose of the hearings, during which about 50 persons were arrested, was to provide the investigative basis for a bill to make it a felony to aid "any hostile foreign power" or person or group "acting in hostile opposition" to the United States armed forces.

Yesterday, after he had suddenly broken off the hearing, Representative JOE R. POOL, Democrat of Texas, said that his bill would be reported out next week. He predicted it would quickly pass the House and Senate.

But today, Senator DIRKSEN made it plain that, regardless of the expected approval by the House, the chances of the bill's passing the Senate were exceedingly slim.

MANSFIELD SHARES VIEWS

Views similar to Mr. DIRKSEN's were also expressd by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, the majority leader. Mr. MANSFIELD expressed doubt that, considering the composition of the Judiciary Committee, the bill would ever reach the Senate floor.

Amid the tumult and the shouting of the subcommittee hearings the 50 persons later arrested were forcibly removed by Federal marshals from the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building.

Among those arrested were several of the 12 witnesses; a lawyer for two of the witnesses, Arthur Kinoy; and many student spectators in the audience who time after time interrupted the proceedings.

The witnesses had been subpoenaed by the subcommittee to tell of their activities in opposition to the Vietnam war. The activities had ranged from attempts to halt United States troop trains to the collection of money for medical supplies for North Vietnamese forces and the Viet Cong.

Mr. POOL'S bill would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 and would provide penalties up to a 20-year jail sentence or $20,000 fine.

Senator DIRKSEN speaks with some authority on the prospects of the bill in the Senate because he is the ranking Republican member of the Judiciary Committee, to which the bill will be referred.

"When you draft a criminal statute that applies to the whole country, the utmost caution has to be exercised," Mr. DIRKSEN said.

"A criminal statute carries with it a penalty—a fine or prison sentence—and you don't lightly send a person to jail or fine him, you don't want a criminal statute to become a veritable dragnet."

The Republican leader went on to say that "when you talk about rendering aid to an enemy, or some country with which we are at hostilities, you must exercise caution to make sure it's carefully defined. This is a job for lawyers, and it is necessary to take a good look before a jump into the dark."

Mr. MANSFIELD noted that Senators loosely classified as "liberal" constitute a majority of the Judiciary Committee, and he doubted that they would report out a bill as vaguely drafted as the Pool bill.

Many Senators who are lawyers have the reservations and objections to the bill expressed last week by Henry J. Steiner, a Harvard law school professor.

The first section of the bill would impose criminal penalties on persons who give, or advise or solicit another to give, "money, property or thing" to "any hostile foreign power," or to any group of persons "acting in hostile opposition" to the armed forces.

Addressing himself to this section, Professor Steiner noted that there were several Federal laws that rigorously control export of money or goods to foreign countries or their nationals, including the Export Control Act of 1949 and The Trading With The Enemy Act. Both of these acts have criminal penalties.

Mr. Steiner also contended that the section was vague. The language, he said, does not make clear whether "the hostile foreign power" must be a nation that United States is actually fighting.

Does the phrase, he asked encompass, "any country which actively opposes our policy in Vietnam?" And, he continued, "when is a group to which a person might contribute 'acting in hostile opposition' to the armed forces?"

Third, Mr. Steiner's chief criticism was directed at the inclusion within the bill's sanctions of those who "advise" others to give money or property in aid of a hostile foreign power. The bill thus reaches "behind conduct," he said, to speech, and this opens the possibility of a dangerous violation of constitutional rights.

The second section of the Pool bill provides penalties for those interfering, or advising others to interfere with, the movement of troops or supplies.

Here again Mr. Steiner said that there were already laws dealing with such obstruction. If the present laws are inadequate, he said, they can be strengthened, but any new legislation should extend to overt action and not to "advice."

Many House members, as well as those in the Senate, take the same critical view of the Pool bill. However, House members have found it difficult—especially, in campaign years—to vote against bills favored by the Un-American Activities panel, particularly when the bills are directed against such activities as were definitely confessed last week by the witnesses.

To the utter confusion of the subcommittee, which had become accustomed to witnesses who took refuge from the outset in the Fifth Amendment's protection against self-incrimination, these young revolutionaries proclaimed their affiliations with the Peking-oriented Progressive Labor party and its former satellite, the May 2d Movement.

Unquestionably many House members believe, as Mr. DIRKSEN does, that the "spectacle" did not improve the House image and they see little sense in providing the students of the New Left with a forum grossly out of proportion to its threat.

But few of those who feel this way will go so far as to demand that the committee be abolished or even to vote against the Pool bill. As in the past, they are expected to take the safe course of voting for a bill repugnant to them in the sure knowledge that the Senate will dispatch it to oblivion.

ANALYSIS OF THE POOL BILL (H.R. 12047)

(By Henry J. Steiner, professor of law, Harvard University)

H.R. 12047, introduced by Congressman JOE POOL of Texas, is now under consideration by the House Un-American Activities Committee. This proposed legislation, which would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by adding new Sections 402 and 403, is unnecessary and unwise.

Section 402 is applicable whenever armed forces of the United States are engaged in hostilities abroad. It imposes criminal penalties upon persons who give (directly or indirectly, through intermediaries), or advise or solicit another to give, any "money, property, or thing" to "any hostile foreign power" or its national, or to any group or person "acting in hostile opposition" to the armed forces. Such persons must have the intent, or reason to believe, that their conduct will "interfere with" the operations of the armed forces, or "in any manner prejudice the interests of the United States," or "advantage" the foreign power, foreign national, group or person.

Insofar as this bill would block the transfer of any property to a country (or its national) with which the United States is engaged in hostilities, it is redundant. Several federal laws rigorously control exports to foreign countries or their nationals. The key laws are the Trading with the Enemy Act (particularly Section 5(b)), 50 U.S.C. App. 1–40, and the Export Control Act of 1949 (particularly Section 3), 50 U.S.C. App. 2021–2032. Both acts are backed by criminal sanctions. They delegate extensive powers to the executive branch to control the transfer of money, commodities and technical data to foreign countries or their nationals. Acting under these laws, the Treasury Department and the Commerce Department have issued lengthy and detailed regulations. They identify the kinds of exports and the countries or nationals which are covered by the requirement of a special license before transfers can be made.

A review of the regulations (31 Code Fed. Reg., Parts 500 and 505; 15 Code Fed. Reg., Parts 368–399) will indicate how broad a range of transactions they affect and how far they reach to curb indirect as well as direct transfers. As now administered, the two acts ban all transfers to North Vietnam and Communist China. There have been frequent amendments to the regulations to keep them responsive to current political and trade considerations. Any gaps that might develop in the existing regulatory scheme—whether relating to gifts or indirect transfers or aid to hostile forces in South Vietnam—could be filled in the same manner, by additional regulations. It is difficult to believe that departments of the executive branch, the branch of government directing our military operations in Vietnam, would not be alert to any such need. It is difficult to understand what new purpose would be served by those provisions of H.R. 12047 which regulate conduct.

Apart from its repetitive quality, the bill would substitute vagueness for the relative precision of the existing regulations. Criminal legislation should speak with as clear a voice as possible. The language of H.R. 12047 falls short of this goal. For example, it does not make clear whether the "hostile foreign power" to which (or to whose national) exports are banned must be a country with which the United States is engaged in combat. Is a hostile power any country which actively opposes our policy in Vietnam? Any Communist country affording aid to North Vietnam? Would an export to any such country or its national "advantage" the country or national? When is a group to which a person might contribute "acting in hostile

opposition" to the armed forces? Only when engaged in combat?

The section thus creates certain ambiguities about the kinds of conduct that are proscribed. It reaches, however, behind conduct and penalizes those who "advise" others to give money or property for the stated purposes. Whereas the laws now in effect control conduct, overt acts of transfer of property, Section 402 here aims directly at speech. Such a proposal runs counter to the strong traditions of this country. Apart from the strict constitutional limitations upon laws that would penalize speech, our tradition has been to encourage debate, to view the expression of dissenting ideas as a sign of health. Only under circumstances of extreme and pressing danger has there been thought to be justification for controlling the expression of ideas of a political stamp. Is there now such justification for reaching "advice"?

The basic objective of Section 402 cannot be to discourage debate. It must be to prohibit exports that disserve this country's interests. That objective is met by statutes now on the books and by the regulatory scheme that has developed under them. This is a time for open discussion of controversial policies. Such debate may occasionally exceed what many would consider to be the boundaries of propriety. But acceptance of that debate is a mark of the strength of this society. There is a national interest in regulating exports, not in spinning an intimidating web of criminal legislation around "advice" and speech as such.

Section 403 visits criminal penalties on persons who interfere with, or advise another to interfere with, "the free movement on foot, or otherwise" of any member of the armed forces while on duty, or the loading or movement of any transportation facility being used for military purposes. Such persons must have the intent to interfere with the United States or any member of the armed forces in preparing for or carrying on military activity.

This section overlaps in part some existing laws insofar as it aims at conduct obstructing military operations. Various provisions of the Criminal Code, such as 18 U.S.C. 1381, 2153, and 2157, penalize sabotage or certain interferences with military personnel. Section 2153 penalizes anyone who injures war materials, premises or utilities (all broadly defined to include, for example, transportation facilities for troops or materials), with the intent to interfere with the United States in preparing for war or in its defense activities. To the extent that the present laws are inadequate, new legislation may of course be advisable. But for the reasons stated above, any new legislation should be held to the control of conduct and should not proscribe "advice" alone.

This country has for several years experienced intense debate, within and without the Congress, over Vietnam. The costs in lives and funds of our involvement are large. We should be wary that Vietnam does not raise costs in other directions, by exacting a toll of our own traditions. No doubt our internal debate, the symbol of a free society, gives some comfort to those we fight. Such is the minor price we pay for that society. One cannot say that the campus incidents that led in part to H.R. 12047 have hampered our military efforts. To direct towards them legislation that curtails speech evidences a fear that we need not have. It blurs the line between the closed societies that we oppose and the open society that we defend.

RELIGIOUS ACTION CENTER, UNION OF AMERICA HEBREW CONGREGATIONS,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1966.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations and the Central Conference of American Rabbis, we write to express our opposition to H.R. 12047 (known as the Pool Bill), to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950.

We firmly agree with all those witnesses from the Executive agencies who testified before the Un-American Activities Committee that this bill was either undesirable, unnecessary, or unconstitutional—in some cases all three.

We think the bill is unnecessary and unwise because there already exists a vast body of law, state and federal, which adequately protects the national interests in the subject matter with which the bill is concerned. The bill is unwise because it needlessly injects federal law and federal enforcement into state and local affairs. The bill prohibits no substantial criminal conduct which cannot be dealt with under existing law. Further, we question the excessive and indiscriminate penalty—fines up to $20,000, prison up to 20 years—which would apply, in Deputy Attorney General Clark's words, to "saboteurs and sit-ins alike."

As pointed out by the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, it may be in the national interest to allow both the solicitation and the actual sending (both of which would be prohibited by the bill) of some supplies to hostile areas. The bill could even interfere with sending medical and other needed supplies for American prisoners. Religious and other organizations engaged in international relief work are also affected and concerned.

We are particularly concerned that the bill violates civil liberties. It is vague, ambiguous, and indefinite. By prohibiting "solicitation," it violates freedom of speech without demonstrating any clear and present danger that this need be done. It may prevent the mailing of newspapers or magazines into hostile areas, if such written material contains a criticism of the war in Vietnam, on the ground that "the interest of the United States would be prejudiced." We agree with Deputy Attorney General Clark that the bill has a "potential for infringement of the constitutional right of free speech . . ."

We feel that the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in its hearings, abused orderly legislative processes and the dignity of the House. Legislation coming out of such hearings is seldom likely to be constructive—and the legislation in point is a keen example.

We can see no other need or purpose for this legislation except to intimidate dissent. At this difficult time, channels of discourse and even dissent would best be left open and undisturbed. Even though the national interest in the short range may sometimes appear to require acquiescence in government policy, the Administration has wisely recognized that in the long range, the repression of dissent may be a greater danger to our free institutions than the dissent or the dissenters.

Sincerely,
RABBI MAURICE N. EISENDRATH,
President Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
RABBI JACOB J. WEINSTEIN,
President, Central Conference of American Rabbis.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the committee for its leadership for such legislation as we have up today which I feel is vitally needed by our country at the present time.

On the first day of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, January 10, 1966, I introduced H.R. 11864, a bill to provide criminal penalties for wrongful interference with or impairment of the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict. I have introduced a companion bill to Chairman POOL's bill, in order to join him in behalf of such legislation.

During the adjournment of Congress last fall we had a great rush of anti-American demonstrations caused by our Government's firm stand in Vietnam and our Nation's involvement in the conflict in assisting the free South Vietnamese people in stopping aggressors from North Vietnam. The several demonstrations and events around the country during the last year or two have threatened our military activity and support of American troops in South Vietnam.

These demonstrations have threatened our national security. And many have been inspired by highly publicized misguided individuals, some of whom called for giving blood to the aggressor Communist forces from North Vietnam, who have killed over 5,000 of our American soldiers in the Vietnam war.

While some called for blood to the enemy, the distinguished acting chairman of this committee was leading a drive on Capitol Hill for blood to our friends, the South Vietnamese. At the same time I and others in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., and on Veterans Day gave blood for the South Vietnamese.

These demonstrators who seek to disrupt proper and important military activities of our Government are afforded license to act against the national interests of our country by encouragement to anarchy even by some who claim to do so for religious reasons.

Our Nation's involvement in the Vietnam war has caused serious debate throughout the country by many groups, individuals, inside and outside the Government, and in the news media. This is healthy and needed.

However, there are those persons who have gone beyond the constitutional bounds of freedom of speech and assembly and who have actually subverted the national interest of the United States and its efforts to protect the general population and preserve the peace.

In October 1965, for example, 11 demonstrators were arrested at Truax Air Force Base near Madison, Wis., when they tried to enter the installation to make a citizen's arrest of the base commander.

A group in Oakland, Calif., in the summer and fall of 1965, marched on the Oakland Army Base and attempted to stop troop trains going to the installation.

These and other illustrations point up the need for legislation now to make it clear that these acts with the color of treason be prohibited.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the chairman and the committee for looking into these matters which are harming our efforts to maintain freedom in southeast Asia. The country needs a law on the books to cope with these demonstrations when they threaten our national

security, and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 12047.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I want to compliment my distinguished colleague [Mr. POOL].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to say a word.

I do not want to discuss any of the problems of verbiage, expression, or anything of that kind. I merely wish to say that war is war, whether it is cold or hot.

I was brought up not to feed or equip my enemies. I was also brought up to take care of the wounded. That is a very different thing.

To collect money in a country like ours and to send it over to the Vietcong against our boys who are dying—and a good many of them are from my district, right now—to me is—I was going to use the word "sacrilege." How can we so misuse the very things for which this country stands—justice and honor? How can we get back to using the word "treason" where it belong, because there are many things today that, in the estimate of the older generation, are treason.

I hope very much that this bill will be passed. I agree with some of the remarks that have been made, that the language could be tightened. It could be done in a more careful way, but I shall vote for the bill even so.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for permitting me to address this body for my first time. I do so with considerable reservation.

I probably am the only Member of this House whose district has at this very hour, and has had for 2 months, for 24 hours a day, these demonstrations occurring within their district. There are demonstrators today at the naval ammunition depot at Port Chicago in my district. So my acquaintance with the problem is sufficient and I am not totally unaware of what is at stake in this particular bill and in this particular problem.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make my remarks and address myself, however, to the second portion of this bill. I have no great objection personally to the first portion of the bill. I share the contempt expressed on the floor for those who would do business by sending goods, money, or other things to the enemy in North Vietnam or the Vietcong. However, the second portion of the bill, I think, deserves some comment from one who has had some experience with it. I recognize that there was some tremendous pressure exerted during the hearings on this bill by discourteous and contemptuous witnesses before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I do not know why they so conduct themselves, nor do I sympathize with those certain people who aline themselves with the objectives of picketing and demonstrating and obstructing military traffic, but I do know what we do in these instances in Port Chicago daily in my district. There are several things you ought to know about. When you are back here listening to oratory in a committee and are being subjected to the harassment and indignities you were, it is entirely possible your viewpoint and perspective becomes somewhat a little bit obscured. In Contra Costa County we have arrested 38 of these demonstrators over a 2-month period and just yesterday we arrested 3 more. We arrested them under State and local laws. Two of them were arrested under Federal laws. The laws we use are very simple. There are two State laws and one county law. The State law provides that if they stand or lie in front of a truck, they are obstructing traffic and are creating a nuisance and are subjected to a penalty of 6 months in the county jail and a $500 fine.

If they go limp when you seek to remove them from in front of a truck or if they chain themselves to a truck, as they have done, they are charged with resisting arrest and are subjected to a penalty of 1 year in the county jail and a $1,000 fine. In addition to that, if they are sleeping on the roadside, we have an act which we just passed in the county in the last week, a county ordinance, prohibiting sleeping on the roadside. If they do that, then they are subjected to a prosecution as a misdemeanor with a penalty of $500 fine and 6 months in the county jail. Of the 38 who were prosecuted 1 stood trial by a jury and was found guilty; 37 plead guilty and were sentenced. Every single one of these was sentenced by Judge Otto Lichty. I obtained these figures over the weekend. He is a gentleman that the people in our county respect, and he has been there for many years. He is not one of those up-in-the-air sort of fellows but is the sort that the members of this committee would appreciate for his hardheaded, realistic, and fair approach. Having the right to sentence these people to as much as 1 year in jail and subjecting them to a $1,000 fine, he sentenced them to 15 days in the county jail without possibility of probation and no fine. If they go limp and resist arrest, he gives them 30 days in the county jail without possibility of probation and gives them no fine.

The U.S. district attorney is Cecil Poole, in our area. I also called him over the weekend to find out what his attitude was toward this bill and how he was handling the situation in our county and found he has made two arrests for trespassing on the naval base. They are subjected to a penalty of 6 months in jail and a $500 fine.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. WALDIE. May I have additional time if you use it all?

Mr. ICHORD. I do not control the time.

Mr. WALDIE. I would prefer to yield, then, when I am through.

So the Federal district attorney, Cecil Poole, tells me he believes this bill will not only not assist them in prosecution but it would hamper them, and he said it was so for this reason:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WALDIE. Will the gentleman from Texas yield me additional time?

Mr. POOL. I do not have any additional time to yield.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that the time is under the control of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have a question with reference to section 403 as contrasted with section 402.

As I understand it, section 402 is limited to those cases where we are engaged in armed conflict abroad, while section 403 contains no such limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the committee might enlighten me as to why this limitation is contained in section 402 and is not in section 403.

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

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

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, in section 403, we specify and provide against interference with the free movement of troops and supplies.

In section 402, it has to do with the solicitation or the collection of funds.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the section, if adopted, would do, but am wondering if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] would have any objection to limiting section 403 to those periods of time when our country is engaged in armed conflict and to activities related to it?

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLE. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I might point out to the gentleman from Kansas——

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Texas is studying that information——

Mr. POOL. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a question of the manner in which the Armed Forces operate. They are operating all the time, whether we are in armed conflict or not. So, that is the consideration involved here. Section 403 applies at all times.

Mr. YATES. Including peacetime?

Mr. POOL. That is right.

Mr. DOLE. Would the gentleman from Texas have any objection to adding to section 403 language which would make it applicable when engaged in armed conflict?

What is proposed is to make it wide open. In its present form, section 403 would apply to demonstrations, riots, and all other instances where the National Guard was federalized or the Reserves called up.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I believe the

Armed Forces should be protected at all times, whether we are engaged in armed conflict or not. That is the reason why I express my response in this manner.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no quarrel with section 402. However, I have some serious question about the meaning of section 403.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I was just trying to protect the armed services at all times, those forces that are standing at "ready" at all times, whether we are engaged in an armed conflict or not—whether it is wartime or peacetime.

Mr. Chairman, the armed services certainly should have the protection of this provision.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with the gentleman that the armed services ought to have protection. I spent a little time in the armed services myself.

However, I am wondering if section 403 does what the committee intended.

It might be a mistake to make section 403 that broad.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, can the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], tell us whether the Joint Chiefs or the Secretary of the Army or that of Navy have asked for any help in this respect?

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

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12047. This measure is the result of hearings held this summer by the House Un-American Activities Committee. It is the product of the hysteria generated by those hearings. In subpenaing people to testify as to their beliefs and associations, the committee utilized its typical trial-by-committee technique. I made my views known concerning the hearings at the time they were taking place, as did others. The New York Times published on August 17 an editorial entitled "Useless Hearings" in which it stated that the hearings "proved as disorderly and unproductive as the work of this committee usually is." We remember the photograph which appeared in many national newspapers of an attorney and Rutgers law professor being choked as he was bodily removed from the hearings while he was making a point of law. The bill which confronts us proves the New York Times statement that the disorderly hearings were unproductive.

This bill does not have the support of a single agency of the Federal Government. The Department of Justice has recommended against its enactment. The Treasury Department has said that it could interfere with our efforts to help American prisoners of war. And the Department of State has said it is unnecessary and undesirable.

Mr. Chairman, furthermore this is another example of the House Un-American Activities Committee trespassing upon the jurisdiction of an important legislative committee. The Judiciary Committee is the proper committee to consider a criminal statute of this nature.

H.R. 12047 purports to aid the Nation by establishing criminal penalties for activities aiding a foreign power, organization or group engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States. It also sets criminal penalties for obstructing the movement of troops or military supplies. No one will argue that the United States should be able to prevent certain activities which are clearly intended to aid a country engaged in armed conflict against the United States.

However, the Treasury, Justice, and State Departments are opposed to this measure. All three departments agree that, as the law stands today, the United States has ample power to deal with the situation intended to be covered by H.R. 12047 and that this bill is unnecessary at best and raises substantial constitutional questions at worst.

Section 402 of H.R. 12047 provides criminal penalties for giving, delivering, soliciting, collecting, or receiving "any money, property or thing" for delivery to or for the use of "any foreign power, organization or group engaged in armed conflict" with the U.S. Armed Forces. If these activities are carried out with "the intent, or having reason to believe, that such conduct will impede or interfere with the operation or success of the Armed Forces of the United States, or in any manner prejudice the interests of the United States, or advantage such foreign power," penalties of $20,000 or imprisonment for 20 years, or both, can be imposed.

There is no question that this section is unnecessary. The Deputy Attorney General told the committee in his testimony opposing this measure that the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act "are better adapted to prohibit the activity contemplated by H.R. 12047 than is that bill itself." A look at that statute proves the point.

The act which is directly applicable to the conduct proscribed by H.R. 12047 is 50 U.S.C. App. sec. 5(b). Section 5(b) provides:

> During the time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President—
>
> The President may, by appropriate action:
>
> (A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and
>
> (B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national thereof has any interest, by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—

It is provided in section 5(b)(3) that anyone violating any provision of section 5 or of any license, order, rule, or regulation issued pursuant to section 5 shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned for not more than 10 years or both.

Regulations under the act are set out in 31 C.F.R. part 500. These forbid any dealings with certain designated countries by persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction without a license issued by the Secretary of the Treasury. It is made clear that transactions prohibited include transfers by any means of property, including gifts, and that the property includes every type of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, or interest or interests therein, present, future or contingent—31 C.F.R. §§ 500.309, .310, .311.

North Vietnam is one of the countries specified in the regulations as being subject to the act. Because there was a problem of proving that the National Liberation Front and the Front's Red Cross, the Liberation Red Cross, were instrumentalities of North Vietnam and that transactions with these were covered, the regulations were amended as of June 17, 1966, to list specifically the Front and its Red Cross—31 Federal Register 8586, June 21, 1966, amending 31 C.F.R. § 500.306.

It should be noted that the section is applicable during times of national emergency declared by the President. At the beginning of the Korean war, President Truman proclaimed such an emergency—Proclamation No. 2914, 15 Federal Register 9029. Although the Korean armistice was signed on July 27, 1953, there has been no subsequent termination of the emergency by proclamation, nor has Congress approved a concurrent resolution prescribing an end to the emergency.

The committee report, without mentioning the severe penalties of the Trading With the Enemy Act, cavalierly dismisses the act and the Justice Department testimony by stating that it is a regulatory act and not a penal statute. The report fails to mention, however, that a violation of the statute is punishable by 10 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine. It is a semantic fiction to complain that this statute is regulatory rather than penal. Its operation is identical, for example, to the operation of Federal statutes restricting trade in narcotics.

The Deputy Attorney General also pointed out in his testimony that the Trading With the Enemy Act is supplemented by the Foreign Agents' Registration Act requiring anyone soliciting or sending aid to any foreign government to register with the Attorney General. The Export Control Act and other Federal statutes are also pertinent—hearings, page 1426.

The committee in its attempt to justify this bill points out that soliciting is not covered by existing statutes. Even this last defense by the committee is not wholly accurate. Under the conspiracy statute—18 U.S.C. 371—it would be illegal for two or more persons to solicit aid for North Vietnam or the Vietcong in violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act if they did anything further

to effectuate their aims. The conspiracy statute states:

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or any agency thereof, in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both.

It is true that mere solicitation with absolutely no other act is not covered by present law. In his testimony, the then Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark pointed out that the bill's attempt to control advising, counseling, urging, or soliciting would jeopardize the purposes of the bill and fundamental rights of Americans by risking infringement of constitutional rights of free speech. Evidently in an effort to meet that objection, the committee deleted "advises," "counsels," "urges," but retained the language "solicits," which still raises serious constitutional objections. Even if there were no constitutional question, it seems hardly appropriate to create an entire statute just to cover the case of soliciting aid.

Present statutes could be amended to cover this situation. That, too, however, is unnecessary for, as the General Counsel for the Treasury Department testified, even if a solicitation is made, the attempt to send aid is a Federal crime under present statutes. Under the conspiracy statute, the solicitation coupled with any other act to further the cause of the solicitator would be a crime.

In addition to being unnecessary, this bill may in fact be injurious to our national interest. Under the Trading With the Enemy Act and the Export Control Act, the Government has some flexibility in determining whether medical aid should be permitted. This statute would end that flexibility. The Treasury Department indicated in its testimony in opposition to this bill that there are times when such aid may reach U.S. prisoners.

In its letter of August 17, 1966, to the chairman of the committee, which appears at pages 10–11 of the report, the Treasury Department said:

We believe a rigid ban such as that contained in H.R. 12047 would be undesirable, and that flexibility is essential. Under certain circumstances, it may be in the national interest to allow some solicitations for and indeed the actual sending of some types of supplies to hostile areas; for example, in connection with the Government's efforts to assist American military personnel who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam. A rigid ban could interfer with our efforts to help these American prisoners.

Just recently the Treasury Department permitted a group of Yale University religious leaders to send $300 worth of medical supplies to North Vietnam via Canada in the hope that the Canadian committee handling the supplies can make contact with U.S. prisoners.

It is clear that section 402 of this bill is unnecessary, may deprive U.S. prisoners of badly needed medical supplies, and raises serious constitutional questions.

Mr. Chairman, section 403 fares no better under analysis. Section 403 makes it a crime to obstruct, impede, or interfere with or attempt to obstruct, impede or interfere with first, the free movement on foot or otherwise of any member of the Armed Forces while on duty; or second, the loading, provisioning, manning, operation, movement, or passage of any facility of transportation being used, or intended to be used, in whole or in part, for the transportation of personnel, supplies or materiel of such Armed Forces. A violation carries a $10,000 fine, 5 years imprisonment, or both.

There are so many statutes covering the activities prohibited by this section that it is not possible to list every one. The Deputy Attorney General did mention several to show that this section is totally unnecessary. The Deputy Attorney General pointed out:

It is difficult to conceive of either a major or successful effort to obstruct the movement of military personnel or equipment in this country. Of all movements, this is the most difficult to impede.

Rather than list the statutes applicable, I will quote from the Justice Department's testimony which is found on page 1327 of the hearings:

For example, our sabotage statutes protect military material and installations, including buildings and grounds where such material is produced or stored, and utilities such as railroads, canals, bridges, vehicles, boats, aircraft, and power and communication lines used by the military. Severe penalties are provided. Of course, intensive investigation and prosecution would follow any act of sabotage. (See 18 U.S.C. 1362 and 18 U.S.C. 2151–2157.)

Trespass on military property is a Federal crime. Entering any military reservation for any purpose prohibited by law or regulation or reentering after having been removed and ordered not to reenter subjects the offender to a fine of up to $500 and imprisonment up to 6 months (18 U.S.C. 1382). Where there are restrictions placed on a military area any person entering, remaining in, or leaving such area in violation of those restrictions and with knowledge of them is subject to a fine of $5,000 and imprisonment for up to 1 year (18 U.S.C. 1383).

The Port Security Act, 50 U.S.C. 191–192, prohibits movement in port areas during a national emergency and provides high penalties.

If two or more persons conspire to prevent by force, intimidation, or threat, any person from entering the military service, or from discharging his duty; or to leave the place where his duty is to be performed, or to injure him, or his property on account of his discharge of his duties, or while he is engaged in the discharge of his duties; or to molest, interrupt, hinder, or impede him in the discharge of his duties they are subject to a $5,000 fine and 6 years imprisonment (18 U.S.C. 372).

To damage property of the United States, or being manufactured or constructed by it, is also subject to strict penalty. Where the property value exceeds $100, punishment of 10 years and $10,000 fine is authorized (18 U.S.C. 1361).

In addition to the Federal laws, the Deputy Attorney General pointed out:

In every jurisdiction of the Nation there are scores of laws applicable to conduct directed at members of the Armed Forces or military supplies. One need only point to general statutes and ordinances proscribing assault, destruction of property, malicious mischief, traffic infractions, disorderly conduct, disturbing the peace, and parading without a permit.

Mr. Chairman, there are ample statutes on the books to deal with the situations covered in the bill. The measure may be harmful to our fighting men abroad and may erode our constitutional liberties at home. This bill is fresh evidence of the mischief which results from the survival of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Their hearings reflect discredit upon the House; their legislation is either unnecessary or unconstitutional. Under the rules of the House penal statutes should be considered by the Judiciary Committee and not by a committee which has consistently shown a disregard for the fundamental principles of our Constitution.

The passage of this bill by the House will have a chilling effect on dissent in this country. It is clear from the hearings that this is the real target of the committee. As the war continues, the temptation to curtail dissent will become increasingly stronger. We should not discourage debate and discussion by passing a bill which is clearly unnecessary. We should not let the fact that we are fighting in Vietnam lead us to pass this bill. At a time like this we must stand up for constitutional freedoms. It is always in times of crisis that our democratic way of life is most severely tested. Let us meet this test and defeat this ill-conceived and misbegotten bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there have been a number of questions asked, and no matter from what side the question has come, no one has really gotten a coherent answer. I hope that I will be an exception.

If the chairman would listen to me, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee a question, and that is on the possibility that the President of the United States might want to try to get some of our captured prisoners back from the North Vietnamese, and for that reason would enter into some type of an arrangement to furnish drugs, as was done in the Cuban case a few years ago.

I asked you this when we were considering the rule, and you assured me that this bill would not prohibit that. You said it does not restrict the President.

Will you please tell me on what page and on what line the exemption is contained?

Mr. POOL. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield.

Mr. POOL. It does not prevent it, it does not spell it out; but the sovereign powers of the President are already preserved. How many bills can you name that specifically exempt the President from their provisions?

Now, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. JOELSON. I thought I was asking the question.

Mr. POOL. You asked me to answer a question, and that was what I was trying to do.

Mr. JOELSON. I am hopeful that you can answer it.

Mr. POOL. Do you want me to answer the question?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes; I do.

Mr. POOL. This bill does not prevent the Government from acting in its capacity, in all of its sovereign powers, to take any action to promote the interests of our prisoners of war.

Mr. JOELSON. May I ask the gentleman where is that in this bill? What section?

Mr. POOL. I am just saying that it does not bar it; it does not have to be spelled out in the bill.

Mr. JOELSON. The bill says that whoever shall give or deliver or attempt to give or deliver is guilty of a criminal act.

Mr. POOL. I will say to the gentleman that this statute is a penalty statute which would prohibit certain activities only if there is intent to aid the enemy. If the President is trying to aid our prisoners of war, he is not trying to aid the enemy.

Mr. JOELSON. Will the gentleman accept an amendment later tonight that will clear this matter up?

Mr. POOL. No. I think it is very clear. I do not think there is any problem at all.

Mr. JOELSON. If it is not even in existence there how can it be clear?

If you really mean what you say, you will accept an amendment which I intend to offer later tonight on it, and the same thing about the Red Cross about which you assured me also was not affected. I do not see it in the act.

I would yield to the gentleman for an answer.

Mr. POOL. I tried to answer the question.

Mr. JOELSON. I will offer my amendments later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] who has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 2 minutes of time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the hearings before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the very distinguished minority leader in the other body, said, and I quote from an article in the New York Times of Sunday, August 21, 1966, under the byline of the eminent journalist, E. R. Kenworthy:

> This is a spectacle that could do the Congress no good.

But the minority leader went on to offer a constructive suggestion about how we might remedy the damage to our reputation and he said, and again I quote:

> When you draft a criminal statute that applies to the whole country, the utmost caution must be exercised.

In the spirit of the minority leader's admonition, I would like to address a question to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] with respect to a letter signed by Fred B. Smith, General Counsel of the Treasury Department, which appears on page 10 of the report in which he says:

> Under certain circumstances, it may be in the national interest to allow some solicitations for and indeed the actual sending of some types of supplies to hostile areas.

Then he says:

> A rigid ban could interfere with our efforts to help these American prisoners.

Was Mr. Smith called before the committee to explain that statement?

Mr. POOL. First, I want to state that Senator DIRKSEN has since said that he has been misquoted and that his statement was misinterpreted.

Second, the gentleman to whom you referred, Fred B. Smith, backtracked a good deal before the committee when he testified before the committee.

Mr. MATHIAS. Will the gentleman refer me to his testimony?

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

Mr. MATHIAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. His testimony is on page 1279 of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the rules and to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules the time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The remaining time is under the control of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] who has 7 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield me some time so that I might ask a question.

Mr. POOL. I am very sorry but the time has already been promised to other Members.

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

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

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

[Roll No. 357]

Abernethy	Brown, Calif.	Duncan, Oreg.
Addabbo	Broyhill, Va.	Dwyer
Albert	Cahill	Dyal
Anderson, Ill.	Callaway	Edmondson
Andrews, Glenn	Cameron	Edwards, La.
Annunzio	Carey	Evans, Colo.
Arends	Celler	Evins, Tenn.
Ashley	Clancy	Fallon
Aspinall	Clark	Farbstein
Ayres	Clevenger	Feighan
Baring	Collier	Findley
Barrett	Conyers	Fino
Bates	Corman	Fisher
Belcher	Craley	Flynt
Bell	Culver	Fogarty
Bingham	Curtin	Foley
Blatnik	Davis, Ga.	Ford, Gerald R.
Boland	Delaney	Fulton, Tenn.
Bolling	Dent	Fuqua
Bolton	Derwinski	Gallagher
Bow	Devine	Garmatz
Brademas	Dickinson	Gilbert
Bray	Diggs	Gilligan
Brooks	Dingell	Goodell
Broomfield	Dorn	Grabowski
	Dow	Gray
Green, Oreg.	Mackie	Rogers, Tex.
Green, Pa.	Mailliard	Roncalio
Gross	Martin, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.
Grover	Martin, Mass.	Rosenthal
Hagan, Ga.	Martin, Nebr.	Roudebush
Halleck	Matsunaga	Schmidhauser
Hanley	Minish	Schneebeli
Hanna	Minshall	Scott
Hansen, Idaho	Mize	Shriver
Hansen, Wash.	Monagan	Slack
Harvey, Ind.	Morrison	Smith, N.Y.
Hébert	Moss	Smith, Va.
Helstoski	Multer	Stalbaum
Herlong	Murphy, N.Y.	Stanton
Hicks	Murray	Steed
Holland	Nix	Stephens
Howard	O'Brien	Stratton
Hungate	O'Konski	Stubblefield
Huot	Olsen, Mont.	Sweeney
Irwin	Olson, Minn.	Teague, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal, Ga.	Tenzer
Johnson, Pa.	Ottinger	Thompson, N.J.
Jones, Mo.	Passman	Thompson, Tex.
Karsten	Pickle	Todd
Karth	Pike	Toll
Keith	Pirnie	Trimble
Kelly	Powell	Tunney
Keogh	Price	Tuten
King, Calif.	Pucinski	Ullman
Kirwan	Purcell	Utt
Landrum	Quillen	Vigorito
Latta	Rees	Walker, Miss.
Lennon	Reid, Ill.	Watkins
Long, La.	Reid, N.Y.	Weltner
Long, Md.	Reinecke	White, Idaho
Love	Resnick	Widnall
McCarthy	Reuss	Willis
McDowell	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson, Bob
McMillan	Rivers, Alaska	Wolff
McVicker	Robison	Wright
Macdonald	Rodino	Wyatt
Mackay	Rogers, Colo.	Wydler

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KING of Utah, 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. 12047, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 229 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] had 7 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK].

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Chairman, let me apologize to the Members. I was not in any sense responsible for the calling of this quorum. I might further add that the trouble you took to come back here will not be repaid by anything that I may have to say.

My very lovable and friendly colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] became somewhat offended because he thought he did not have enough time and he is responsible for the calling of the quorum, or for making the point of order of the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. TUCK. I yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. BATTIN. I am glad that the gentleman did so that we could hear you, Governor TUCK.

Mr. TUCK. Thank you, sir. I appreciate that compliment. I get so few and it sounds so good to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 12047.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings have revealed the existence of a concerted effort by Communist groups, their affiliates, and other disaffected and dissident organizations to obstruct the Government of the United States and its Armed Forces in carrying out their constitutional duties. This effort has not been limited to speech activity. If it were, needless to say, we would not be here debating this bill.

I hope that you will not consider my statement as one being made in a boastful spirit, but I come from the great Commonwealth of Virginia, and I favor freedom of speech and freedom of the press, as was so well declared in that matchless instrumentality penned by George Mason of Virginia, which has come down to us through the ages, stating that freedom of speech and freedom of the press shall constitute the great bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained except by a despotic government.

Therefore all men shall have the right to write, publish, and declare their sentiments on all subjects, being responsible only for the abuse of the right.

Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be the last person to do anything to impinge upon the right of any American citizen, irrespective of his stature, to have freedom of the press and to declare himself.

We are concerned with overt criminal activity. the obstruction of the movement of troops and supplies intended for the battlefront. We are concerned with the solicitation, collection, and delivery of money and property in aid of enemy forces who are killing our soldiers, sailors, and marines. And I was a marine in World War I. I confess that. I am getting up in years. I am proud of having been a member of that organization. I have only one thing about which to boast in connection with my service in the war. I served for some 16 or 17 months. The only thing of which I can boast is that I never in that time suffered one single reduction in rank. I enlisted as a private and I was discharged in the same rank.

The question is, Are we to permit these activities to continue without reproach and punishment?

With the increasing strength and arrogance of Communist power, we have noted the concurrently intensified efforts by their agents and sympathizers within this Nation, particularly in this period of crisis. It is apparent that there are substantial deficiencies in existing legislation controlling the giving of aid and assistance to the enemies of the United States and other activities hostile to our national security.

With regard to that I dispute the question as to whether or not the law of the land is adequate or whether or not the State laws, to which the gentleman from California referred, are adequate. I might say also that they have not been declared unconstitutional yet by the Supreme Court of the United States, but when they get through with the question, we may not have any law.

But be that as it may, I am somewhat in the position of the man who lost his very unpopular mother-in-law in California. Someone sent him a telegram that said, "Your mother-in-law is dead. How shall we dispose of the body? Shall we embalm her, cremate her, or bury her?"

The man wired back and said, "Take no chances. Do all three."

That is the way I feel about this bill.

It is a melancholy fact that in the face of constitutional action taken by our Government to secure the safety and liberty of our people, there are certain persons and organizations within our midst who are acting to defeat the Government of the United States and our Armed Forces in the execution of their duties.

Secretary of State Rusk recognizes the danger of what is involved. I want to say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that I am not known as a supporter of the present administration. I have opposed measures of the present administration as much as any man in this body, regardless of whether he is a Republican or a Democrat. But I can say this. I do not know whether we ought to be in Vietnam or not. I am no student of international law. But I know we are there, and I believe we are there in accordance with the laws of this country. But whether we are or not, I think it is our duty as American citizens to support the President of the United States in his endeavors in regard to our safety in Vietnam and to support our soldiers, sailors, and marines as long as they are there and as long as the American flag is there.

Our Government and our soldiers are fulfilling their duties in the defense of the United States. It behooves us to stand by them.

In resisting aggression, our Armed Forces have been employed at great sacrifice. Upon their success depends all we hold dear in life.

We as members of the Committee on Un-American Activities have taken a lot of punishment. I never sought membership on the committee. So far as I know, no other one did. We vary in our views. It is a nonpartisan committee. But one thing we agreed wholeheartedly on was this bill.

I know the Washington Post has referred to us as "buffoons." Some of us may be buffoons. Probably I fall in that class, but I do say that some of the members of the committee, at least, are very distinguished and eminent members of of the bar of this country who enjoy an unusually high degree of confidence and esteem both of the judiciary and of the bar.

Whether or not we are in those categories, we are all patriotic American citizens; and we stood together and reported this bill unanimously.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, but it is my opinion that the bill does not go far enough. Last year and again in the early part of this year, I was privileged to visit in Vietnam and other parts of southeast Asia. Wherever I went, I invariably heard remarks by our officials that the demonstrations in this country were very definitely hurting our cause in southeast Asia.

Immediately upon return from my second trip, I introduced H.R. 12775 and House Joint Resolution 833, copies of which I wish to insert at this point as well as a copy of a news release I made upon the introduction of the bills. I wish to repeat that I will support this bill, but again do not believe it goes quite far enough.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE (D-Tex.) introduced in the House of Representatives today a bill and a constitutional amendment to prohibit certain public activities in time of armed conflict.

"Under legal authorities a state of war is a question of law rather than fact," TEAGUE said, "and it is my purpose to provide the same protection to our government and armed forces while engaged in armed conflict, which I consider to be a factual state of war, as they now have if engaged in a legal state of war."

The bill provides a $10,000 fine, 10 years imprisonment, or both, for any person who, without authority of the United States during a period of war or armed conflict, knowingly contributes, solicits, collects, or disburses money or anything of value directly or indirectly for the enemies of the United States. This provision of the bill would prohibit activities such as those recently engaged in by a group of individuals in Berkeley, California, who call themselves the Medical Aid Committee for Vietnam. "I am advised that under existing law there is no provision which directly prohibits such assistance to the communist forces with whom we are, in fact, at war," TEAGUE said.

The bill also makes it unlawful to make public speeches and lectures or to publicly picket, parade, rally or similarly demonstrate against any lawful measure of the United States related to the conduct of such armed conflict if such activities give aid or encouragement to the enemies of the United States and if they are done with intent to interfere with the successful prosecution by the United States of any armed conflict in which it is engaged.

"I am sure there will be some who consider this provision of the bill to be a violation of the first amendment of the constitution," TEAGUE stated, "but it should be noted that these public speeches and demonstrations are prohibited only if they give aid or encouragement to the enemies of the United States and if they are done with intent in interfere with the successful prosecution of the armed conflict."

"The freedom to dissent can be destroyed by its abuse because that freedom is dependent upon the survival of our government. If our government is to survive, it must be permitted to protect itself against those who give aid or encouragement to enemies who seek to destroy us," TEAGUE stated.

"If any part of the bill I have introduced is in conflict with the constitution, then I think the constitution should be amended to give Congress the power to protect our government against the activities of those who seek to aid our enemies. I think we should legislate now to curb certain current activities. The power of the Congress during a time of declared war appears to be adequate but, in my judgment, it is unlikely that the United States will ever again be in a declared war. The Korean conflict was not a declared war and so far the conflict in Vietnam is not a declared war. There will probably never be a declaration of war in any so-called 'brush fire' type of war and certainly an all-out nuclear war would be over before Congress could act. In my judgment it is therefore necessary to make such statutory or constitutional changes as are necessary to permit our country to survive under present-day conditions.

"For these reasons I have also introduced a constitutional amendment, the provisions of which would be applicable only during a period when the United States is at war or engaged in armed conflict. This amendment would make it unlawful to give aid or encouragement to enemies of the United States during such a period by opposing any lawful measure or policy of the United States related to the conduct of the war or armed conflict by public demonstrations, public writings, public speeches, or other means. This constitutional amendment, if adopted, would be enforceable only as provided by the Congress through appropriate legislation.

"We now use the police power of the state to draft young men into the armed forces where they are required to risk their lives in the pursuit of policies which our constitutionally-established government has adopted. When these young men are inducted into the armed forces they forfeit many of their constitutional rights and I think it is not only proper—BUT NECESSARY—that we restrain the beatnik types and the pseudo-intellectuals who insist that the constitution permits them to give aid and encouragement to our enemies and thereby further endanger the lives of those who are called upon to sacrifice so much for the nation."

H.R. 12775

A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit certain activities in time of war or armed conflict

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 115 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2392. Activities prohibited during war or armed conflict

"Whoever, during any period when the United States is at war or engaged in armed conflict, without authority of the United States, knowingly contributes, solicits, collects, or disburses money or anything of value, directly or indirectly, for the enemies of the United States; or

"Whoever, with intent to interfere with the successful prosecution by the United States of a declared war or of any armed conflict in which the United States is engaged, shall give aid or encouragement to the enemies of the United States by opposing any lawful measure or policy of the United States related to the conduct of such war or armed conflict by public speeches, lectures, or other public utterances, by written or printed matter displayed or otherwise disseminated to the public, or by public picketing, parades, rallies, or similar public demonstrations—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both."

(b) The analysis of chapter 115 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2392. Activities prohibited during war or armed conflict."

H.J. Res. 833

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that certain activities shall be prohibited during a period of war or armed conflict

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress:

"Article —

"Section 1. During any period when the United States is at war or engaged in armed conflict, it shall be unlawful to give aid or encouragement to the enemies of the United States by opposing any lawful measure or policy of the United States related to the conduct of such war or armed conflict through public demonstrations, public writings, public speeches, or by any other means.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 12047. I do so for several reasons. First, this bill is unnecessary; second, in spite of its purpose, which is to protect the national security, it may, if enacted into law, have consequences harmful to our policy objectives in Vietnam and elsewhere; third, it poses a threat to basic constitutional rights; and, fourth, its enactment would tend to aggravate an atmosphere of suspicion and hate in this country which is already present to a regrettable degree.

I do not base my opposition to this bill on the character of the hearings in regard to it that were held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. I have spoken of these hearings before. At this time I will say only that these hearings provided undeserved national publicity for the witnesses and their far-out supporters.

NO NEED

The various Departments of the executive branch, including the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Department of Justice are agreed that H.R. 12047 is unnecessary. Their views are set forth in the various communications reprinted in the committee report.

Section 402 of the bill, under the heading "Assistance to hostile forces," provides for a fine of up to $20,000 or imprisonment of up to 20 years, or both, for a person who seeks to send money or any commodity to any group or member of a group "engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States." The committee report makes clear that this is aimed at those who have sent or attempted to send money and medical aid to North Vietnam and the Vietcong, but the specific cases of such assistance referred to involved quantities of no significance whatever. The payments made to the "Liberation Red Cross" were obviously of symbolic, rather than real, importance. Certainly, they could have had no perceptible effect on the war effort of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese.

The other operative section of the bill, section 403, provides heavy penalties for interfering or attempting to interfere with the movement of U.S. Armed Forces or supplies for the Armed Forces. The only incidents cited in the report to justify a need for new Federal legislation are a few demonstrations in Berkeley, Calif., about a year ago and an abortive attempt to stop munitions trucks in Port Chicago 2 months ago. The Berkeley demonstrations were all handled adequately by local officials and fall within the criminal laws of State government. There were 5 days on which attempts were made in the northern California area to interfere with troop trains and on only one of them did the demonstrators actually come close to stopping a train even for a moment. In the Port Chicago incident, the committee report notes that a few marines were able to prevent any interference with the movement of trucks.

It seems clear to me that Federal legislation is totally unnecessary to deal with such offenses if they are isolated. If they are more than that, the Deputy Attorney General of the United States has indicated that existing Federal laws dealing with conspiracy, treason, sedition, and subversive activity are adequate. Similar views have been expressed by the Defense Department.

HARMFUL AND OTHER UNINTENDED EFFECTS

Representatives of the executive branch have indicated that a rigid ban on sending of supplies to North Vietnam might interfere with our efforts to help American military personnel who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

In my view there is an even broader area in which passage of H.R. 12047 would be harmful to our national interests: it would give an entirely false impression to Hanoi and the Vietcong of the size and significance of the efforts being made in this country to send assistance to North Vietnam and to interfere with U.S. troop movements. If new legislation is needed to cope with these problems, Hanoi and the Vietcong might well reason, then they must be pretty extensive. Such a conclusion would only strengthen the stubborn refusal of Hanoi to respond in any constructive way to the President's efforts to get negotiations started.

Still another effect of this legislation, if enacted, would probably be to stimulate, rather than deter, the kinds of activities sought to be penalized. The reason for this is that those at whom the bill is aimed may welcome the chance at conspicuous martydom that prosecution under the provisions of the act would offer. The inevitable publicity attendant upon such prosecutions would, once again, focus national attention on an isolated, beleaguered and unimportant collection of generally antisocial people.

Finally, if this bill is enacted into law, it may rise to haunt some of those who now support it. The day may well come when they will be the ones who strenuously oppose an armed conflict that the United States is engaged in. For example, the bill would clearly apply to a situation such as prevailed in the Congo in the early 1960's when U.S. planes were ferrying United Nations forces and were being shot at by hostile elements in the Congo. If the bill had been law at that time, any person seeking to assist the forces of Moise Tshombe and Katanga would have been subject to the heavy penalties of this bill.

In this connection, it should be noted that, although the introductory paragraphs of the bill contain findings and a declaration with regard to the threat to the security of the United States posed by the world Communist movement, the operative paragraphs are not in any way

limited to conflicts in which Communists are involved.

As the American Civil Liberties Union points out in its memorandum in opposition to H.R. 12047, the provisions of section 402 could make it a crime to send newspapers and magazines to North Vietnam, even though such newspapers and magazines are generally available to the public. It could be argued that the sender would have reason to believe that such conduct would prejudice the interests of the United States if the newspapers or mazazines included stories indicating dissatisfaction in the United States with the war in Vietnam.

The American Civil Liberties Union and the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO point out that section 403 could be utilized to make it a criminal offense for any labor union to engage in a strike or a slowdown in the maritime or transportation industry.

CONTRIBUTION TO ATMOSPHERE OF HATRED

This bill represents, it seems to me, a kind of angry reaction to expressions of support by Americans for those who are fighting against our forces. The anger is understandable—indeed I share it—but it should not be allowed to give rise to unnecessary and probably harmful legislation.

This bill is not a practical answer to a practical problem; it is a symbolic answer to symbolic gestures. As such, it will do nothing to assuage the confusion and unhappy uncertainty that is so prevalent in this country on the subject of Vietnam; on the contrary, it will only stimulate and stir up the animosity and hatreds that already exist between the exponents of extreme views on this complex and difficult subject.

The proponents of this legislation insist that they are not trying to curtail or prohibit dissent. But the kinds of opposition and action which they are trying to prohibit are, in reality, only extreme expressions of such dissent.

In many areas of American life, we are seeing today a drastic departure from the traditional methods of the American system—discussion, debate, adjustment, and acceptance of the give-and-take of a representative democracy. A bill which could make a criminal of a Quaker who seeks to send medicine to a North Vietnamese child is, it seems to me, another expression of this trend away from our traditions of tolerance and kindness within the democratic process.

One final note: H.R. 12047 was carefully drafted to create an additional title in the Internal Security Act of 1950, so that it might be referred to and considered by the House Un-American Activities Committee. The provisions of law which are actually being amended, however, are the Trading With the Enemy Act and sections of the criminal code. Properly speaking, therefore, this legislation should have been considered by other committees of the House. Even though this bill is passed by the House, as it may well be, such an event will, in my judgment, in no way indicate the need for or desirability of the continued existence of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong opposition to H.R. 12047.

This bill is unnecessary. In the first place, there is a wide range of laws presently in existence which encompass the same areas covered by H.R. 12047. The Trading With the Enemy Act and the Export Control Act of 1949 are notable instances. Secondly, it presumes a threat which, in reality, does not exist. As Deputy Attorney General Clark said when he testified before the committee:

Isolated instances of vain acts by a handful of extremists to aid the enemy or obstruct our Armed Forces have failed. There has been no assistance from within the United States to hostile forces. There has been no interference with the free movement of military personnel or supplies. We should not lend credence to the possibility by again prohibiting what has not and what will not happen.

Moreover, ambiguity in the language of the bill leaves open the way to interpretations which would make acts of compassion and humanitarianism punishable by harsh fines and imprisonment.

But more serious, by making it a crime to solicit any money, property, thing, or supplies for the use of any foreign power or any residents or nationals thereof engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, the bill would, as Deputy Attorney Clark testified, "jeopardize fundamental rights of Americans by risking infringement of constitutional rights of free speech." The bill's terminology beclouds what should never be ambiguous; namely, the distinction between disloyalty and dissent.

To pass this bill would be equivalent to an endorsement of the hysterical atmosphere in which it was drafted. The committee had little cause to hold its hearings, and even less justification for drafting this bill. In attracting national attention, the committee invited vast exposure and publicity for a tiny and insignificant group of extremists, and, once again, raised the disturbing and unhappy specter of the McCarthy era.

Unnecessary and ambiguous legislation enacted in an artificially created atmosphere of hysteria does not reflect well on the House of Representatives. I strongly urge, therefore, that we join in defeating H.R. 12047.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, it is important, in our consideration of H.R. 12047, that we remain as objective and as dispassionate as possible. We must weigh the merits of the bill on their own, without being swayed by the influence of the most emotion-packed, riotous subcommittee hearings that most of us can remember. There is danger, I fear, that memories of the August hearings, marked by frequently violent differences between the subcommittee and the witnesses and their attorneys, will influence the House in making a decision it will regret.

In my opinion the measure before us is a poor piece of legislation. It should be voted down. It is a poor piece of legislation because it is superfluous. Ample testimony from expert witnesses from the executive branch of Government, considered after the hysterical shouting had stopped ringing through the halls of the Cannon Office Building, supports this conclusion.

I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, that the House will do what press reports have indicated it might do: pass H.R. 12047 and leave the responsibility for killing it to the other body. Let us assume that responsibility ourselves and save the other body the time and trouble.

The committee report on this bill states:

Existing law is clearly inadequate to provide an enforceable base for prosecuting the activities described above. Although the executive agencies have taken the position that there is no need for new legislation, they have in fact confessed their inability to prosecute, and when pressed have cited no statutes which would be clearly applicable or adequate to cover important aspects of the conduct involved.

My reading of the testimony leads me to quite the opposite conclusion.

Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, wrote:

In general, proposed section 402 of the bill would duplicate the scope and effect of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder.

Then, citing the Foreign Agents Registration Act, he added:

In view of the foregoing, we see no need for the provisions of proposed section 402 of the bill.

Finally, Mr. Clark had this to say about section 403:

In our view, present laws both Federal and State would seem to be adequate to protect society from any extreme effort at interference with the movement of military personel and property by severe penalties and from any minor interference by misdemeanor sanctions. Furthermore, such laws reflect a better balance in Federal-State relationships and do not inject the United States into law enforcement in what are essentially local activities, though they involve matters as to which the Federal Government has constitutional authority to act. In these circumstances we see no need for the provisions of proposed section 403 of the bill.

Fred B. Smith, General Counsel of the Treasury, wrote the committee regarding section 402, which would proscribe giving assistance to a nation with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict abroad:

If it is your committee's view that legislation to deal with this problem should be enacted, we believe a rigid ban such as that contained in H.R. 12047 would be undesirable, and that flexibility is essential. Under certain circumstances, it may be in the national interest to allow some solicitations for and indeed the actual sending of some types of supplies to hostile areas; for example, in connection with the Government's efforts to assist American military personnel who are prisoners of war in North Vietnam. A rigid ban could interfere with our efforts to help these American prisoners.

As for section 403, which would prohibit obstructions to the movement of military personnel or supplies, Mr. Smith said:

The only activity of which this Department is aware that has impeded the Coast Guard in the performance of its missions as an armed force concerns interference by

members of various organizations with launchings of naval vessels. In this regard, the Coast Guard has authority under the so-called Magnuson Act (50 U.S.C. 191 et seq.) to promulgate regulations establishing limited access areas in connection with the launchings of naval vessels.

Robert E. Giles, General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, said section 402 would overlap with present prohibitions imposed under authority of the Export Control Act on exports detrimental to the national security.

Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army, noted that there are several existing statutes such as those included in chapters 105 and 115 of title 18, United States Code, concerning sabotage, treason, sedition, and subversive activities, which have possible application to acts like those addressed by H.R. 12047.

All the above statements are contained in the committee report. Yet the committee reached different conclusions based on what I regard as far less substantial evidence.

In a statement to the subcommittee that conducted the boisterous hearings, Brig. Gen. William W. Berg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Military Personnel Policy, said:

We do not have any evidence available to us, or reports by commanders in the field, that indicate that the morale of our forces has been impaired by the demonstrations of dissent to United States policy, by the publicized assertions of intent to assist our adversaries, or by the gestures of impeding the military effort.

Perhaps the most eloquent witness was Ramsey Clark, Deputy Attorney General, who testified:

There is no need for new legislation because a panoply of laws, state and federal, presently protects the national interest. Moreover, however reprehensibly, indeed irrational, much of the conduct of those who endeavor to interfere with our efforts to protect world freedom in Viet Nam may be, it can hardly be considered a threat. Isolated instances of vain acts by a handful of extremists to aid the enemy or obstruct our Armed Forces have failed. There has been no assistance from within the United States to hostile forces. There has been no interference with the free movement of military personnel, or supplies. We should not lend credence to the possibility by again prohibiting what has not and will not happen.

Essentially, the Viet Nam obstructionist movement has been a propaganda effort. What we do to exaggerate its dimension, which is minuscule, only aids it in the accomplishment of its purposes. That such a tiny handful of people could secure so much atention in so vast a nation by what has largely been eccentric behavior, is in itself a cause for concern.

The committee report criticizes Mr. Clark's dismissal of the obstructionists as "eccentric." It continues:

The people of more than one nation have done so to their regret. If we are not prepared to suppress hostile activities in their infancy, we shall be faced with greater problems as they mature. If we value our liberties, as we do, we shall not permit any impairment of our national security while powerful forces, avowedly hostile to our society, are preparing to make us their victim.

Mr. Chairman, I think the statements of Mr. Clark and the other spokesmen for executive departments whom I have quoted from the committee report reflect admirably the levelheaded perspective that differs so sharply from the near-hysteria of the committee conclusion. I urge all Members of the House to join me in opposing this needless, ill-conceived bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, let us be perfectly frank and admit that a lot of us do not want to be misunderstood and therefore intend to support H.R. 12047, which would prohibit the solicitation, collection, and delivery of any money or property for use of any foreign power in armed conflict, and likewise, would prohibit obstruction of our military personnel and supplies, where the intent is to injure the United States.

The Justice Department opposed the bill on the basis that the law already covers such matters, and it is widely said that this legislation is for political purposes.

But what I want to know is, if the law prohibits these un-American acts, why has the Justice Department not done anything about it?

In my support of this bill today, frankly I know it is not going through the Senate. My vote will be an expression of personal feeling that next year the committee will come out with a much better bill—a bill that is clear and that will protect all citizens regardless of their views, under the first amendment of the Constitution.

In the last hours and final days of this 89th Congress, why is this legislation keeping us here at this late hour? It seems to me unfortunate that the Democratic leadership has scheduled this bill at all.

But I do not approve of the leftwing lunatic fringe and so, reluctantly, I will vote "aye" on final passage.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, under general leave to extend, granted yesterday, I wish to make further comments with reference to H.R. 12047, which would amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. I feel the House Committee on Un-American Activities has made a very real effort to deal with a highly emotional and serious problem. The hearings held by the committee on August 16, 17, 18, and 19 left something to be desired, but it does appear some legislation is necessary to protect members of the Armed Forces against intentional injury and that some legislation is necessary to penalize those who solicit, collect or deliver money, property, or any other thing of value to be used for the benefit of any foreign power involved in armed conflict with our country.

It seems certain this bill will not be acted upon by the Senate this year—and perhaps never. There is considerable speculation about bringing the bill to the House floor at this late date and also the real purpose of the hearings and the debate on the bill at this time.

There are inadequacies in existing law, but it is equally clear that enforcement of the proposed legislation will be a monumental task. Section 401 of the bill is clear and simply constitutes a finding by the Congress that additional legislation is needed. Section 402 is susceptible to many interpretations, but for the most part is clear and unequivocal and, I believe, necessary. Section 403, in my opinion, before the adoption of the amendment I submitted yesterday, was most ambiguous and much too broad in application. My amendment accepted by the committee sufficiently limits section 403. In its amended form, section 403 could serve some useful purpose. In its original form, section 403 would have vested in members of the Armed Forces unlimited power, whether or not our country was engaged in armed conflict or whether or not the activities of a member of the Armed Forces were in any way related to such armed conflict. The original section would have applied across the board, in peace, war, or armed conflict, and would have, in my opinion, vested far too much authority and power in the military.

If our country is engaged in armed conflict, then anyone who obstructs, impedes, or interferes with, or attempts to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the movement of any member or members of the Armed Forces while on active duty or with the loading or movement of any facility of transportation, or supplies and materiel, with intent to obstruct, impede, or interfere with our Government or any member of the Armed Forces, should be punished. Specifically, if the interference or obstruction or impediment relates to the armed conflict, in other words, movement of troops to a staging area, moving of supplies or materiel to ports for shipping to the area of hostilities or any other of literally hundreds of acts where there is some direct connection with the interference, obstruction, or impediment, and the armed conflict, then section 403 should apply.

On the other hand, the application of the original language contained in section 403 was limitless. Conceivably, it could have applied to any member of the Armed Forces, at any time, at any place, and would have, in my opinion, led to more abuse than any hoped-for benefit. It could have related to any activity involving Armed Forces or supplies not related to an armed conflict.

Members of the Armed Forces and the movement of supplies are entitled to protection, but again, in my opinion, there are adequate local laws to take care of any peacetime situation without setting up new, vast unlimited and unnecessary authority. The amendment I offered yesterday, which was accepted by the committee, is as follows:

Provided, That nothing contained in this section shall apply unless the United States shall be engaged in armed conflict and unless the acts referred to herein are related to such armed conflict.

This amendment will properly limit the application of section 403 but still serve the real purpose intended by the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate my opposition to H.R. 12047, a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950. Able and distinguished Members on both sides of the aisle, far more competent than I, have risen to question the need for and the constitutionality of this proposed

legislation. The adverse testimony of every executive department witness has been cited. The comments of the Democratic and Republican leadership of the Senate to the effect that this bill would be doomed in that body, even if we were so ill advised as to pass it, have been reported. The adverse comments of distinguished attorneys and the editorial writers of the Nation's most respected newspapers are likewise in the record.

I can add little to these more able analyses. I can only say that I wish to associate myself with their remarks, and with their conclusions as to the complete undesirability of this bill, and the possible harm it will do.

I hope that this body will not succumb to the hysteria engendered by our unfortunate involvement in the tragic Vietnam war. Passage of this bill by this House, even though it never passes the Senate, would be one more small step toward extinguishing all dissent in this country toward the policies of an all-powerful Federal Government—a Government whose course is more and more determined by the executive branch, with little or no control or check by the Congress of the United States.

And as this great House of Representatives yields to hysteria, so will the mass of the people of this country yield, whipped into a frenzy by the voices of a false patriotism, overriding the bounds set by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution of the United States.

If this happens, we will then be set irrevocably on the course of all past empires, ruled by the laws of overwhelming power, and we must inevitably suffer their fate, to pass into history under the curse of all lesser peoples.

I seek a better fate for mankind. Let us turn back while there is yet time.

I urge all Members to vote against this bill.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us today. This bill emerges not from careful deliberation but from a mistaken notion that it is somehow essential to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. I do not regard this bill as necessary at all. It will not help the war effort. I think this bill is superfluous. It is totally unnecessary. Let us think this bill over. If we really want it, let us enact it next year. I think that if we put it off now, we will never enact it into law, because we will recognize—after a bit of reflection—that it is a bad bill.

Why do we need this bill? It is clear that there is ample legislation already in existence to handle the situations which, we are told, it is designed to correct. If the Government wanted, it could bring criminal action against anyone who violated this act under the longstanding Trading With the Enemy Act. There are other acts also on the books which could readily be applied. So it is not needed to cover the gaps which we have been told currently exist. There are no such gaps.

The administration has studied this bill carefully. Every department that has an interest has given testimony that there is no need for it. The Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, said:

> There is no need for new legislation, because a panoply of laws, state and federal, presently protects the national interest. Moreover, however reprehensible, indeed irrational, much of the conduct of those who endeavor to interfere with our efforts to protect world freedom in Vietnam may be, it can hardly be considered a threat.

I think Mr. Clark's testimony adequately makes the case.

There are many good reasons for voting against this bill, Mr. Chairman. It is carelessly drawn and could very well become the vehicle for political persecution. It uses words which threaten the constitutional guarantees of free speech. It is vague, although I concede that in its present form it is an improvement over the form in which it was introduced. But since it serves no purpose and since it does contain certain inherent dangers, I will vote against it and I urge all of my colleagues to join with me. In my view, the cause of Americanism will best be served by our rejecting this bill by a substantial margin.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the proposed amendment to the Internal Security Act for three basic reasons.

First. I am a member of the House Judiciary Committee and have been a practicing attorney for 36 years before coming to the Congress. It is my opinion that the proposed amendments require much more careful and objective consideration than that which was given to them by the committee which conducted the public hearings. I have read the hearings in detail and am convinced that the House Judiciary Committee would have been the proper forum for the public hearings and to have held executive sessions to study and review the language of the bill. The Judiciary Committee composed of 35 House Members, all lawyers, would have examined the questions involved in depth and with less public demonstration.

The distinguished minority leader of the Senate, the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN has stated:

> When you draft a criminal statute that applies to the whole country, the utmost caution has to be exercised. A criminal statute carries with it a penalty—a fine or prison sentence—and you don't lightly send a person to jail or fine him, you don't want a criminal statute to become a veritable dragnet. When you talk about rendering aid to an enemy, or some country with which we are at hostilities, you must exercise caution to make sure it's carefully defined. This is a job for lawyers, and it is necessary to take a good look before a jump into the dark.

I associate myself with these remarks and sentiments.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings surrounding this legislation were not conducted in the manner which Senator DIRKSEN suggests as desirable and that is one of the reasons why I oppose congressional approval of the bill.

Second. My opposition is based on the fact that I do not believe foreign policy can be written on the floor of the House of Representatives without hearings and complete consideration of the possible adverse effect the proposed legislation would have on our foreign relations. We saw during the debate the many questions which were raised and the numerous amendments offered to the bill, because of the vague language and lack of definitions.

Third. The Internal Security Act, the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Export Control Act, and other Federal statutes provide adequate protection to the security of the United States. Because of these existing laws we should not be rushing to pass a bill in such form. The bill has been criticized by the Acting Attorney General, by members of the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House, and by leading legal authorities.

The Deputy Attorney General, the Honorable Ramsey Clark, in his testimony before the House Un-American Activities Committee, stated that:

> There is no need for new legislation because a panoply of laws, state and federal, presently protect the national interest. Moreover, however reprehensible, indeed irrational, much of the conduct of those who endeavor to interfere with our efforts to protect world freedom in Vietnam may be, it can hardly be considered a threat.

Let me make it quite clear that I will vote against this bill with the full knowledge that some may say it was not "good politics."

To this I can only answer that I studied the bill and the hearings and follow my conscience on this matter. Let me also make it clear that I do not condone those who would aid the enemy in North Vietnam, but I agree with Senator DIRKSEN that "it is necessary to take a good look before a jump into the dark."

The Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Commerce also oppose the legislation.

The Treasury Department recently granted permission to a group of Yale University religious leaders to send $300 worth of medical supplies to North Vietnam via Canada in the hope that the Canadian committee handling the supplies could get them to the U.S. prisoners. Section 402 of the bill may deprive U.S. prisoners of war of badly needed medical supplies, thereby raising serious constitutional questions, this bill would seek to end the flexibility which the executive branch of the Government should have.

The statement by Msgr. Charles Owen Rice which appeared in the Pittsburgh Catholic, August 25, 1966, is worthy comment on the subject and I want to call it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Pittsburgh Catholic, Aug. 26, 1966]

UN-AMERICAN

(By Msgr. Charles Owen Rice)

Supposedly it exists to uncover facts that might guide the House of Representatives in enacting legislation. Actually, its time-honored function is to harry suspected radicals and subversives. It bears a charmed life because it is "patriotic."

Martin Dies, a Texas congresssman, was its first chairman, and for years, it was known as the Dies Committee, but now it gets its formal name, the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Another Texan, JOE R.

POOL, is today its happy, headline-making ring master.

JOE—I am not being unduly familiar, JOE is his name, not Joseph—JOE, white-haired, portly, anguished, indignant and patriotic, has been locked in televised combat with a prime mixture of oddities, idealists, headline-hunters of the left, and patriots of the left.

A few of these have engaged in un-American activities by anybody's definition, including their own, but hardly anyone would have heard of them, if Congressman POOL had not dredged them up and given them precious exposure on TV and the front page.

The pure patriots, right, left, or center, get small attention during these circuses. The extremists love HUAC although only the right-wingers among them admit it.

It suits the promoters of the ultra right that currency be given to the strongest and wildest statements and postures of the far left. They have a fine recruiting pitch as they declare: "We told you that such things went on. Our youth are being subverted and debauched, and you do nothing. Join your local chapter of "Nuts and Riflemen for Defense" and save your country."

On the other hand the deadly serious ones of the left are also assisted in their recruiting efforts by the unfriendly publicity itself, although many of their idealists are sincerely outraged by the illegality and anti-Americanism of the whole HUAC process. It must be admitted, however, that among the victims of HUAC are those who get a lift out of the virtually painless, for them, martyrdom of being heaved out of the committee room.

Do not think for a moment that the committee is harmless merely because it misses the mark so often and is intellectually unspeakable. It has power and sharp teeth. It damages good people and good causes, and is a constant threat to the dignity and freedom of those who dare to dissent.

The excuse for last week's hearing was a package of legislation designed to suppress agitation against the fighting in Vietnam. The legislation is two-pronged. One prong, for those who would aid the enemy; another for those who hold back our military or military supplies.

Since we are not at war it was hard to define the enemy, so the definition was made very broad, any country, group or person, "in hostile opposition to the armed forces of the United States." You could break that law by giving a glass of water to a rioter or by sending a food package to a starving family. You would not even have to give the aid, just advise someone else to do it. For many reasons that stringent statute appears to be certainly unconstitutional, and the committee was harassing citizens in order to promote a law that it had no business dealing with. That is part of the reason Judge Corcoran issued his short-lived injunction against the hearings.

No one alleges that any significant material aid is being given to the enemy, but the committee, and many citizens, are outraged that anyone at all would so much as contemplate helping the Vietcong or the residents of North Vietnam. No American, they feel, should want to feed, to heal, or to soothe the population which our military are trying to bomb into submission in an undeclared war. Dissent is being made equal to disloyalty.

We already have legislation to deal with those who would truly aid a real enemy, and the proposal is not only bad but unnecessary.

The second prong, which would prevent interference with materiel destined for military use, could turn out to be the worse of the two. It makes military goods virtually sacred.

If that should become law it would hit idealistic pacifist groups of the sort that are encamped near the nuclear submarine base in Groton and of the sort that will strongly protest any resumption of nuclear testing. These idealistic souls do not really interfere with the movement of men and materiel but they do annoy as they offer their tokens of dissent. It would be shameful to treat them as criminals, but they would be criminals if HUAC had its way.

There is another class of people who do interfere with the movement and manufacture of goods, and who would be hit by the legislation, although it is not aimed at them. When unions strike, their intention is to halt manufacture and movement of goods until the strike is settled. Military materiel travels on every road and railroad and is being processed in half the factories of the United State. JOE R. POOL has chanced upon a strike-breaking law of tremendous potential. What irony if it passes! The trade union establishment has never been more warlike and less pacifistic than it is now, but who cares? The labor lobby had better get busy.

The House Un-American Activities Committee functions not as a legislative instrument, but as the voice of a muddled and angry segment of the citizenry. Let them find their emotional outlet somewhere else, and let us rescue the legislative process from further degradation by ending an ignoble experiment in un-Americanism.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is an excursion in futility, a fact that is known to everyone on this floor, and with no effort to keep it secret. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], and others have stated in the debate with no denial from any quarter, that there is no intention of pushing the bill to a vote in the other body. The 89th Congress is about to die.

If there were any serious thought of this bill becoming a law I am sure there would have been greater care in its drafting. I know of no better lawyer, and certainly no finer gentleman than our able colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. TUCK], who will go down in history as one of the outstanding Governors in the long and brilliant story of Virginia. I regard the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD], a former speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, as a lawyer of the finest capacity, with a penetrating legal mind. There are others on the committee who could be depended upon to oversee a better job of legislative drafting if the product they were working on had any serious ambition of making the statute books.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, it is ever the part of wisdom, certainly not in the role of a statesman, to flirt with futility.

As I read the bill we have before us it could be interpreted to forbid the extension of medical aid through the International Red Cross to American prisoners of war. I would not want that on my conscience. It surely would make it a felony to give medicine to a dying enemy—and I do not know if any of us would want to go that far. After all, we do have some reservations.

The office of the Attorney General of the United States has assured us that our national security requires no further penal enactments to meet every demand of the present situation.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

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 the Internal Security Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE IV—OBSTRUCTION OF ARMED FORCES

"Findings of fact

"SEC. 401. The Congress of the United States hereby finds and declares that—

"(1) There exists a world Communist movement having as its objective the destruction of free governments, including the Government of the United States.

"(2) The security of the United States is seriously threatened by the aggressions of Communist powers, groups and organizations.

"(3) The conduct of wars by such powers, groups and organizations has taken unconventional forms, in that armed hostilities are undertaken and initiated by them without prior declaration or such formalities as are recognized in international law as constituting a legal or political status of war.

"(4) The fact and consequences of such unconventional warfare constitute a present and long-range threat to the safety and security of the United States, and if not successfully resisted threaten total involvement of the United States and the world.

"(5) In defense of its national security and in the interest of world peace, the United States has been compelled on several occasions to engage in actual war, although of limited scope and sometimes designated as police actions, to insure its safety and to prevent full-scale international war.

"(6) There exist in the United States certain organizations, groups, and persons who adhere to the purposes and objectives of the world Communist movement, who seek to give aid, assistance, and comfort to forces hostile to the Government of the United States, and enlist others in support of the purposes and objectives of the world Communist movement, with the intent to obstruct and defeat the defense activities of the United States.

"(7) There also exist within the world other powers or forces which, although not identified as Communist, have committed or threatened aggressions, involving the interests and security of the United States and the stability of world peace.

"Assistance to hostile forces

"SEC. 402. (a) Whoever, within the United States or elsewhere, owing allegiance to or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, whenever any element of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be engaged in hostilities armed conflict abroad—

"(1) gives, or attempts to give, or advises, counsels, urges, or solicits another to give or deliver, any money, property, or thing, or

"(2) solicits, collects, receives, or gives to another, any money, property, or thing for delivery, or

"(3) solicits, collects, receives, or gives to another any money or thing of value for the purchase or acquisition of any property, supplies, or thing, intended for delivery,

to any hostile foreign power, or agency or national thereof or to any organization, group, or person, acting in hostile opposition to the Armed Forces of the United States with the intent, or having reason to believe, that such conduct will impede or interfere with the operation or success of the Armed Forces of the United States, or in any manner prejudice the interests of the United States, or advantage such foreign power, agency, national, organization, group, or person shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned for not more than twenty years, or both.

"Obstructing military personnel or transportation

"SEC. 403. Whoever, within the United States or elsewhere, owing allegiance to the United States, obstructs, impedes, or interferes with, or attempts to obstruct, impede, or interfere with, or advises, counsels, urges, or solicits another to obstruct, impede or interfere with—

"(1) the free movement on foot, or otherwise, of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States while on duty, or

"(2) the loading, provisioning, manning, operation, movement or passage of any facility of transportation being used, or intended to be used, in whole or in part for the transportation of personnel, supplies or materiel of such Armed Forces,

with the intent to obstruct, impede, or interfere with the United States, or any member of the Armed Forces, in preparing for, or carrying on, any military duty or activity, shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both."

Mr. POOL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD, and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 10, strike out "(a)"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 11, immediately after "owing allegiance to", insert "or subject to the jurisdiction of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 13, strike out "hostilities" and insert in lieu thereof "armed conflict".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, strike out lines 15 through 17, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) gives or delivers, or attempts to give or deliver, any money, property, or thing, or

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, beginning in line 1, strike out "to any hostile foreign power, or agency or national thereof, or to any organization, group, or person, acting in hostile opposition to the Armed Forces of the United States" and insert in lieu thereof—"to or for the use of any foreign power, organization, or group engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States, or to or for the use of any resident, national, member, or agent thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, beginning in line 11, strike out "agency, national, organization, group, or person" and insert in lieu thereof "organization, group, resident, national, member, or agent".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, line 19, immediately after "owing allegiance to", insert "or subject to the jurisdiction of".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, beginning in line 21, strike out "or interfere with, or advises, counsels, urges, or solicits another to obstruct, impede,".

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I feel this is one of the most important pieces of language that we had in the original bill as introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL]. If the committee amendment prevails and we strike out this language, in essence what we are doing is virtually to punish the young person and to let the real culprit go free.

In my judgment, the one who gets up and encourages and solicits and gets another to go out and impede the movement of materiel or men of the Armed Forces is just as guilty as the person who actually chains himself to the truck or lies down in front of a railway train or a truck.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want us to make a mistake here. We are aware of the modus operandi of the Communists. They do not get out in front. They capitalize on the idealistic thinking of young people and those who might not perhaps be as realistic in facing up to the facts of life. If we strike this language out, we are going to say "Go ahead" to the hardened Communists and those who would capitalize on young people, "and you will go scot free. You will sit beside a troop train and tell the youngsters to go ahead and get on the tracks and get under the wheels and the Government can do nothing with you. If you are standing there urging these young people to commit these acts which will be punishable by severe fines under the terms of this bill, we will not be able to touch you."

I may say to my dear and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], I know he had in mind exactly what I am speaking of right now when he proposed this language initially and wanted to subject the coconspirator, the hardened person, the adult, and the Communist who will go out and try to encourage young people to impede the movement of materiel and armed forces—he wanted them to be punished equally with those who actually commit the act. There are some who would say, "I know that, but one who sits on the sideline is just engaging in free speech, and should this amendment not be adopted, we are going to strike at the very freedom of speech or expression or dissent which we have in this country." I believe in freedom of speech, as I stated earlier during the general debate on this matter, but I submit that if we knock this language out of the bill, we are going to say not only do you have freedom of speech, but we are going to say that you can stand here and tell the young person and the person who is idealistic and a thinker and a naive person to get down and actually commit the act and you will be able to sit back and laugh and then move over to the next group of people and tell them to do the very same thing. If we mean business here, we are going to get the hardened criminals as well as the Communist-front movement. I submit here in this House that we should go along with the original intent of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL], which I know he had in the language in the bill and apply the same penalties and provisions to the Stokely Carmichaels and the Otepkas or any of the rest of them who will get out and convince these young people and encourage them to get under the front of a troop train or anything such as that.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I oppose the amendment and hope that the Committee will refuse to go along with the suggestion in this committee amendment.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as the author of the amendment in the committee which strikes all language referring to advising, counseling, and urging, I rise to defend the committee amendment. I do agree with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] that this language would probably be constitutional. However, here we are in a so-called gray area. There is some doubt as to whether this language would be constitutional. I strongly feel, in view of the many decisions that have been handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court, that the present court would hold such language to be unconstitutional.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will my dear friend yield to me at this point?

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. I am inclined to agree with my dear friend that perhaps in the present frame of mind the Supreme Court would probably declare this language to be unconstitutional. However, we can take care of that possibility or eventuality by simply putting at the end of the bill a saving procedure that should any part of this measure be declared unconstitutional, it will not affect the validity of any other.

And, so, I should like to see you now do the entire job and not be fearful of the fact that the Supreme Court might declare this section unconstitutional.

Mr. Chairman, we have a responsibility, and that is why I am urging that we go ahead and face our responsibility.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman from South Carolina that the regulations of the Commerce Department and the regulations under the Export Control Act do have language similar to the language that has been stricken.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, one cannot do in a regulation what one could not do in a statute.

For example, Mr. Chairman, on page 1303 of the hearings, I pointed out to Mr. Meyer, the representative of the Department of Commerce, that the Commerce regulation contains the following language:

> No person may knowingly cause, or aid, abet, counsel, command, induce, procure or permit the doing of any act prohibited by, or the omission of any act required by the Export Control law or any proclamation, order, rule, regulation, or license issued thereunder.

I say, again, Mr. Chairman, certainly we cannot do this by regulation if we cannot do it by statute.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] withdraw his opposition to this amendment, because the gentleman does admit that we are working in the so-called gray area here. And I feel that we should restrict the application of this act to overt acts, with the specific intention of aiding, and abetting an enemy of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ICHORD. As we have the bill now drawn, with the committee amendment, a person has to have the specific intent, and he has to commit an overt act.

I now yield further to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, may I say that there is no one in this body for whom I have a higher regard and with whom I prefer to deal than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

But, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly about this, and I want to make it emphatically clear that I believe the gentleman's feeling is just as strong as mine——

Mr. ICHORD. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. That the gentleman wants to get the coconspirators as well as the one who actually commits the acts. We want to get the ones who urge the youngsters to commit the act as well as the youngster who actually performs the act.

And, Mr. Chairman, I shall not withdraw my objection to this committee amendment.

I hope we will have a division vote on this question.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that we have a responsibility to legislate in accordance with what we feel is right and constitutional. I feel that this language is constitutional, and I shall not back away from it simply because I feel the Supreme Court might decide that it is unconstitutional.

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

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I am in wholehearted sympathy with what the gentleman from South Carolina is attempting to do. But, is it not true that the general statute relating to conspiracy—aiding and abetting a conspiracy—anyone who would intentionally violate this proposed act will be covered under the conspiracy statute?

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman from Florida is correct.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amendment proposes to strike certain words which include the word "solicit" in section 403.

However, in section 402, we have the word "solicit" remaining at least in two places—lines 20 and 22.

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the gentleman from Missouri might enlighten us as to the intent of the committee in the use of the word "solicit" in section 402, when it has very properly offered an amendment to strike it in section 403?

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

Mr. MATHIAS. Certainly. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland that the amendment was offered for the purpose of prohibiting the actual solicitation of funds for the use of the Vietcong or the North Vietnamese, which has happened many times within our own United States. Certainly if a person, with the committee amendment, if it is adopted, if he states "I think that you should give $10 for the use of the Vietcong," that would not be a solicitation. But if I came to you and stated "I am collecting money for the use of the Vietcong, will you give me $10?" that would constitute a solicitation.

Mr. MATHIAS. What the gentleman is saying is that the verb "to solicit" as used in section 402 is in the sense of actively raising money?

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct.

Mr. MATHIAS. And not solicitation in the sense of merely advocating or expressing or uttering or that kind of thing?

Mr. ICHORD. That is correct, if the amendment is adopted.

Of course, the gentleman from South Carolina is against the adoption of this committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WATSON) there were—ayes 45, noes 39.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. POOL and Mr. WATSON.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 27.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 5, beginning in line 11, strike out "$20,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years" and insert in lieu thereof $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. POOL: On page 5, line 13, immediately before the quotation marks insert the following: "The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any labor dispute (within the meaning of that term as used in the Act of March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C. ch. 6))."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] is recognized.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was drawn by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and in his absence I have offered the amendment for him. I agree with the amendment and I have taken it up with members of the committee and understand that the minority side also agrees; is that correct?

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

Mr. POOL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe that the legislative record has made it abundantly clear that this amendment is not necessary. But to be sure even beyond what may be necessary, I am willing to go along with the amendment and we have no objection on this side.

Mr. POOL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the committee a few questions with regard to this particular amendment.

As I understand it, the amendment is to protect members of organized labor who may be striking in a defense plant or who may be picketing a truck company or any other mode of transportation that is transporting material for the armed services against the penalties enumerated in this act.

May I have the response of the committee chairman to that question?

Mr. POOL. In this act we provide that "whoever obstructs, impedes, or interferes with, or attempts to obstruct, impede, or interfere with—"

They shall be covered by this act.

A labor dispute would not come under that and that is why I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The language of the amendment would appear on page 5, line 13, before the quotation marks; is that true?

Mr. POOL. The gentleman is correct, yes. This additional language would be inserted in the bill on page 5, line 13, after the penalty provision.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Then it applies to a section which does not contain the element of intent; is that not correct?

Mr. POOL. On line 8 the language appears "with the intent to obstruct, impede or interfere with the United States," and a labor dispute would not have that purpose. This is the way I look at it. I did not offer the amendment. It is the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT]. I offered it for him as a courtesy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand. Then any labor union, whether it is dominated by Communists or not—and some of them we know, as the record shows, have been dominated by Communists—can obstruct the flow of goods to our Armed Forces in Vietnam without penalties and, on the other hand, some poor, benighted, half-witted person could lie down in front of a truck, be removed, and, as the committee report shows, he would be subject to a fine of not more than $10,000 or not more than 5 years. Is that correct?

Mr. POOL. I want to make it clear that in accepting the amendment it is my understanding that it is not designed to protect from prosecution a Communist-led trade union, or any Communist trade union leader, who might deliberately call a strike to obstruct the flow of goods in an undeclared war or sabotage a military operation of this country or aid the enemy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The language of the gentleman's amendment does not contain the language which the gentleman has just now enunciated.

Mr. POOL. It certainly does. This language is a provision of that section:

> This section shall not be applicable to any labor dispute within the meaning of that term as used in the Act of March 1932.

As I interpret that act, it does not mean with intent to impede or interfere with the flow of goods.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But the union does intend to obstruct the flow of goods if it pickets.

Mr. POOL. I am glad you gave me this opportunity to read this legislative intent.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to have the legislation that this refers to read also, as there is nothing available to me.

Mr. POOL. Are you opposing the amendment?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am trying to clarify the language to find what the gentleman means.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I would point out to the gentleman from California that section 402 as presently drafted is a specific-intent crime; that is, the person has to first, give, deliver, or attempt to give or deliver; second, solicit——

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. If I may continue to make the necessary legislative history, the person would have to commit these overt acts with the specific intent, as shown on page 4, that such conduct will impede or interfere with the operation or success of the Armed Forces of the United States, or in a manner that will prejudice the interests of the United States or advantage such foreign power or organization, group, resident, national member or agent.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is reading the language of section 402 and he is not reading the language of section 403, because the language is completely different. Line 9 of page 5 states: "any member of the Armed Forces, in preparing for, or carrying on any military duty or activity," whether it is peacetime or engaged in armed conflict. Therefore, the language does not apply to those people engaged only in armed conflict.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Recently the machinists of the airlines struck in order to obtain certain advantages in working conditions and salary. They intended, in order to carry out their purposes, that the planes should not fly, planes that were carrying members of the Armed Forces and materiel bound for southeast Asia. Would this act be applicable to that kind of strike?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. YATES. Can we get an answer to that question from the committee?

Mr. ICHORD. I would state to the gentleman from Illinois that it is not the intent of the members of the committee to have this apply to labor disputes. Personally, I do not believe that the amendment is necessary. I do not believe that the language of section 403 as contained in the bill would cover bona fide labor disputes. The gentleman wanted to make certain that labor disputes were not covered, so the gentleman from Texas agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that I believe the section 1 is correctly drawn and I can support that with good grace and with good conscience. But I also say that section 403 is so ambiguous and covers such a wide territory that it goes far beyond military service in armed conflict and goes to any duty performed by a military person or unit in the United States. It strengthens the military power in the United States over and above civilian powers. It gives them protection against civilian powers, which civilian powers now have, in cases where military superior officers are not present to control actions of a member of the military. It provides penalties for such civilian exercise of legitimate authority; and, so far as I am concerned, unless section 403 is stricken or greatly improved in its nature, I shall vote against the bill.

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

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

Mr. CONTE. I want to compliment the gentleman. I asked questions during general debate on this very point. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. If this is not changed, I fear I shall have to vote against the bill, also.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe that section 1 is acceptable, and I am willing to support it. But this is so poorly drafted and it will do so many things that we do not want to do and the committee does not intend to do that I shall support, if offered, a motion to strike that section; and if stricken I shall then vote for the bill. If it is not stricken or is not amended properly, I shall vote against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: Immediately after the final section add the following and number it accordingly: "Nothing herein contained shall pertain to or provide a penalty for any action carried out pursuant to the order or directive of the President of the United States of America."

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I asked the chairman before where in this act there was any provision that would allow the President of the United States to allow drugs, let us say, shipped to North Vietnam in exchange for American prisoners.

I am sorry to say that I got no answer whatsoever. I would say to you that this bill may be setting a record because it is the shortest bill generating the most confusion than anything I have ever seen in my life.

We have heard a lot of concern expressed here—and it was expressed very sincerely—for our servicemen in Vietnam. Yet we have servicemen in prison in North Vietnam, and they can be kept there indefinitely in despair unless we make some kind of an arrangement to get them back. I do not want us to tie the hands of the President of the United States. We did not do it to John F. Kennedy when he wanted to negotiate for the return of Cuban nationals. Yet we are tying the hands of the President so that he cannot negotiate to return own own boys from North Vietnam. That is a pretty un-American contribution from the House Committee on Un-American Activities. We are turning our backs on them and saying that we cannot do anything to help them.

I would urge, not as a partisan matter or a sectional matter, but I would really urge and plead with the subcommittee chairman to accept this amendment.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I yield.

Mr. ICHORD. Personally I have no particular objection to the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey, but I really do not think it is necessary. The gentleman's amendment is applying to section 402.

Mr. JOELSON. It is applying to this act.

Mr. ICHORD. Again I would point out to the gentleman that there has to be specific intent to advantage such foreign power. Certainly in sending medical aid to our prisoners of war captured by the Vietnamese there cannot be that intent.

Mr. YATES. Are you sending it to North Vietnam?

Mr. JOELSON. That is right. We are sending it to North Vietnam.

Mr. YATES. In exchange?

Mr. JOELSON. And I say to you that we have heard before that if there is doubt, as to the need of this entire bill, we should resolve the doubt by passing it. Does not the same argument apply to my motion?

Mr. ICHORD. How would that be advantaging the North Vietnamese?

Mr. JOELSON. If there is any doubt, let us put it in. That is what we have been hearing all afternoon and all evening. So why take the chance? That is what we have been hearing all day.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POOL. There is nothing in this bill that prohibits the President from issuing any directive or order to that extent. So why have the amendment?

Mr. JOELSON. Because the bill says "whoever." "Whoever" gives anything to a foreign country engaged in hostilities with us is charged with the crime. It does not exempt the President or anybody acting under his orders. Again I urge the chairman to accept this amendment.

Mr. POOL. It is a needless amendment and, as far as I am concerned, I am opposed to it.

Mr. JOELSON. I guess that your opposition is just for the fun of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON]. It is a fine amendment, but it does not go far enough. As I recall it the Cuban arrangements of which he spoke were not conducted in accord with an order or a directive of the President of the United States. They were made by private citizens acting without any such order or directive. Even if his amendment is adopted, it would not cover that situation.

Mr. JOELSON. Will the gentleman yield for a second?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Very briefly.

Mr. JOELSON. The President could issue an order or directive authorizing it.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If you recall, that was something the President felt could not be done under such circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment very briefly on the hearings that led to this bill. I wish to state at the outset that I felt the witnesses who made such outrageous attempts to disrupt the hearings and their attorneys, who did everything they could to disrupt those hearings, should have been removed and should have been cited for disorderly conduct.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if these witnesses, or any of them, were the same persons or were associated with the same political organization as those witnesses who appeared during the committee's investigation of "Travel to Cuba?"

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they belonged to the progressive labor movement and that was the sponsoring movement behind the trips to Cuba. Castro provided the money to send the students down to Cuba and Castro entertained them and indoctrinated them in the Red Chinese philosophy of communism.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Let me ask this further question: Did they not in those hearings use exactly the same tactics that they so effectively used in trying to disrupt these hearings and in their effort to heap ridicule and contempt upon the Congress of the United States?

Mr. POOL. That is correct. However, we obtained more information from them the second time, in some respects, than we did upon their initial appearance.

Mr. Chairman, seven of them admitted that they were Communists, and they were in a sense helpful to the committee in its work.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear my contempt for these witnesses, people whom I consider to be a lunatic, left-wing fringe. At the same time, I have absolutely no sympathy with the decision to call these witnesses, in the full knowledge that they would not produce useful testimony, that they would use this hearing as an opportunity to make themselves appear to be a significant interest group in the United States, which they are not, and that they would use these hearings in an attempt to try to disrupt the business of the Congress and to heap ridicule and contempt upon the Congress of the United States, which is exactly what they did. Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee knew, or should have known, that that is what they would do, but the committee deliberately gave them that opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot approve of the committee's action in this regard.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes, I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that after that statement, I should make this statement: These witnesses were called in an effort to develop information about their activities with respect to raising money to send to the Vietcong and to the North Vietnamese—actions which were clearly material and pertinent to this bill, on which the hearings were held.

Also, this was done in our efforts to show that these people are a part of the "May 2 movement," a part of the "Progressive Labor movement," and by their own testimony that they are in fact a part of the Communist movement; to prove that as a matter of policy and subversive intent, the Communists were behind these demonstrations in the United States and their organized activities demonstrated a need for legislation.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, it is helpful, in considering this legislation to have knowledge of the facts produced through the committee's hearings.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I feel that we should have known that and that we should have been able to obtain that information from the cooperative witness, Mr. Luce, and from other cooperative witnesses called by the committee.

I do not believe you had any reason to expect useful information from the witnesses who deliberately disrupted the hearings.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

Mr. POOL. The record shows that we obtained useful information, information very helpful to the committee, and some of it came from some of these wild-eyed revolutionists.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I have examined the record and I do not agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 358]

Adair	Clausen, Don H.	Findley
Albert	Clevenger	Fino
Anderson, Ill.	Collier	Fisher
Anderson, Tenn.	Conyers	Flynt
Annunzio	Corman	Foley
Arends	Craley	Frelinghuysen
Ashley	Culver	Friedel
Ashmore	Curtin	Fulton, Tenn.
Aspinall	Curtis	Fuqua
Ayres	Dague	Garmatz
Baring	Davis, Ga.	Gathings
Barrett	de la Garza	Gibbons
Bates	Dent	Gilligan
Bell	Derwinski	Goodell
Bingham	Devine	Grabowski
Blatnik	Dickinson	Green, Oreg.
Boland	Diggs	Green, Pa.
Bolling	Dingell	Gross
Bolton	Dorn	Grover
Bow	Dow	Gubser
Brademas	Dowdy	Hagan, Ga.
Bray	Duncan, Oreg.	Hagen, Calif.
Brooks	Dwyer	Halleck
Broomfield	Dyal	Hanley
Brown, Calif.	Edmondson	Hanna
Burton, Utah	Edwards, Calif.	Hansen, Idaho
Callaway	Edwards, La.	Hansen, Wash.
Cameron	Evans, Colo.	Hardy
Carey	Everett	Harvey, Ind.
Carter	Evins, Tenn.	Hébert
Cederberg	Fallon	Herlong
Celler	Farbstein	Hicks
Clancy	Feighan	Holland
		Horton

Howard	Morris	Schneebeli
Hungate	Morrison	Scott
Huot	Moss	Shriver
Hutchinson	Multer	Sickles
Irwin	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Jarman	Murray	Stalbaum
Johnson, Okla.	Nelsen	Stanton
Johnson, Pa.	Nix	Steed
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien	Stephens
Jones, N.C.	O'Konski	Stratton
Karsten	Olsen, Mont.	Stubblefield
Karth	Olson, Minn.	Sweeney
Keith	Ottinger	Teague, Calif.
Kelly	Pickle	Thomas
Keogh	Pirnie	Thompson, N.J.
Kirwan	Poff	Thompson, Tex.
Kornegay	Powell	Thomson, Wis.
Kupferman	Price	Todd
Latta	Pucinski	Toll
Lennon	Purcell	Trimble
Long, La.	Quie	Tunney
Long, Md.	Quillen	Tupper
Love	Redlin	Tuten
McCarthy	Rees	Ullman
McDowell	Reid, Ill.	Utt
McMillan	Reinecke	Vigorito
McVicker	Resnick	Waggonner
Macdonald	Reuss	Walker, Miss.
Mackay	Rhodes, Ariz.	Walker, N. Mex.
Mackie	Rhodes, Pa.	Watkins
Martin, Ala.	Rivers, Alaska	Weltner
Martin, Mass.	Rivers, S.C.	White, Idaho
Martin, Nebr.	Robison	Whitten
Mathias	Rodino	Widnall
Matsunaga	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Mills	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Bob
Minish	Roncalio	Wolff
Minshall	Rosenthal	Wyatt
Mize	Rostenkowski	Wydler
Monagan	Roudebush	
Moore	Schmidhauser	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KING of Utah, the 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. 12047), and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 211 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time of the quorum call, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] had 2 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI].

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, at the time the quorum was called, we were discussing the meaning of lines 4 through 8 on page 3 of the bill.

Will the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] describe what he understands the meaning of that paragraph to be?

His explanation seemed to be directed to "other force or forces."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman at this time how the gentleman would define "other powers" as contained in that clause.

Mr. ICHORD. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ICHORD. Of course, I would point out to the gentleman from Michigan that this is merely a "finding of fact." That finding of fact has nothing to do with the penal sections whatsoever.

I am sure that the committee, however, did have in mind forces or groups such as the Progressive Labor movement.

Mr. NEDZI. Is the word "powers" meant to be a foreign power of any kind?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that it is meant to be a foreign power, yes.

Mr. NEDZI. The language says "There also exist within the world other powers or forces" at the present time.

To which power is the gentleman referring?

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this is not my language. It is the language of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL].

I do not know what particular power the gentleman from Texas has in mind.

Mr. NEDZI. Could the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] define the word "powers" as contained in that clause?

Mr. Chairman, I am now addressing the chairman of the subcommittee.

Could the gentleman from Texas define what is meant by "other powers" as it appears on line 4, page 3, of the bill?

Mr. POOL. Nations, States, and political entities is what it means.

Mr. NEDZI. Which one, specifically?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes in order that the question may be answered.

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all other amendments to this bill be concluded at 9 o'clock.

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RYAN) there were—ayes 29, noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill H.R. 12047 be concluded at 9 o'clock p.m.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I intended to support this bill, and I may yet, but I think probably the—I hardly know what adjective to use, so I will say the most insufficient answer I have ever heard in the 18 years I have been here to a perfectly legal and logical question was the answer the chairman gave when he opposed Mr. JOELSON'S amendment.

When the gentleman asked him why, he said "Well, I am just against it."

Mr. Chairman, this is a perfectly good amendment, and could even, if this bill is interpreted later on, prevent the President of the United States from exchanging prisoners with the North Vietnamese.

Now, everybody knows, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is not going to be taken up in the Senate. And I will go as far as any man to elect the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL]. But this is a fantasy and a futility to be here on the 12th day of October at 25 minutes after 8. The last rollcall showed that there were 207 Members present. The next one is going to show that there are 206 present, because I am going home.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOELSON) there were—ayes 37, noes 62.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded. As many in favor of taking this vote by tellers will rise and remain standing until counted. An insufficient number have arisen. Tellers are refused.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOLE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLE: On page 5, following line 13, after the period, add the following:

"*Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall apply unless the United States shall be engaged in armed conflict and unless the acts referred to herein are related to such armed conflict."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I am simply attempting, by this amendment, to make section 403 conform in certain respects to section 402 and to limit its application. The amendment is self-explanatory.

Under section 403 its application is presently wide open. It does not just apply while the United States is engaged in armed conflict or to troops or supplies and activities related to armed conflict.

It applies to the Armed Forces on duty and movement of supplies, and a number of other things, anywhere at any time, whether in peace or while engaged in armed conflict.

I have discussed this amendment with Members on both sides and assure the committee that this is an effort to improve the bill.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. We see nothing objectionable to adding this language in the bill and we accept the amendment.

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

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. I understood earlier that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] had no objection to the provision which would prohibit interference with the National Guard or Armed Forces in enforcing the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation. Now if this amendment is accepted it will take that authority out of the bill.

Mr. DOLE. I am attempting to limit application of section 403 in accord with my understanding of the overall objectives of this bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I can say for this side of the aisle, we accept the amendment. The intent of the amendment seems to be good and it is certainly offered with a good purpose in mind. I think it improves the bill and the amendment should be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALDIE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALDIE: On page 4, after the period on line 15, strike out all the balance of the language on page 4 and page 5.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to continue explaining the situation in my county of Contra Costa, which, as I might reiterate for those who may not have been present on the floor when I attempted to speak the last time, is the only district in the United States in which, at this very hour, these demonstrations are occurring. They have been going on for 2 months in Contra Costa County. During that 2-month period there have been 38 arrests made in Contra Costa County of the demonstrators that have prostrated themselves before the napalm trucks coming into and going out of Concord Ammunition Depot.

Of the 38 arrests, there have been 38 convictions, 1 as a result of a trial, and 37 by plea. Of the 38 arrests, the judge sentencing the defendants had the right to sentence them to a maximum of 1 year in jail and a $1,000 fine. In every instance he has sentenced them to no less than 15 days in the county jail without probation and no fine.

The Federal authorities—and I talked to Cecil Poole, the district attorney, in our district, over the weekend—have made two arrests under a trespass law when the demonstrators trespass on the very base itself. Under that law the perpetrators of that crime are penalized—and both of those people, by the way, have been convicted—are subjected to a penalty of not to exceed 6 months in jail and $500 fine.

The Federal district attorney tells me that in his view that this bill would be most detrimental to obtaining prosecutions, because under the present statute they can obtain prosecutions as petty offenses, meaning the defendant is not entitled to a jury trial, and he is tried before a commissioner, and they expeditiously take care of these people. They are taking care of them in Contra Costa County.

The local authorities in Contra Costa County are as patriotic, understanding and hardnosed and hardheaded as any Member on this floor. They understand the problem in Contra Costa County, and they do not like the idea—and, frankly, I do not either—of the Federal Government telling them that they know better how to handle the problems in Contra Costa County. We do not want marshals in Contra Costa County. We can handle the problems there. We have been handling them. None of our people were called before the committee. Had they been called before the committee, they would have told you, "We know what we are doing in Contra Costa County. We feel we can handle the situation."

The committee has adopted an amendment which says that when a man is involved in a labor dispute and holds up a truck of napalm which is intended for our troops in Vietnam, that act is less reprehensible than the act of the young foolish kid—who, by the way, I hold no brief for and for none of these demonstrators; I think they are acting foolishly, immaturely, and in many instances even more seriously than that—but the laboring man who holds up that truck taking napalm for shipment to Vietnam is acting no less mean, no less unworthy, no less patriotic than is that young college kid who is a damn fool on a picket line, and yet we are declaring that that young college kid who is on the picket line is unpatriotic, unworthy, and is subject to punishment by a $10,000 fine or a term of 5 years in jail.

Mr. Chairman, what we have really done is to take the same act and we have said, "If you stop a napalm truck and you are a laboring man, you are not as reprehensible as the young college kid." That is not true. Those young fellows who stop the napalm trucks intended for shipment to Vietnam are just as reprehensible as the college kids, and what we are doing is to take the same act and, stripping the act of the ideological views involved, we are punishing the ideological views by this act. I think that is unworthy of this Congress.

I do not mean to tell you. I am fully cognizant and aware of the attitudes and the dignity of the House. I am proud to be a Member. I am proud, and I will continue to be proud to be a Member of this House. But I have had more pride in the attitude of the Senate with respect to this issue in this bill.

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

Mr. WALDIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. BATTIN. There is a part of the gentleman's statement I do not quite fully comprehend; that is, for one group of people who might be offenders it would be all right to have a jury trial, but for another group it would be all right to handle them as having committed petty crimes and to have one man sit on the bench.

Mr. WALDIE. The United States District Attorney told me that one of the big problems in this area is to expeditiously handle these people and not to permit them the maximum publicity which they seek. That is the whole objective, to get on the television, to get in the newspapers and on the radio, and to call attention to themselves. He says that the faster we get them out and dispose of them the better off we are.

If we make it a felony, as this bill would do, we would subject them to grand jury indictment and a jury trial.

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

(On request of Mr. BATTIN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WALDIE was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. WALDIE. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. BATTIN. The gentleman is not suggesting that even under the procedure stated, which the U.S. attorney and the Federal judge might recommend, they could exclude from participation in the hearings the press of the United States.

Mr. WALDIE. I am not suggesting that at all. I am suggesting that under the present petty offense, which is what they consider a petty, unworthy, mean offense, they are not entitled under Federal law to demand a jury, so that entitlement is not theirs under existing law. Under this bill they would be entitled to demand a jury, and thereby it would encourage them to run this on and on to get the publicity they seek.

We are playing into their hands with this bill. They want this attention. They want to be martyrs. They want to feel important.

They are not important. They are irritating. They are nasty. But they are not important, and we should not make them important.

Mr. BATTIN. Does the gentleman not believe that 99 percent of the people of this country feel the same way he does?

Mr. WALDIE. I know they do in Contra Costa County, and we have handled this in accordance with that feeling. But the Congress, properly reflecting an irritation that was prompted by absolute discourtesy and extreme provocation during the hearings, reacted, from their far distant viewpoint, far more strongly than have the people at the local level. This just convinces me more and more that the people in the local communities know better what to do with the problems confronting them than we do.

Mr. BATTIN. Is the gentleman for or against the bill?

Mr. WALDIE. I am for the first portion of the bill. I believe the first portion of the bill is desirable. There are not, in my view, sufficient ways of preventing the transferring of blood, money, and goods to the enemy. I believe we ought to pass that.

I am asking that the second portion of the bill be stricken.

Mr. BATTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of confusion created today as to what the bill contains and what it does not contain. I would point out to the gentleman from California that if the amendment is adopted there is no law and there will be no law—still no law—on the books to protect the free movement of U.S. troops outside bases.

The gentleman from California, as he indicated, does come from a section of the country where there have been many incidents of interference.

I would point out to the gentleman that the assistant prosecuting attorney from Alameda County appeared before the committee and testified in favor of this section. Mr. Meese stated that there was no Federal law under which the Federal Government could prosecute for interference with a troop movement or the movement of supplies. He testified before the committee that the Federal district attorney in Alameda County had determined and decided not to prosecute because there is no Federal law. Now, it is true, as the gentleman from California has pointed out, that these acts could very well be in violation of the breach-of-peace statutes or ordinances on a local level or some of the disorderly conduct statutes that the local unit of government might have. However, I ask the gentleman from California, Is it the responsibility of the local units of government to protect the movement of Federal troops, or is that the responsibility of the Government of the United States?

Now, the assistant attorney of Alameda County testified that he did not feel that the local statues—I do not know what the gentleman has in his county, but he did not feel that the local statutes and ordinances provided sufficient penalty for the acts of these individuals. Mr. Meese testified before the committee that it had cost Alameda County alone—it had cost Alameda County alone—better than $100,000 just to provide police protection for these people interfering with the movement of Federal troops—$100,000 was his testimony before the committee.

I would point out to the gentleman from California that the penalty provided in section 403 is not a minimum penalty. This is just a maximum penalty. It is a maximum penalty of $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both. Under this statute the court, of course, should deal out the punishment in accordance with the gravity of the offense. Any fine could be levied from $5 up to $10,000 or from 5 days to 5 years. Certainly in the case of a young college student I would not be in favor of giving that student 5 years, but the section that the gentleman from Texas has here does not require that to be done. However, it could be done in the cases of members of the Progressive Labor movement who testified that they are opposed to the Government of the United States and that they are in favor of a Vietcong victory. When this group goes out and tries to interfere with a movement of troop trains and supplies, such a penalty could be handed down.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from California. I am perfectly willing to support the first section in the bill, which is section 402, as it is designated here, but we are moving far afield in section 403. In my opinion, there is not a clear and present danger to the United States in the actions of these emotional and disturbed people, yes, some Communists or maybe most of them. I do not know how many.

There may be some Communists, and probably are.

However, Mr. Chairman, I believe there are in this group a lot of deluded, emotional people who are very much concerned. I have them in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent. They are running a man against me in the congressional district which it is my honor to represent a man who is being backed by the Beatniks and the "peace at any price" type of people.

Mr. Chairman, no one in this House will say that I have not supported the war in Vietnam. I have supported it in every way possible. I have voted for and supported every appropriation and every piece of legislation in regard thereto.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are going far afield. We are becoming disturbed over something that is not of great importance, and we are using cruel and unusual punishments upon many people, who are as the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE] said, mentally disturbed about this thing.

And, Mr. Chairman, if they were of the judgment like we are in this House of Representatives, that would be one thing.

However, Mr. Chairman, I have talked to these people and to the mothers who are completely distraught and emotional and unreasonable because their boy has been drafted to go to Vietnam, or is about to be drafted to go to Vietnam.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what evidence does the committee give us?

Well, permit me to show to the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union some of the statements contained in the committee report thereon.

> Several of the pickets jumped in front of the train, which proceeded slowly at that point, and jumped away when it became obvious that the train would not halt.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to be this cruel in passing this legislation? These people were involved but no one was hurt and the train was not actually stopped.

Mr. Chairman, how many of us remember the "Perils of Pauline," and how someone was always rescued just about the time the train was to run over them?

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is not that old.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, let me continue to quote from the report:

> Demonstrators sat on the tracks, others lay down on the tracks, the train was forced practically to a halt—

Then, Mr. Chairman, we go to page 6 where there appears the following:

> Each time a truck approached the gate, demonstrators appeared and lay down in its path. A number of Marines were taken from their normal duties to carry off demonstrators.

Well, Mr. Chairman, a number of marines are taken away from their normal duties to do cooking duty in the general's kitchen and to mow his yard and to pick up cigarette butts and things like that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be reasonable about this thing. There is no clear and present danger that has been proved by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that these people acted in a very objectionable way, and I hold no brief for them. I know that some of them did it through design, but do we in the United States want to go to the extreme, the extreme of taking these people, many of them emotional and incapable of wise judgment and give them these cruel and unusual punishments?

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

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And I have the same respect for each Member of this committee. However, I think they are going too far here in section 403 of the bill.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I have every respect for not only the Member but the opinion of the distinguished Member who now occupies the well of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman that this group does not constitute any serious threat to the security of the United States.

But, is not the gentleman from California concerned about the cost to the local units of government involved?

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out a while ago the fact that the county of Alameda, Calif., had spent better than $100,000 in 1 year alone just to provide police protection for these people who were interfering with the orderly movement of military logistics.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, when human rights are involved, I am not concerned with the cost.

Mr. Chairman, this democracy can pay the cost that is necessary to treat our people with humaneness. And, even though it is objectionable and it is irritating and I do not like it, I am still willing to pay the cost of preserving to those people, many of them incapable of wise judgment, I believe they should have, even though they act in a way which I do not approve, this protection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the amendment which has been offered by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE]. I know that this bill can be improved. I believe that we have many amendments pending here

which do not really accomplish what we have set out to do.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for what they are attempting to do, but I believe they are doing it in a very inexpert, poorly drafted piece of legislation.

I think that if you allow the Federal Government to occupy a field in the last section where you totally exculpate labor disputes from the effect of the section, why, the necessary result of that then would be to deprive the State of California of all of its injunctive powers with respect to control of labor disputes. There are only certain kinds of labor disputes which are recognized under California law, and many others are enjoinable by the Federal Government coming in and exculpating all other labor disputes, so you are expanding this area which can be used to disrupt military cargo and personnel I believe unreasonably.

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

Mr. LEGGETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman mentioned the problem of the draftsmanship of this bill, and I just want to ask him a question to see if he knows the answer, because the chairman of the committee apparently did not.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if the first section of this bill, section 402, would have applied to Vietnam during the years 1961 to 1963, or 1964, when all we had in Vietnam ostensibly were advisers? Does the gentleman have an opinion as to whether or not the criminal sanctions would have applied during that period when we said we had only advisers there, and we were not engaged in armed conflict?

Mr. LEGGETT. The gentleman makes a good point. It probably would have applied, although the bill does have prospective operations, I would say this to the first section of the bill: It would purportedly punish anybody who solicits. That is, everybody. And so far as I can see the mere transfer of a few college students of maybe a few thousand dollars to Vietnam would not constitute clear and present danger to the security and welfare of the United States. I think that section would be violative of the Constitution, and would be so interpreted by the Supreme Court.

I would also point this out: if you take the last section, section 403, the one we are seeking to strike, by its literal interpretation, which we must, according to its plain meaning, and not alluding to any of the arguments made on the floor, the necessary effect then would be to punish anybody who would attempt to impede the progress of any Vietnamese potential fighters, American soldiers, sailors, or marines, toward the front lines. So that if any judge were to issue a restraining order against a military defendant in a criminal case, the net effect then would be to violate this section. He would certainly be intending to impede the progress of that young military man toward the frontlines.

Or if a man sought to avoid a transfer or sought to transfer his billet, assuming he is billeted toward Vietnam, or if his wife consulted a Congressman to try to change his billet, and to try to impede his progress toward Vietnam, the wife definitely is in violation of this section, and so would the Congressman be.

And I submit that this is just a portion of some of the loose phraseology that is in this statute, if we are going to strictly interpret this bill and we are going to follow its plain meaning. So therefore, I submit this is meaningless. I submit that this act is going to be voided for vagueness, and still we are going through this futility on this floor. And I say the same arguments can be made with respect to section 1, because there, if a disinterested national were in the United States, of another country, who was in the United States promoting peace terms, seeking the support of some nationals of some other foreign power, eventually destined to get into the hands of the Vietnamese, and we intended this to the mutual advantage of the United States and also the foreign power because the offer would be to keep the foreign power from getting their heads blown off and to try to bring an end to the war, or to some kind of a reasonable conclusion, that would be covered by the plain meaning of the first section of this act.

I say that this legislation is not in the interest of this Congress. I think we can declare a sense of the Congress which will certainly declare this body against some of the reprehensible acts that have taken place in this country, but this is not the way to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOLIFIELD), there were—ayes 40, noes 51.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. WALDIE and Mr. POOL as tellers.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 43, noes 55.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VIVIAN

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VIVIAN: In section 402, page 4, line 10, strike out: "or in any manner prejudice the interests of the United States or advantage such foreign power, or organization, group, resident, national member or agent".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the motion of the House all debate ceases at 9 o'clock.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VIVIAN

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VIVIAN: In section 402, page 3, line 20, strike "solicits" and replace by "offers to collect"; on line 22, strike "solicits", and replace by "offers to collect".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER: In section 402, page 4, line 15, strike the period and insert a semicolon and the following new language: "*Provided*, That this section shall apply only if the fact that an element of the armed forces of the United States is engaged in armed conflict abroad has been publicly acknowledged by the President."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KING of Utah, 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. 12047) to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 1007, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? (After a pause.) If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The SPEAKER. On the question of the adoption of the sundry amendments?

Mr. BURTON of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, further proceedings on this measure will be put over until tomorrow.

Without objection, the gentleman's point of order is withdrawn.

The Chair would like to get the attention of the gentleman from California. The Chair wants to be certain what the gentleman had in mind in demanding a separate vote is clearly understood, to protect the gentleman. Will the gentleman enlighten the Chair as to what particular amendment the gentleman had in mind? It is the understanding of the Chair that the first amendment was a committee amendment.

Mr. BURTON of California. As the distinguished Speaker once again demonstrates, he shows his most patience with the most junior Members of the House.

The point of order I raised was to the only vote taken by the House. As I understand it, that preserves this gentleman's right to raise any and all amendments adopted in the committee to question at the point in time when the bill will be before us, operating as we are now under the unanimous-consent situation and agreement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to protect the gentleman from California. The Chair respectfully calls to his attention the fact that the first amendment, as the Chair understands it, is a committee amendment, that was unanimously agreed to. If the gentleman has some other amendment in mind the Chair would like to be enlightened, to protect the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. I understood the parliamentary situation at the time I objected to the vote and made the point of order that a quorum was not present, the Speaker was in the process of ruling that the sundry amendments, all but the first, were to be adopted. At that point I raised my point of order. If I understand the parliamentary situation, that means all the amendments, including the first upon which I asked for a separate vote, will be subject, if under the rules of the House that procedure is desired and followed, to a rollcall vote by the membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, so that there will be a clear understanding, that the gentleman demanded a separate vote on the first amendment adopted.

Mr. BURTON of California. Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker then moved the remainder of the amendments, as I understood it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair then asked if there was a separate vote demanded on any other amendment. There was no request. Then the Chair put the amendments en gros and the Chair ruled that the remaining amendments, other than the one upon which the gentleman from California demanded a separate vote, were agreed to.

Now, if the gentleman from California had some other amendment in mind, instead of the first committee amendment adopted, the Chair would like to know, to protect the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Speaker stated the situation exactly as I understood it but for the last clause of his statement. As I understand it, I fully intended—and I hope my rights are protected with respect thereto—to object to the vote on the adoption of the sundry amendments, as I believe they were described, and I made the point of order with respect thereto.

The SPEAKER. On that statement the Chair clearly understands the gentleman from California. Then, when the gentleman from California made the point of order, and so forth, we came back to the unanimous-consent agreement that any votes would be taken tomorrow. The Chair so announced. So tomorrow the question will be on the adoption of the sundry amendments en gros. The second vote will be on the amendment on which the gentleman from California demanded a separate vote.

Mr. BURTON of California. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that on the vote on the sundry amendments en gros, other than the No. 1, on which the gentleman demanded a separate vote, the gentleman's right to demand a rollcall will be protected or, if a quorum is not present tomorrow, his right to make the necessary point of order is preserved.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the parliamentary situation, tomorrow there will be two points at which it would be proper, in the event there is not a quorum, for the votes to be objected to and a point of order to be made that a quorum is not present. As I understand it, those two matters are, first, the first amendment adopted by the committee and, second, the balance of the amendments or the sundry amendments that the Speaker mentioned prior to my objecting to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the sundry amendments, en gros, will be the first order of business. Then the other amendment with reference to which the gentleman has demanded a separate vote will follow.

Mr. BURTON of California. I deeply thank our venerable Speaker for his assistance in this matter.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. The Chair stated that the gentleman from California asked for a separate vote on the first amendment adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The first amendment adopted was striking the letter (a) on line 10. Is that not correct?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. That is the Chair's understanding, and that is why the Chair was interrogating the gentleman from California.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the Chair. That is what I understood the request was on. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to hear a little further from the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the record on this point is quite clear. I have preserved my rights with respect to this issue, and I have no more to say other than to thank you one and all for bearing with me.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BATTIN. As I understood the Chair, the sundry amendments were put as a unit.

The SPEAKER. That is correct, en gros.

Mr. BATTIN. And the vote will come on all of the sundry amendments and not a division of the sundry amendments. Is that true, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BATTIN. Then we will have a vote on striking the letter (a) that the gentleman objected to?

The SPEAKER. The Chair's understanding is consistent with what the gentleman said.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POOL. 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. 12047.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on foreign aid to Vietnam. I understand this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee, the Honorable OGDEN REID.

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

There was no objection.

REQUIRING PREMARITAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2228)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, 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 House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That all applications for marriage licenses shall be open to inspection as public records. All such applications upon which licenses have not yet been issued shall be kept to-

gether in a separate file readily accessible to public examination.

"SEC. 2. No application for a marriage license shall be received unless there shall be filed therewith a statement or statements; upon a form prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, signed by (1) a person in the District of Columbia certified by the Department of Public Health as duly qualified to administer and interpret a standard laboratory blood test, (2) a physician licensed to practice medicine or osteopathy in the District of Columbia, a State, or a territory or possession of the United States, or (3) a commissioned medical officer in the military service or in Public Health Service of the United States, that the applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within thirty days prior to the filing of such application, and that, in the opinion of such certified person, physician, or medical officer, based upon the result of that test, the applicant is not infected with syphilis in a stage of that disease in which it can be transmitted to another person. Such statement shall not disclose the technical data upon which it is based. Any such statement shall include the name of the person or laboratory administering the test, the name of the test administered, the exact name of the applicant, and the date of the test.

"SEC. 3. If a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia determines that public policy or the physical condition of either of the persons applying for a marriage license requires the intended marriage to be celebrated without delay, he may waive the provisions of section 2 of this Act and section 2 of the Act of August 12, 1937 (D.C. Code, sec. 30-109), and a license may be issued without regard to such sections.

"SEC. 4. In any case in which a person is unable for financial reasons to obtain the services of—

"(1) a private physician, or

"(2) any other person in the District of Columbia, certified by the Department of Public Health as duly qualified to administer and interpret a standard laboratory blood test,

to conduct such test or sign the statement required by section 2 of this Act, any medical officer of the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia is authorized to conduct such test and provide such statement at no cost to such person.

"SEC. 5. Any information obtained from any laboratory blood test required under section 2 of this Act shall be regarded as confidential by each person, agency, or committee who obtains, transmits, or receives such information.

"SEC. 6. Whoever—

"(1) knowingly divulges, other than in accordance with the provisions of this Act, any information, derived from the laboratory blood test required by section 2 of this Act, relating to any person suffering, or suspected to be suffering from, syphilis,

"(2) knowingly misrepresents any fact called for by the statement required by such section, or knowingly falsifies any material fact in connection with the laboratory blood test required by such section,

"(3) knowingly issues a marriage license without having received the statement required under such section or an order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued under section 3 of this Act, or

"(4) otherwise fails to comply with any other provision of this Act, shall be imprisoned for not more than six months, or fined not more than $250, or both. Prosecutions for violations of this section shall be conducted by the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 7. This Act shall take effect upon the expiration of ninety days after the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BASIL L. WHITENER,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
FRANK HORTON,
RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3314) to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate struck out all the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference.

Statement required to be filed with marriage application: The House bill required that an application for marriage license be accompanied with a statement signed by a designated person, (e.g., physician licensed to practice in the District of Columbia, and others specified) stating that the applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within 30 days of filing such application and is not infected with syphilis in such stage to be transmitted to another person. The Senate amendment required the said statement to be on a form prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and amended the definition of physician to include a physician licensed to practice osteopathy. The conference substitute includes these provisions of the Senate amendment.

Waiver of required statement and of waiting period: The House bill prohibited the issuance of a marriage license until 24 hours following the filing of application therefor, and provided for waiver, for good cause, by a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of both the statement requirement and the 24-hour waiting period. The Senate amendment did not change present law 3-day waiting period but did provide for similar waiver as to the required statement. The conference substitute provides for waiver of both the required statement and the present law 3-day waiting period, on the grounds of public policy or the physical condition of either party.

Public Health may conduct blood tests and furnish statement without charge: The Senate amendment provided that at the request of any physician, the Department of Health should conduct the required laboratory blood test at no charge to the applicant; and if he be unable financially to employ a private physician to furnish the required statement, the Department of Public Health is authorized to provide same at no cost to him. The House bill did not contain such provisions. The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that such statement and test will be provided at no cost upon the request of a person financially unable to secure the services of a person authorized to provide such statement of test.

Penalty provisions: The House bill made it a misdemeanor for any person to misrepresent the facts called for in the required certificate or otherwise fail to comply with the bill's provisions, or for a licensing officer to issue a marriage license without the certificate or court order. The Senate amendment modifies these provisions and includes the requirement that the blood test information be regarded as confidential and subjects any violator thereof to 6 months' imprisonment or a fine of not over $250 or both, prosecution to be conducted by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants. The conference substitute adopts the Senate penalties and more clearly defines the violations inviting same.

BASIL L. WHITENER,
JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
FRANK HORTON,
RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report was unanimously approved. It is a conference report on the bill which was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN], is not personally present. But it was cleared with the gentleman.

The bill is, simply stated, one which will require premarital examinations by competent medical authority in the District of Columbia before marriages may be contracted in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to require laboratory tests of persons who are contemplating marriage, with a view to ascertaining whether they are affected with syphilis in a communicable stage. The bill provides that no license would be issued without certification by a physician or authorized designated person that the parties contemplating marriage are not infected with such disease, or if infected, that such disease is not in such stage to be transmitted to another person.

The bill is based upon the Uniform Marriage Application Act proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law in 1950. Forty-five States now require by statute some form of premarital examination or routine serological testing for syphilis as a condition precedent to the issuance of a marriage license. Nearby Virginia has such a requirement although Maryland does not.

CONFERENCE ACTION

The Senate struck out all the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Except for technical clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference:

STATEMENT REQUIRED TO BE FILED WITH MARRIAGE APPLICATION

The House bill required that an application for marriage license be accompanied with a statement signed by a designated person—physician licensed to practice in the District of Columbia, and others specified—stating that the

applicant has submitted to a standard laboratory blood test within 30 days of filing such application and is not infected with syphilis in such stage to be transmitted to another person. The Senate amendment required the said statement to be on a form prescribed by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and amended the definition of physician to include a physician licensed to practice osteopathy. The conference substitute includes these provisions of the Senate amendment.

WAIVER OF REQUIRED STATEMENT AND OF WAITING PERIOD

The House bill prohibited the issuance of a marriage license until 24 hours following the filing of application therefor, and provided for waiver, for good cause, by a judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia of both the statement requirement and the 24-hour waiting period. The Senate amendment did not change present law 3-day waiting period but did provide for similar waiver as to the required statement. The conference substitute provides for waiver of both the required statement and the present law 3-day waiting period, on the grounds of public policy or the physical condition of either party.

PUBLIC HEALTH MAY CONDUCT BLOOD TESTS AND FURNISH STATEMENT WITHOUT CHARGE

The Senate amendment provided that at the request of any physician, the department of health should conduct the required laboratory blood test at no charge to the applicant; and if he be unable financially to employ a private physician to furnish the required statement, the Department of Public Health is authorized to provide same at no cost to him. The House bill did not contain such provisions. The conference substitute is the same as the Senate amendment, except that such statement and test will be provided at no cost upon the request of a person financially unable to secure the services of a person authorized to provide such statement of test.

PENALTY PROVISIONS

The House bill made it a misdemeanor for any person to misrepresent the facts called for in the required certificate or otherwise fail to comply with the bill's provisions, or for a licensing officer to issue a marriage license without the certificate or court order. The Senate amendment modifies these provisions and includes the requirement that the blood test information be regarded as confidential and subjects any violator thereof to 6 months' imprisonment or fine of not over $250 or both, prosecution to be conducted by the Corporation Counsel or his assistants. The conference substitute adopts the Senate penalties and more clearly defines the violations inviting same.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House that I am in complete agreement with the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate in their amendments to H.R. 3314, to require premarital examinations in the District of Columbia.

The conferees, I can say, have adopted substantially the provisions of H.R. 3314 as introduced by me, and the changes which were made are improvements, which, of course, I approve.

The House over 2 years ago passed the first bill I offered, and it is gratifying that the other body has finally agreed to the urgency, wisdom, and necessity of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been disturbed by reports made of the high percentage of infectious syphilis cases reported in the District of Columbia.

From 1956 to 1963, the number of reported cases of infectious syphilis in the District of Columbia increased from 36 to 711. This was an increase from 4.3 cases per hundred thousand population to 92.3 cases. In 1963, among cities of 200,000 population or over, Washington, D.C., was second only to Newark, N.J., and there were only four other cities with a rate of over 50 cases per 100,000 population. During the period from 1956 to 1963, the national rate also increased, but not nearly so dramatically, from 4.1 cases per hundred thousand population to 11.9 cases.

While some of the indicated increase in the District of Columbia may be the result of better case findings and better reporting, the indications are that the major part of the increase is an actual increase. This is confirmed by reports from 63 cities throughout the country, 28 of which have attributed the major part of their own increase to an actual increase in cases.

How many cases exist which are not reported is not estimated, but the above figures are so impressive as to confirm the necessity of the enactment of legislation such as proposed in this bill. The District of Columbia Commissioners in the past have favored such legislation and it is certainly the hope of those concerned therewith that these tests will materially contribute to education of the public and to the avoidance and treatment of this disease, thereby curtailing its spread as well as materially contributing to the prevention of genital syphilis in the District of Columbia.

The Department of Public Health in the District of Columbia estimates that the enactment of the bill would require between 19,000 and 20,000 serologic tests each year, approximately 75 percent of which would be performed by this Department, the other 25 percent estimated to be handled by private or hospital laboratories.

The extra services and supplies required by the Department of Public Health is estimated to cost less than $10,000 per year, a very small price to pay for attempting to remove this disgrace from the Nation's Capital.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS submitted a conference report and statement on 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 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes.

AIRLIFT FOR APO MAIL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, relating to mailing privileges of members of the Armed Forces overseas, to carry out the two recommendations for legislation which are made in the report on my recent investigation and on-site inspection conducted of the postal systems of the U.S. Armed Forces for delivering mail to servicemen in Vietnam and Thailand. This report was adopted unanimously by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and filed with the House, House Report No. 2198, 89th Congress, 2d session.

The first section of this bill is intended to carry out recommendation No. 1, to the effect that free mailing privileges for first-class letter mail and transportation by air for small parcels, now authorized by Public Law 89–315, for servicemen in combat areas, should be provided for such servicemen while on rest and recreation outside the combat area.

Servicemen in combat areas are provided a rest and recreation trip for 5 days each 6 months at such places as Hong Kong, Tokyo, Bangkok, or Manila. Since these places are not within the combat areas to which the special mailing privileges apply under Public Law 89–315, the servicemen assigned to the combat areas, but on rest and recreation for 5 days outside the combat areas, are not granted either the free mailing privilege or the air transportation service for small parcels.

Such personnel assigned to a combat area are on temporary duty at the rest and recreation points. They should be entitled to the mailing privileges while on such temporary duty for a short period outside the combat area. Such a

change in the law would not present insurmountable administrative difficulties as the servicemen very easily could exhibit their orders when mailing a package, or could show their permanent APO number in the return address.

Section 2 of the bill is intended to carry out recommendation No. 5. The recommendation and the justification are as follows:

5. Airlift of Mail for Servicemen in the Pacific: All mail addressed to or sent by servicemen in the Pacific area should be transported by air on a space-available basis.

One of the major recommendations made by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in House Report No. 1226, 89th Congress, was that legislation should be enacted requiring that mail addressed to or sent by servicemen overseas be transported by the fastest means of transportation available. It was contemplated that airlift would be used wherever feasible.

Public Law 89-315 has resulted in airlift being used for first-class letter mail and parcels up to 5 pounds mailed between the United States and the servicemen in combat areas. The administration has implemented this law by providing domestic airlift for all APO, San Francisco, and Seattle letter mail, because it is impossible to segregate APO-addressed mail at the local post office. The segregation of APO letter mail, for airlift to the combat area, is performed at the postal concentration centers in Seattle and San Francisco.

Air transportation of the mail to Vietnam can be accomplished within a few days. Surface transportation requires weeks and sometimes months. Airmail from the United States to Japan takes 3 days. Regular letter mail takes an average of 18 days for delivery in Japan. Other mail averages delivery time to Japan in excess of 20 days. The airlifting of this mail could result in delivery within no more than 4 or 5 days. It is believed that this delay in the delivery of mail to the servicemen in the Far Pacific is inexcusable and completely unjustified. In the absence of action by the administration to provide airlift for mail to the servicemen in the Far Pacific vigorous action should be initiated to enact legislation requiring the airlift of all mail to servicemen in the Pacific area.

During the 6-month period of January through June 1966 about 2,500 tons of personal surface mail was dispatched from CONUS to Army and Air Force personnel stationed in Vietnam. Approximately 1,050 tons of personal surface mail was shipped from Vietnam to the United States during the same period from our Army and Air Force personnel.

The current cost for transporting surface mail between San Francisco and Vietnam is 10 cents per pound. Personal parcels weighing 5 pounds or less are airlifted on a space-available basis by commercial carriers between San Francisco and Vietnam at the rates of 49.2 cents per pound (from United States) and 41 cents per pound (from Vietnam).

The personal surface mail was moved between the United States and Vietnam during the above-cited period at a cost of $710,000. Had this mail been airlifted at the space-available mail rate it would have cost the Department of Defense $3,321,000 or an additional $2,611,000. Based on the Army and Air Force strength in Vietnam, it would cost an additional $2.62 per man per month to airlift his personal surface mail at the space-available mail rate.

Mr. Speaker, I am very optimistic that this bill will receive favorable consideration.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ATTEMPTS TO REPEAL STATE USURY LAWS—HOMEOWNER HIT AGAIN—REQUIRING 2 YEARS' WORK TO PAY EXTRA INTEREST ON $20,000 HOME LOAN

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the forces unleashed by the Federal Reserve Board's December action in raising interest rates are slashing away at State usury laws throughout the country.

State usury laws—when properly enforced—are protectors of the consumer, the small businessman, the homeowner and others who must borrow to meet their basic everyday needs.

Now throughout the Nation, these usury laws are under attack because the Federal Reserve Board has allowed interest rates to skyrocket to historical highs. The Federal Reserve Board, through its actions is attempting to repeal all of the State usury laws.

This week, the newspapers in Washington carried big headlines about efforts to convene a special session of the Virginia General Assembly to raise that State's present 6-percent ceiling on interest. Similar pressures are being put on other State governments.

These States should hold firm and not give in to the pressures of the Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board should be forced to roll back interest rates rather than to have the States take the lid off the usury laws and set up the-sky-is-the-limit criteria on credit. If there are to be special sessions of legislatures on interest rates, I hope such sessions will be directed at lowering interest rates and tightening usury laws. The States should demand that the Federal Reserve Board change its policies and lower interest rates.

The State Governors and the State legislatures should not weaken and give in to this pressure from a Federal Reserve Board which is accountable to no one and which consistently ignores the public interest. The States should maintain and strengthen their usury laws.

In the current controversy in Virginia, it is interesting to note that some are recommending that the usury limits be raised from 6 to 8 percent. This represents an increase of 33⅓ percent—almost as high as the 37½ percent imposed by the Federal Reserve Board last December.

Those who propose a 33⅓ percent increase in the interest allowed under State usury laws should translate these percentage figures into dollars and cents. A 2-percentage-point increase, as publicly called for in Virginia, would cost the homeowner almost $9,500 extra interest on a 30-year, $20,000 mortgage.

In this morning's Washington Post, I note that Arlington County Delegate Harrison Mann has spoken up for the public interest and urged that Virginia not change the usury laws. Delegate Mann is to be commended for his stand and I hope that legislators throughout the country will take a similar position as the pressure grows on this issue.

I place in the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post which bear on this subject:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 11, 1966]

GODWIN URGED TO CALL SPECIAL SESSION ON INTEREST RATE CEILING

(By George M. Kelley)

RICHMOND, October 10.—A legislative commission studying interest rates in Virginia was urged today to ask Gov. Mills E. Godwin for a special session of the General Assembly to raise the State's present 6 per cent ceiling on interest.

H. H. Crowell, Jr., an Arlington realtor and president of the Virginia Real Estate Association, sounded the special session call in testifying before the nine-member Money and Interest Study Commission. He was backed by banking and savings and loan organizations.

Del. Hardaway Marks of Hopewell, chairman of the study group, said a report by the Commission will be sent to the Governor in December. He said the Commission, however, would not get "involved" in moves to convene the Legislature immediately.

The Governor's office declined to comment on the special session proposal but it was apparent the testimony before the study group marked the start of an organized drive by lending firms to get legislative action. It was learned later in the day that savings and loan associations in the State have started a mail campaign urging the Governor to convene the Assembly.

INITIAL REACTION

Initial reaction at the Capitol was that calling a session solely on interest rates would be dangerous politically.

Interest rates could be considered at a special session called to revamp Virginia's election laws, although Godwin has indicated he has no concrete plans now to recall the Legislature for action on that subject. The Assembly will not have another regular session until January, 1968.

It is a bleak outlook for the building industry in Virginia unless the legal interest ceiling is raised, the study commission was told. A new ceiling of 8 per cent was suggested.

Crowell said the maximum of 6 per cent now allowed by State law for home loans has dried up mortgage loan money and this, in turn, is cutting deeply into home sales.

He said many real estate men are going out of business and in some areas sales volume is down as much as 50 per cent. In Northern Virginia, home building has skidded so drastically that a housing shortage and unemployment in the building trades is considered possible.

EIGHT PERCENT URGED

Mark W. Saurs, executive vice president of the Virginia Savings and Loan League, suggested that the Legislature could amend the State's present usury statute to allow a contract rate of 8 percent on homes. He said the present 6 percent could be kept in the statute and apply to short term loans.

Saurs said if something isn't done quickly there will be a drop of some $50 million in lending during the next year by savings and loans associations in Virginia.

"If funds are not available from the usual sources," he said, "the Federal Government will take over this vital phase of our economy and the resultant increased tax burden

will far overshadow the cost of a small additional amount of interest on home loans."

Saurs said the limitation on interest rates in Virginia has made it impossible to compete with other states for loan money. He and other spokesmen for the banking industry said mortgage money naturally has gone to states where higher rates are allowed.

The impact, he said, is that home building activity is decreasing in Virginia and the economy of the state stands to be seriously affected.

John B. Siegel Jr., senior vice president of the Life Insurance Co. of Virginia, said that mortgage loans to individuals have become so unattractive as a medium of investment in the State that his company is no longer making new residential mortgage loans.

The hearing today was the first held by the study commission since it was created by the General Assembly early this year. Persons testifying were invited to appear. A second hearing open to all, will be held here on October 23.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 12, 1966]

MANN PROTESTS CALL FOR SPECIAL SESSION

(By Helen Dewar)

Arlington Del. Harrison Mann issued a strongly worded objection yesterday to a proposed special session of the Virginia General Assembly to consider raising interest rates.

In a letter to Gov. Mills E. Godwin, Mann said the State should withstand pressure to increase the "usury rate to alleviate a wholly temporary condition" in the money market.

The call for the special session came Tuesday when Arlington realtor H. H. Crowell, president of the Virginia Real Estate Association, told a legislative commission that the 6 per cent ceiling set now by Virginia is drying up the mortgage loan market and cutting deeply into home sales.

Crowell, backed by banking and savings and loan organizations, suggested raising the limit to 8 per cent.

Mann said interest rates are now beginning to level off and should decline further in coming months.

"I recognize," he added, "that gradual declining interest rates will not satisfy some people who have been seeking a hike in the 6 per cent rate for a considerable period of time, and who are now attempting to capitalize on present circumstances to push for exorbitant rates."

He said the same people were lobbying four years ago when the limit was between 5¼ and 5½ per cent to raise it to 7 or 8 per cent.

Mann said it was "to the long-range benefit of the home construction and home sales industry to maintain a reasonable level of interest rates" and "essential for the State to protect consumers from . . . unjustifiably high rates."

The consumer, he said, is "often the last to know what he is actually paying for borrowed money, and while the great majority of lenders are fair and honest, there is the inevitable segment who will bilk the public, especially the uninformed, milking them for every cent they can get."

OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE'S ROLE IN HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the operations of the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board are among the least-known facts of the U.S. Government.

In the October 4 edition of the Los Angeles Times, Charles Neal writes about the Open Market Committee's role in the current high interest, tight money policies. Mr. Neal writes:

Few persons have ever heard of this committee, yet in many ways it is the most powerful group of men in this country. It is accountable to virtually no one, and it operates in such secrecy that even the CIA must be envious.

Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times and Charles Neal have performed an important public service in printing some of the facts about the Open Market Committee. I hope other newspapers across the country will follow this lead and put the true facts about monetary policy before the American people. I place in the RECORD this excellent article entitled "Federal Open Market Committee Gets Exposure":

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Oct. 4, 1966]

FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE GETS EXPOSURE

(By Charles Neal)

Considering all the controversy over "tight money" and high interest rates, it is time to give the credit, or the blame, to whom it belongs. That would be the federal Open Market Committee.

Few persons have ever heard of this committee, yet in many ways it is the most powerful group of men in this country. It is accountable to virtually no one, and it operates in such secrecy that even the CIA must be envious.

MONEY SUPPLY

The committee is made up of the seven members of the board of governors of the Federal Reserve System, who are appointed for terms of 14 years, placing them beyond the reach of any President, plus five of the 12 Federal Reserve Bank presidents. In actuality, all 12 presidents of the Reserve Banks sit in on the meetings, although only five of them vote.

The committee deals in government securities, thus changing the nation's money supply at will. Thus some 12 men have the power to affect the cost of money as well as its availability. By purchasing U.S. government securities for the 12 banks, the committee has the power to increase the money supply overnight. By not buying such securities, or by selling them, the money supply can be made to dry up.

The New York City Federal Reserve Bank calls most of the shots, and it can influence the money supply, interest rates and reserve requirements of the entire nation. Most of the very large banks, of course, are in the East. Even our secretary of the Treasury must consult with these banks and bond houses before issuing new securities, otherwise he may find he has no market.

FINANCIAL CRISIS

To be sure, the secretary of the Treasury can be a pretty tough guy to deal with, and sometimes he is. But if he is a banker with intense loyalties in that direction (as Andrew Mellon was), the U.S. taxpayers can come out with bloodied noses.

We are, at this very moment, in a serious financial crisis. Our balance of payments is precariously out of balance. Our gold hoard is dwindling. Money is so tight and costly that small businesses are failing, and home building is in a depression. There is little or no money to finance homes. Yet giant corporations have all the money they need to expand, and bank profits in general are the highest in many years.

If we come through all this without serious harm to the economy and without ruining too many people, I guess we can thank the wisdom of our money managers, even if they are beyond our control. But if this degenerates into something more serious, it may be time to inject a little more democracy and representative government into the vital area of money and credit.

HIGH INTEREST RATES STOP HOUSING INDUSTRY IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AREA

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic toll of high interest rates and tight money continues to grow across the country.

In recent days, the Washington Post has surveyed the housing and building situation in the Washington, D.C., area, clearly illustrating the destructive nature of high interest rates. The Washington, D.C., situation is not isolated. The same thing is happening all over the country and is, in fact, much worse in areas where the population generally is less affluent.

As the Washington Post articles illustrate, high interest rates and tight money are keeping decent housing out of the reach of millions of Americans, and at the same time, are forcing thousands of construction workers out of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the problem of high interest rates is now being translated from the academic level of discussion into the hard cold facts of human misery.

This Congress votes billions of dollars to fight the war on poverty and sits by and watches the Federal Reserve Board force good hard-working citizens out of jobs. This Congress votes billions of dollars for housing programs and sits by while the Federal Reserve Board virtually stops housing construction throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post which show what is happening in just one area of the country:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 10, 1966]

LEAN WINTER FEARED BY BUILDING WORKERS

(By Richard Corrigan)

Fears of future widespread unemployment among construction workers here are spreading as the pace of residential construction in the metropolitan area continues to nose dive.

Government employment officials, labor leaders, antipoverty workers and others are bracing for what might be a hard winter and an even harder spring.

Right now the employment statistics are glowing. But that is because most of the work now going on was financed last year or early this year before the tight money market began to cut sharply into future building plans.

Now with the cost of borrowing money reaching prohibitive rates for many builders and would-be buyers, the construction business is dropping sharply.

Building permits issued in the area during the last three months for new homes and apartments were valued at $64 million less than the permits granted over the same period last year. The permits, which are the standard indicator of the future construction market, are generally expected to drop even further this month.

Fred Z. Hetzel, director of the U.S. Employment Service here, said the slump already has had some effect on the job picture. "If it continues," he said, "it could of course become serious."

J. C. Turner, president of the Central Labor Council (AFL–CLO), said "The construction industry is like a roller-coaster anyway." On its present course, he said, "it might not come back up for another year."

The United Planning Organization, Washington's antipoverty agency, already is directing some job-seekers and would-be apprentices into other areas beside construction. "We don't want to train people for jobs if jobs aren't going to be waiting for them," said UPO manpower specialist Art Solomon.

Solomon added that a continued building slump in the area would most seriously affect unskilled and semiskilled, nonunion laborers—most of whom are Negroes living in Washington.

But such a slump would be felt in many other quarters as well. "It will have a bad effect on the entire area," Turner said. He estimated that for every on-site construction worker, three or four others depend on the industry for a living—equipment dealers, materials suppliers and the like.

A Washington architect reported that business is getting slow in his field. Sand, gravel and cement trucks are said to be standing idle in some company lots. A few bricklayers and cement finishers have showed up looking for work at the U.S. Employment Service office, an unusual event at this time of year.

The construction industry represents one of the Washington area's biggest employers, hiring about 7 per cent of the total labor force. In August, a record 78,000 persons were working in jobs directly related to building. About 60,000 of them are laborers and craftsmen.

Roughly a third of the 78,000 persons work in Washington, where the commercial building business is holding relatively steady. But the rest work in the Maryland and Virginia suburbs, where permits show that during the past six months the homebuilding business has been $32 million off the 1965 pace.

Earlier this year there actually were shortages of construction workers in some areas because the building boom still was on. So looking on the bright side, the USES's Hetzel said the slump would give skilled craftsmen a chance to "catch up" on their timetables. But Hetzel warned that if the slump persists, "we'll really have to start working" to find jobs.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 6, 1966]

UNEMPLOYMENT THREATENED: AREA HOME BUILDING ONLY HALF OF 1965 PACE

(By Richard Corrigan)

Home building in the Washington area has skidded so drastically recently—due to tight money—that the outlook is now "grim" for a housing shortage and for possible unemployment in the building trades.

Statistics on building permits issued in Washington and its bedroom suburbs, compiled yesterday, show that building plans for the past three months are half of last year's.

September's figures show that the skid, which started early in the summer, is accelerating. The value of building permits issued last month dropped 60 per cent compared with September of 1965.

Since building permits are for future projects and most of the construction now in progress was financed last year, the slump is not yet evident to sidewalk superintendents or to most construction workers.

With many builders unable to raise money to finance new housing starts, because of high interest rates, the general forecast is for a further drop in building, which could bring on a shortage of new housing next year along with general unemployment in the building trades. Already there are reports of layoffs among some non-union men and of closings by some small contractors.

The outlook is "pretty grim," said a forecaster for the National Association of Home Builders. On the basis of the latest statistics, he predicted that the number of single-family housing starts for the area this year would be only 11,500 and next year only 8000. The 1965 total was almost 15,000.

For apartments, the NAHB official said the number of units would fall from 33,400 in 1965 to 29,800 in 1966 to 16,000 in 1967. Meanwhile, the Washington area population is growing faster than any other in the country.

The residential building permits issued in the three fastest-growing suburban counties—Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince Georges—all reveal a steady and substantial drop in single-family homes. The six-months totals from April through September were $32 million less than the 1965 totals.

A spokesman for the Suburban Maryland Home Builders Association said the drop is even sharper than those figures indicate. He estimated that in Prince Georges and Montgomery, roughly 30 percent of the permits are not being used because of the money shortage.

Apartments, which because of zoning questions, speculative financing and other factors are apt to fluctuate widely from month to month, follow the same trend.

Some examples of the slump, pinpointed by the statistics are:

In Montgomery last month, the value of apartment permits plunged from $11.8 million to $800,000. In the District of Columbia, they fell from $4.9 million to $300,000.

In Fairfax, the new-home permits skidded from $9.4 million in September of 1965 to $3.6 million last month. Apartment permits there are $11 million below last year's six-month totals.

The area's total economy will suffer from the construction cutback. Last year, during the summer, builders took out permits for $115 million in future construction. This summer, the total was $51 million.

The area's slump reflects a Nationwide pattern. The Census Bureau has reported that housing starts from March through August averaged 17 per cent less than the preceding six-months' rate.

Thousands of would-be buyers have had trouble getting Federally insured loans in recent months and lending institutions have been putting their money into other markets besides housing to get quicker and higher returns. The NAHB spokesman said money going into savings-and-loan institutions this year is 83 per cent below last year's figures.

Besides affecting construction of housing, the money situation here also is driving up the cost of used houses and some rental units. Loans are "few and far between," one mortgage banker said yesterday.

Houses

[Dollar value of building permits is shown in millions of dollars]

	Fairfax		Montgomery		Prince Georges	
	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966
April	$7.2	$11.7	$9.2	$6.2	$7.0	$6.6
May	8.8	5.2	6.1	6.6	3.8	6.0
June	5.8	7.4	8.6	5.3	6.9	4.4
July	9.5	3.5	6.5	4.2	4.8	1.1
August	5.5	5.3	6.4	4.3	7.2	2.6
September	9.4	3.6	4.1	2.5	4.5	2.5
6-month total	46.2	36.7	40.9	29.1	34.2	23.2

Apartments

[Dollar value of building permits is shown in millions of dollars]

	Fairfax		Montgomery		Prince Georges		District	
	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966
April	$5.5	$3.5	$0.2	$15.1	$2.3	$6.6	$2.6	$1.4
May	5.6	1.6	2.2	8.5	9.2	4.5	1.6	3.2
June	2.7	.7	8.0	11.2	3.9	22.0	9.2	5.4
July	2.9	.8	7.0	4.0	3.1	1.6	2.8	.9
August	4.7	1.9	5.7	5.3	2.0	2.2	3.4	1.3
September	1.4	2.5	11.8	.8	4.0	3.4	4.9	.3
6-month total	22.8	11.0	34.9	44.9	24.5	40.3	24.5	12.5

POSITION STATEMENT ON THE STATUS OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. BROWN of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the 89th Congress I wish to review briefly again the status of the Vietnam war, as I see it, and state my position on it.

Today our military position is essentially the same as it was 2 years ago. At that time the Saigon government was unstable and had been gradually losing

ground to the Vietcong. These losses continued through 1965. Efforts at internal political, social, and economic reforms to gain present support for the Government had failed.

The United States began a massive military buildup in late 1964 to save the situation. Premier Ky was brought from the South Vietnamese Air Force to head the Government. As of last February the United States has placed renewed emphasis on a massive program of economic and social rehabilitation. Efforts to democratize the Government have begun.

These efforts have succeeded in temporarily reversing the military deterioration, at an enormous cost in men and money to the United States. By the end of 1965, a year ago, the United States and South Vietnam position began to improve. We have again stabilized the war at a much higher level of involvement.

For a military victory, the war would have to be expanded still further. We would have to move from the current level of 400,000 men and $20 billion per year to 600,000 men and $30 billion per year. We would also have to move American troops into the heavily populated South Vietnamese Delta, now in precarious balance between the South Vietnamese Government and the Liberation Front. We would have to cut off completely the rapidly increasing infiltration from North Vietnam by putting a wall of troops across South Vietnam and Laos in the area of the demilitarized zone.

The United States has maintained a highly publicized position of willingness to negotiate while it continued its military buildup. Last December we initiated a bombing pause for over a month and sent emissaries to the far corners of the earth to explain our position. At the same time, we gave no indication of a change in our stand of not allowing any role for the National Liberation Front or Vietcong in a peaceful settlement.

Today there is a faint inkling of behind-the-scenes changes in the negotiating position of the two sides. These may lead to the conference table and an ultimate peaceful settlement. To hope for any sudden improvement in the situation would be extremely unwise.

For the past 2 years I have put my major emphasis on supporting stronger efforts at negotiation by the United States. While military force can prevent the collapse of South Vietnam, it cannot produce a stable political situation there. Only a negotiated peace, which recognizes political realities, and which is guaranteed by the great powers, can produce stability and progress in Vietnam—the goal we claim to seek.

This means we must give ground on our refusal to either negotiate with the National Liberation Front or allow them any role in the Government. The Liberation Front must give ground on their insistence that they are the only legitimate voice of the South Vietnamese people. Very small concessions on each side will permit the ending of hostilities and the beginning of realistic negotiations.

In my opinion we could have done this 2 years ago and saved the American people the $30 to $40 billion we have spent in the last 2 years, as well as several thousand U.S. casualties, plus preventing the untold destruction we have unleashed on all of Vietnam. But the past cannot be relived. By taking this course today we can save the American people the $50 billion or more that another 2 years of war will cost, with the associated rising casualties and continued destruction. And it must be added that there is not the slightest hope that this great cost would buy peace in Vietnam. It could be only the next step to a higher plateau of war, broadened to include the Chinese, as occurred in Korea.

The present military course we are following may bring a military victory, which should be distinguished from the peace and stability we claim to seek, but only at enormous cost. That cost must be estimated at around $100 billion, tens of thousands of American casualties, complete destruction of Vietnam, and a generation of American occupation, as we are still doing in Korea. The occupation and rebuilding will take additional tens of billions of dollars. In my opinion these estimates are realistic and conservative.

The alternative, which I advocate, is to recognize the National Liberation Front as a party to the conflict, negotiate with them as well as with North Vietnam, and provide a mechanism whereby the people of South Vietnam can determine for themselves what voice the Front should have in any future government. At a minimum, this means allowing the members of the Front to vote and to run candidates in an election, in return for a guaranteed commitment to refrain from terrorism and violence. The government so elected should have full power to reach whatever relationship it wishes with North Vietnam, which would certainly include the trade and communication which have been prohibited for the past 12 years. It may include, after a period of years, some form of federation or reunification.

I feel certain that an understanding of this nature will permit a cease-fire and the mutual withdrawal of United States and North Vietnamese troops. I would most emphatically include provisions for strong international guarantees against the further use of force in Vietnam, and all of Indochina. These guarantees must come from all the great powers, including Russia, and China, if possible. However, if China, refuses, the guarantees should be given without her.

The course I am advocating achieves American goals—self-determination and freedom for South Vietnam. It recognizes the fact that the Vietcong are largely South Vietnamese—more so than the Saigon government—and entitled to a voice in their own government, which they have never had. This course halts the tragic waste of American resources and manpower, and the horrible destruction we are bringing to all Vietnam. This course puts the United States back on the path of peace under law, guaranteed by the international community, as we have long sought through the United Nations.

This is my position, and one which I shall maintain.

DR. MARION W. PARKER

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a great public servant, Dr. Marion W. Parker, who died suddenly on Saturday, October 9. He was an outstanding official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture who devoted his life to American agriculture.

He was known well and favorably to many of us here in Congress, especially those of us on the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee before whom he appeared each year in support of the Department's research budgets.

It is my privilege to include in the RECORD a short biographical statement on Dr. Parker prepared by his associates at the Department. On behalf of my colleagues, I extend condolences to his family, knowing the pride they must have in his fine life and many accomplishments.

The statement follows:

DR. MARION W. PARKER, USDA RESEARCH ADMINISTRATOR, DIES

Dr. Marion W. Parker, Associate Administrator of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Agricultural Research Service, died October 8 of a heart attack while watching the Maryland-Duke football game at the University of Maryland. He was 58.

Dr. Parker was internationally recognized as a research scientist, particularly for his important contributions to the body of knowledge on photoperiodism, controlled environment, and the effect of light on plant growth. During the period 1936 to 1951 he published approximately 50 papers on photoperiodism or related subjects.

Dr. Parker was also recognized for his abilities as an administrator of research. Among his administrative positions with USDA were Head, Division of Rubber Investigations; Head, Weed Investigations Section; Assistant Director and Director, Crops Research Division.

Dr. Parker served as Director of USDA's Research Program and Development Evaluation Staff from October 1964 until he was named Associate Administrator of ARS in March 1965.

Born December 4, 1907, in Salisbury, Md., Dr. Parker received his bachelor's degree in botany at Hampden-Sydney College and his master's and doctorate in plant physiology at the University of Maryland. From February 1931 to June 1936, when he came to USDA, Dr. Parker was instructor in plant chemistry and microchemistry and assistant professor of plant physiology in the Graduate School of the University of Maryland.

Dr. Parker was active in community services. He was past president of the College Park Rotary Club; on the executive board of the National Capital Area Boy Scouts of America, and past chairman of the Southern Maryland District, Boy Scouts of America; Councilman, First District, College Park, and served four two-year terms as chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee of College Park; was a former president of Plant

Industry Station Employees Association; and a member of the USDA Welfare Association Board.

Dr. Parker served as a member of the editorial board of the Annual Review of Plant Physiology, was a member of the editorial board of Plant Physiology, and counselor of the Botanical Society of Washington. He was also a consultant for the Biological Division of the Argonne National Laboratory, Chairman of the Agriculture-Interior Weed Committee, USDA Representative to the Interdepartmental Chemicals and Rubber Advisory Committee, and Chairman of the ARS Training Committee.

A member of the Cosmos Club, Dr. Parker belonged to a number of honorary societies, including Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi, Phi Kappa Phi, Chi Beta Phi, and Omicron Delta Kappa. He was also a member of the American Society of Agronomy, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Society of Plant Physiologists, Botanical Society of America, Botanical Society of Washington, Biological Society of Washington, Washington Academy of Science, and the American Naturalists.

Dr. Parker is survived by his wife, Katherine H., 4504 Beechwood Road, College Park, Md.; a son, John C. of Derwood, Md.; a daughter, Mary P. Kern of College Park; a sister, Irene P. Todd of Salisbury; and two grandsons.

Burial was in Parsons Cemetery, Salisbury.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE PEOPLE OF FLORIDA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, made today before the General Subcommittee on Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, regarding H.R. 17248, the Fair Labor Standards Foreign Labor Act.

I concur in what Congressman SIKES, the dean of our Florida congressional delegation in Congress, has said about the impact of imports on the people of Florida. What is true for the First Congressional District of Florida is also true for the Seventh District which I am privileged to represent and a district which produces more citrus fruit than any other in the State.

The imports of agricultural products directly in competition with Florida's principal products have reached a substantial level. The study the General Subcommittee on Labor is making into the impact of imports on employment is important to all agricultural States. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has stated well the importance of the study to Florida.

Congressman SIKES' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT L. F. SIKES, BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REGARDING H.R. 17248

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate very much the opportunity to tell the Subcommittee about the impact of imports on the people of Florida, and especially about its impact on the residents of the First Congressional District of the State, which I represent.

Florida is a remarkably versatile State in the production of goods. In fruits and vegetables, seafood, and manufactures, Florida's production makes an important contribution to the economic growth of the nation. In each of these areas of our economic activity, mounting imports are threatening to disrupt markets, depress prices, and impair our State's potential for full employment.

Let me illustrate this disturbing fact with some specifics.

FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Florida is a leading State in the production of vegetables. Our commercial production of vegetables for fresh market of about 1.7 million tons per year exceeds that of the entire North Atlantic States, or the North Central States, the South Central States or the Western States, excluding California. The farm value of Florida's output of fresh vegetables exceeds $180 million per year. Our principal production is of lima and snap beans, cabbage, celery, cucumbers, eggplant, escarole, green peppers, spinach, and tomatoes.

Florida is, of course, the nation's leading producer of citrus fruits. The State is also a leader in the output of cantaloups and watermelons, and avocados. The citrus crop has a market value in excess of $500 million. The melons were valued in 1965 at $16 million; the avocados at about $2.5 million.

There are about 120,000 persons who earn their livelihood on Florida's farms. More than 10% of the State's farms and farm owners and operatives are located in the First Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

From these data, I think it clear that both Florida and my district have an important stake in the stability of the nation's markets for fruits and vegetables. Foreign trade trends in fruits and vegetables are of fundamental importance to Florida's producers of fruits and vegetables.

FOREIGN TRADE TRENDS IN FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

In 1958 the United States had a favorable trade balance in fruits and nuts: exports of $270 million and imports of $178 million. By 1965 this favorable balance of $92 million was completely erased: exports and imports of fruits and nuts were each valued at $339 million. The imports had increased by 90 percent; exports only 26 percent.

The story on vegetables is quite similar. A favorable trade balance of $25 million in 1958 (exports of $122 million, imports of $97 million) was cut down to $9 million in 1965 (exports of $148 million, imports of $139 million). Imports rose 43 percent over the period, outpacing exports, which gained only 21 percent.

Imports of fruits and vegetables directly competitive with Florida's principal products have reached a very substantial level:

	1965		1st 6 months, 1966	
	Quantity (hundred pounds)	Value (hundreds)	Quantity (hundred pounds)	Value (hundreds)
Watermelons	71,467	$1,324	234,258	$8,500
Cantaloups	148,662	7,529		
Other melons	50,917	1,870		
Total	271,046	10,723		
Citrus fruit	83,340	4,481	37,589	2,342
Beans, fresh	3,409	1,039	3,997	637
Cabbage	3,430	146	(1)	(1)
Celery	278	15	(1)	(1)
Cucumbers	75,776	5,267	64,125	4,919
Eggplant	5,344	433	(1)	(1)
Peppers, fresh	19,075	2,120	(1)	(1)
Tomatoes	268,967	29,925	320,957	47,616
Total		54,149		64,014

[1] Not available.

In these products of direct and immediate concern to the fruit and vegetable producers of Florida, imports are being received in 1966 at an average rate 136% above 1965. Imports of melons are up 59% by value at an annual rate; cucumbers, up 87% by value, and tomatoes' imports have leaped an astounding 218%. The products listed at the annual rate for 1966 (based on the first 6 months) have a foreign origin value of $128 million. With freight, insurance, duty, and importer's markup, these foreign fruits and vegetables would be worth roughly $250 million in the U.S. market—equal to about one-third the value of Florida's fruit and vegetable crop. This degree of import penetration of the U.S. market is alarming, and the implications for the welfare of Florida's workers very disturbing.

SEAFOOD

Florida has nearly three thousand operators and employees engaged in commercial fishing operations—more than any other State in the Union except California and Massachusetts. Nearly 200 million pounds of fish are caught annually by Florida's commercial fishermen, with an ex vessel value of more than $30 million. These fishing boat captains and their small crews are among the most rugged of that fast-disappearing breed of stalwart Americans, the independent individualist who pits his courage and skill against the challenges of nature to produce food for his fellow Americans.

The principal catch from the point of view of value is shrimp, and by a misfortune which many Congressmen have sought to correct, shrimp caught by foreign fishermen are imported into the United States in rapidly rising volume absolutely duty free. It would seem that those least able to battle cheap foreign products in American markets because of the limited financial resources of the small independent shrimp boat owner-captain are given the least assistance from their Government in means of import regulation.

Imports of fresh or frozen shrimp in 1955 totaled 54 million pounds, valued at about $25 million. By 1965 this had leaped to 163 million pounds, valued at over $100 million. While imports were soaring more than 200%, the domestic catch of shrimp declined absolutely, from about 122 million pounds (heads off basis) in 1955 to 121 million in 1965. The imports have taken all of the growth in the market, and the unchecked inundation of the American market with foreign shrimp keeps prices of the domestic catch generally depressed.

On the border of my district, the important shrimp port of Apalachicola struggles with this unending market disruption caused by the ever-rising flood of shrimp imports. It is a matter of concern to the nation, to Florida, and specifically to my district. The Government has deliberately handed the U.S. shrimp market to foreign commercial fishermen, and turns its back on our own people. Look deeply into the plight of America's commercial fishermen and you will find unfair foreign competition at the bottom of it all. Small wonder that in the nation the number of persons employed in Fisheries has declined steadily, from 263 thousand in 1950 to 212 thousand in 1964. The number of fishing craft has also plunged downward, from 92 thousand in 1950 to 76 thousand in 1964. There is a strong inverse correlation between this trend and the unchecked rise in imports of fishery products, from 640 million pounds in 1950 to 1.3 billion pounds in 1964.

MANUFACTURES

The largest group of Florida's citizens engaged in the production of goods consists of the approximately 220,000 persons employed in manufacturing establishments. More than 16,000 of these live and work in the First Congressional District. Manufacturing payrolls total more than $1 billion annually in Florida, and nearly $100 million of this takes place in the First Congressional District.

One of the principal industries in my district is the production of man-made fibers. The world's largest nylon plant is located in Pensacola, and nearby a separate plant is engaged in producing acrylic fiber. Thus the First Congressional District of Florida—and the State—have a direct stake in the textile import problem. The failure of the Executive Branch to act on the man-made fiber textile import problem is especially ominous in its implications for my State and district.

A few facts will suffice to put this problem into perspective. When imports of cotton textiles reached about 5.4% of domestic consumption, President Kennedy instructed the State Department to negotiate an international agreement providing for the regulation of the rate of increase of cotton textile imports. Other nations were told that if the United States could not achieve a negotiated solution of the problem, the President was prepared to act unilaterally. The Short-Term and Long-Term Cotton Textile Arrangements were quickly drawn up and with the consent of the nations principally affected, put into force.

The problem is much more serious now for man-made fiber textiles, but no action seems forthcoming from the Executive Branch. I believe that the Congress should legislate an appropriate set of import controls if Executive action has not commenced by the next session of Congress.

How grave is the problem? Well, for the 12 months ended June 1966, imports of man-made fibers, filaments, yarn, fabric and apparel, on a pound equivalent basis, were equal to 8.2% of domestic consumption of man-made fibers—nearly twice the degree of import penetration that existed when President Kennedy properly and forthrightly moved into action on the cotton textile problem.

The rate of increase of imports of man-made fiber textiles is astounding. On a square yard equivalent basis, imports of yarn, fabric, and apparel leaped 108% during the 12 months ending June 1966 when compared with 1964. During the first 6 months of 1966, for the first time in many years the United States suffered a balance of trade deficit in dollar terms on these products. It also sustained a trade deficit in terms of quantity on the primary products, staple fiber, filaments and yarn, such as are produced by the plants at Pensacola.

The products of the plants in my district are now right on target for market disruption, depressed prices, and job curtailment caused by unregulated import increases. There is absolutely no logic to a situation which finds our Government encouraging ever more rapid increases in imports, the dismantling of such limited regulatory means for imports as existing duty rates provide, and the saturation of domestic supply with imports in clear excess of the capacity of the market to absorb the supply.

The tremendous investment of capital which created the man-made fiber plants in my district, and the thousands of jobs which my constituents have been provided in these plants, are threatened (1) by the apparent plan of the Executive Branch to reduce man-made fiber import duties still another 50%, and (2) by the reluctance of officials in key positions to set in motion the necessary initiatives required to secure the negotiation of a long-term arrangement on man-made fiber textiles to smooth out the rate of increase of imports of the staple fiber, filaments, yarn, fabric, and apparel made of man-made fiber.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, you are to be commended for taking the initiative to set up the Subcommittee's inquiry into the impact of imports on employment. I strongly urge that your Committee report favorably H.R. 17248 to protect the health, efficiency, and living standards of our fellow Americans from the unfair competition of goods produced abroad under conditions which we refuse to tolerate in this country. Your bill should dramatize the serious loophole which exists in the Fair Labor Standards Act through which low wage, long hours of work foreign goods pour in, in a clear defiance of the standards of decency which the Congress has sought to secure as a minimum for all Americans.

There is no logic in inviting foreigners to perpetrate the social and economic crimes in our midst which we have sought so earnestly to eliminate by the Labor Standards legislation handled by your Subcommittee.

Thank you for your attention to my remarks.

WHEAT PRICES SLUMP

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there appear to be four major reasons for the sharp drop in wheat prices in the past few weeks. Cash prices have dropped from 20 to 30 cents per bushel in Kansas and other wheat producing areas.

President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman have clearly and repeatedly demonstrated their determination to keep the price of farm commodities low. Price depressing actions by this administration include limiting the export of hides, ordering the military to reduce pork purchases, dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat and other grain on the open market.

With specific reference to wheat, the four primary reasons for the price drop are as follows:

First. Sharp curtailment of wheat exports under Public Law 480, the food-for-peace program. Secretary Freeman has not denied a report in the August 2 New York Times or statements by Democrat Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN that Public Law 480 shipments would be reduced by nearly 25 percent.

Second. Another factor in depressing wheat prices recently has been the tampering with wheat export subsidies. The amount of export subsidies on wheat was always determined by what was necessary to meet the competition of other nations in getting wheat to world markets. There have been periods in the last month when the Department of Agriculture refused to meet competitive foreign prices. This has resulted in a sharp curtailment in wheat shipments to the west coast, for sales to Japan and other markets in this area. Tampering with export subsidies is discussed in the brochure entitled "1961–65: The Farmers' Worst Five Years," just published by Frank LeRoux, a $25,000-per-year USDA appointee, and a Democrat, who quit this administration on October 3 because of its antifarmer policies.

Third. Announcing increases in wheat allotments for 1967, of approximately 33 percent, without positive assurances to American wheat producers that Freeman and the USDA would not beat down the price next year by dumping Commodity Credit stocks.

Fourth. The overriding and major factor in the drop in wheat prices is the widespread recognition that the Johnson administration is determined to hold down farm prices as a means of combatting inflation resulting from vast expenditures for the war in Vietnam and further aggravated by the tremendous cost of countless multibillion-dollar Great Society programs. This policy has prevented farmers from sharing in inflated prices to the extent that other segments of our economy have.

It is strange indeed that when the price of bread advanced 1 to 2 cents a loaf, committees in both the House and the Senate held "urgent" hearings, but when the price of wheat drops 30 cents a bushel, not a single spokesman for the administration even suggests that Congress investigate the causes. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman continues to issue statements that market prices will remain strong, but at the same time does everything to weaken the market.

The USDA has become so consumer oriented that the American farmer, in effect, does not have a Cabinet-level spokesman.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

I know that many Members have recognized the indebtedness we all owe to our discoverer, Christopher Columbus, and I trust we will all join in this celebration.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy, the celebration of Columbus

Day was always one of the great events of the year. We looked forward to it with impatient eagerness, for Columbus Day brought out the colorful bands, the spectacular floats, the long line of parade marchers, the stirring music, the rousing speeches. Columbus Day was a treat for the eyes and a treat for the ears. And most certainly it was a treat for the palate, for there was always the home-cooked banquet, the triumph of weeks of skimping and arduous preparation, my mother's loving contribution to the festive occasion.

The passing years have failed to dull the magic of Columbus Day for me. The electric excitement remains undimmed, the intensity of expectation undiminished.

But a new dimension has been added with the passage of time. For I now look forward to Columbus Day not only for the colorful parades and the dashing music, the traditional speeches and the festive dinner, but as a truly universal holiday, when all mankind can reaffirm, in the memory of the courageous admiral from Genoa, the determination to press onward through uncharted seas in the undaunted search for a better life for all.

Let us resolve, on this Columbus Day, to continue on our voyage of discovery, in our quest for a greater tomorrow for all mankind.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the discovery of America on October 12, 1492, is something about which we have heard since we were children in school. Perhaps that is why we so seldom recognize it as among the most important events in the history of the world.

The circumstances of the end of that great first voyage of Columbus to the New World were dramatic. On October 8, the worried Columbus and his crews, out of sight of land and sailing on an unknown ocean for 30 days, saw land birds flying near their three small vessels. On the 11th, they fished out of the water a plank and a stick worked upon by human hands. That night, sighting by moonlight, a sailor on the *Pinta* saw white sand and trees behind it. Land at last been reached, and, on the 12th, Columbus set foot on an island of the North American Hemisphere.

One of our country's greatest historical scholars, Samuel Eliot Morison, has expressed his judgment of the importance of the achievements of Columbus in the following words:

> His four voyages—the first in 1492–93; the second, in which the Lesser Antilles and southern Cuba were discovered in 1493–94; the third, in which he first touched the mainland, in 1497–98; and the fourth, 1502–04, in which he discovered unknown shores of the western Caribbean—are the most important in modern history.

The magnitude of those achievements has haunted the imagination of men for centuries. Is it any wonder, then, that the latest evidence of the lasting renown of Columbus is the recent announcement of a new Meredith Willson musical called "1491," set in Spain in the crucial year before the famous first voyage. The author and composer of the musical, which will be presented in Los Angeles and San Francisco before being brought to New York, has said:

> My interest was awakened when I discovered primary sources that disclosed that the true life of Columbus was more exciting than the familiar, but generally false, textbook character drama by Washington Irving and other accepted schoolroom biographies.

Columbus was one of the great men of all time. Whether his memory is honored by musical comedy or the observance of Columbus Day, his fame is assured for all time.

I have introduced appropriate legislation in this regard. I am hopeful that Congress will act favorably on this legislation, making Columbus Day a legal holiday.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, we all share today with our many Italian-American friends in paying honor to that dauntless explorer and navigator, Christopher Columbus. Just 474 years ago Columbus established himself as our truly first "Italian-American." Since that day and with increasing fervor Americans have been commemorating that historical event.

I have supported our great Italian-American societies in seeking legislation to make this day a national holiday. I shall continue my efforts to secure for Christopher Columbus due and official recognition as the "Father of our Continent."

But even though this day has not been proclaimed officially as a national holiday, Columbus is being given great honor all over our land and simultaneously Americans are giving deep thought to the significance of this great day.

President Johnson in signing the Columbus Day proclamation said:

> Proclaiming Columbus Day is more than a ceremonial function. This event gives me a chance along with all my countrymen to reflect on the beginning of our Nation—and on the men who began it.

The President went on to remark that Columbus Day is a time for honoring not only the great explorer but all the Italians whose gifts over the centuries have been so freely given to enrich our science, our statesmanship, and our culture.

I am pleased that the President stressed the benefits accruing from the 1965 Immigration Act, for which some of us worked so untiringly and so long. We now find it much easier to assist our Italian-American friends in reuniting families than was possible under the old discriminating system.

I am sure that every Member joins me in paying tribute to our first immigrant, Christopher Columbus. I know, too, that they all join me in wishing the utmost success to the loyal and public service minded societies made up of those who so proudly claim Italian birth or descent.

I think it is fitting to call attention to the visit of a group of outstanding public officials from Salerno who are visiting various cities in this country. I know you will all join me in welcoming the following:

The Honorable Attilio Grimaldi, Minister of Communications and Transportation of the Sicilian Region;

The Honorable Giovanni Nigro, President of the Legislative Committee of the Sicilian Parliament;

Dr. Francesco Merendino, Regional Director of Transportation and Communications;

Dr. Filippo Jelo, City of Catania, Transportation and Communications;

Dr. Placido Bonaccorsi, press representative for the group; and

Mr. Vito Munaco, special assistant to the Honorable Attilio Grimaldi.

Mr. Vanni Montana, well known to many of us, is playing host to this group. I hope that all of them are made aware of the deep bonds of friendship which exist between all Americans and them as well as their countrymen. May they return home convinced of America's love and affection for all the Italian people.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, on Columbus Day the world pays its tribute of honor to the memory of one of the greatest men in history. Italians, and all who can claim Italian ancestry, are proud to claim Christopher Columbus as a kinsman. Spaniards and Portuguese, and the Latin Americans who treasure their links with Spanish and Portuguese explorers, take just pride in the Portuguese share in Columbus' study and training in navigation, and in the fact that his great voyages were made in Spanish ships, and under authority of Ferdinand and Isabella, rulers of Castile and Aragon. But in honoring Columbus, we pay tribute not alone to the individual explorer, but to the great army of discoverers, settlers, and pioneers who were inspired by his example, and followed his pathways across the hitherto uncharted oceans.

The name of Christopher Columbus heads the list of those who have fared forth boldly into the unknown, dreaming of lands and peoples yet unseen by Europeans, and carrying to these new lands and people the heritage of European civilization.

The stains of greed and cruelty and broken faith that marked the career of some later discoverers and pioneers left unsmirched the character of Columbus. Generation after generation, down to our own time, have been inspired by his contagious courage and persistence, just as were the captains and crews of his three little vessels.

When we look today at replicas of those three ships, the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*, we are struck with wonder that anyone should venture in such little cockleshells across even a known ocean, let alone an ocean whose limits were only vaguely guessed at.

Christopher Columbus, who brought the hemispheres together, doubling the size of the known world, was a man of flawless courage, indomitable persistence, and unshakable religious faith. It is good to look back upon his accomplishment, and realize that he had a character of comparable grandeur. Well may the people of the Old World and the new alike set aside this day on which to do honor to his memory, and set his example before our youth for admiration and emulation.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is heated controversy over recent claimants to the discovery of America, it is fitting that we should pause to honor the memory of the long established personality that historians recognize as the true discoverer of this hemisphere.

Christopher Columbus is rightfully credited with having done more than chart the new waterways to a new land. More so than perhaps any one other individual, it was his daring personal courage that enabled us to become the beneficiaries of western civilization.

His personal courage and farsighted vision were not deterred by the setbacks and discouragements of less adventuresome critics. And it is in emulating him that today's America continues to seek out and discover new frontiers.

The heritage which this son of Italy imparted continues to spark that adventuresome spirit which in our own days is extending the Old World's frontiers beyond oceans of space.

Christopher Columbus indeed not only discovered America, but lit a spark of American adventure that demonstrates confidence in man's wisdom and an abiding faith in the Almighty.

I join my colleagues in honoring this man's memory and the manly courage and spirit that brought him to our hemisphere's shores.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the memory of Christopher Columbus is a unifying symbol for us all. He it is whose achievement spanned the gulfs of ignorance and oceans that separated the hemispheres. He it is whose human courage and fortitude, whose religious faith and devotion, set an example fit for the emulation of every human being in the world today, of whatever race or nation, of whatever station in life or physical locality.

Columbus' triumph was a joining of imagination to logic, of idealism to practical good sense. Many before Columbus had thought and believed that the earth was round. It took the good sense, the courage, and the ambition that characterized Christopher Columbus to translate that thought and belief into action. The theoretical philosophers and mathematicians stayed home and figured out things, but took no action. The practical sailors hugged the coasts, and dreamed up fanciful excuses for not venturing into the unknown wastes of waters beyond the sight of land. Columbus, considering the roundness of the earth as proven, set out with all his energy and determination to translate his belief into action, and to reap benefit for all the world from his courageous persistence.

It makes a man feel that he stands a little higher, when he remembers that Christopher Columbus was also a man. There is an old saying:

What man has done, man can do.

We all have our unknown dangers to face, our counselors of doubt and distrust, perhaps even our enemies and detractors, as Columbus had. Looking back to his shining example, we may often receive some strengthening of our moral stamina, of our intellectual conviction, of our physical courage.

The fact of new frontiers before us today is sufficiently obvious. In the power of nuclear fission, man has unimagined energy available for good or ill. In our ventures into outer space, we begin to see our way to speeds that were thought impossible a few years ago, to distances undreamed of, and perhaps to other planets, habitable or even already inhabited. We see new breakthroughs coming up in various fields of science and technology, such as the conversion of saline water to fresh, the tapping of new sources of nutrition in the ocean, new ways of using and storing energy from tides, sunlight, atmospheric changes. While new and more thorough ways of killing are being developed for warfare, the arts of healing and nutrition make simultaneous and equally spectacular advances.

We do not always think of what Columbus did in precisely this way, but in fact his achievement was a great contribution to the peace of his time, and an example deserving to be followed in our thought and action of today. In his day, the trade routes to the East, which had traditionally been followed by the Spanish and Portuguese and other merchants, were continually beset and harassed by the danger of war, and frequently rendered impassable by actual conflict or conquest by Mongol or Tartar, Turk or Arab—or sometimes by a rival European power. The essence of the plan of Christopher Columbus was to establish peace by making war unnecessary. A trade route to the Far East by traversing the Western Ocean would, as Columbus planned it, avoid the ports and passes, the hostile tribes and warlike rulers, and permit the peaceful replenishment of European stocks of spices, silks, and the other goods obtainable from the Orient. Had not the unexpected interposition of a whole hemisphere between Europe and the Indies, on this westward route, aroused the rival cupidities of the powerful European nations, many of them already involved in an ideological conflict, his project might well have brought, at least for a time, the peaceful state of things that Columbus envisaged. And it did, undoubtedly, reduce the incidence of robbery and murder along the wellnigh deserted overland trade routes between Europe and the Far East.

We share today's celebration with many other nations on our two American Continents, the fruit of Columbus' discovery. We celebrate together with Spain, in whose ships and for whose government Columbus sailed. We celebrate with the city of Genoa and the land of Italy, where he was born, and with Portugal, where he long lived and married his wife. With these, and with all others who honor Columbus as a man of intellect, determination, courage, and religious faith, let us observe this day as a day of patriotic rejoicing.

We all share in the heritage of Christopher Columbus, whether by national and racial inheritance, by sharing his faith in and devotion to God, or by benefiting from his great deed that brought the two halves of the world together. In gratitude and in emulation, let us work to bring together within our nation those various elements that make up our population, and endeavor to build a world in which all men may dwell in peace and friendship.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the discovery of America by the intrepid Genoese navigator, Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, Columbus was a man centuries ahead of his time. His vision and his dream contrasted sharply with the prevailing views of Europe just awakening herself from the thousand years we know as the Middle Ages. At that time, Europe was divided into hundreds of tiny states each jealously guarding its own sovereignty. Against this backdrop, Christopher Columbus, under the flag of the recently united kingdoms of Castile, Aragon, and Leon, set sail east to the Indies. The result of this voyage was to make Spain the greatest nation of its time and, of greater import, to open up a new world where the teeming masses of Europe could build a new life for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as we commemorate the discovery of America, it is time for the Congress to take action on the bill which I have introduced to make Columbus Day a legal holiday. Today more than four-fifths of all the States officially recognize Columbus Day.

Mr. Speaker, Columbus Day has a special meaning to the millions of Americans of Italian descent. By honoring Columbus, it would also serve as a fitting recognition of the great contributions made to this Nation by Italians and by persons of Italian descent. It is only fitting and proper that we do this.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, as you know, our home State of Massachusetts today, October 12, is celebrating Columbus Day with full legal holiday conditions. It is appropriate at this time, therefore, that we here consider a new appeal for this date annually to be set aside as a national holiday to honor the man who discovered this great land of ours, Christopher Columbus.

That goal is urged in a special Columbus Day tribute to this famed Italian explorer by Anthony Cama, a teacher, author, poet, and member of the New England executive council of Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, in the Lynn, Mass., Sunday Post of October 9, 1966. So that the broadest possible reading of this article may be assured, therefore, I wish at this point in the RECORD to insert the text, together with a poem by Mr. Cama which accompanied the article in the newspaper:

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post, Oct. 9, 1966]

A MAN OF HISTORY, HE DESERVES TRIBUTE

(By Anthony Cama)

(Teacher, Author, Poet, and Member of the New England Executive Council of Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Penn.)

Columbus Day is a most memorable national event to honor the great Italian navigator and discoverer of the new world, Christopher Columbus. Born an Italian, he was destined to be forever the pride and glory of Italy and Italians all over the world! He charted the course for the old world to follow—an eternal flame of faith!

Let the dramatic voice of the whole world speak out on this Columbus Day, 1966. Let the words echo and re-echo from horizon to horizon from the tallest mountain peak to the deepest heart of the oceans.

The discoverer of this great new world was Christopher Columbus and he was and will be forever . . . Italian in body and spirit!

DISCOVERER

Every history book in America mentions Columbus as the discoverer of our splendid Republic. In the capital his portrait appears on the doors of the White House and the Capitol Building. As far as we know, 36 states have legally honored Columbus for his immortal discovery of America. In the crucible of the great struggle to make Columbus Day a national holiday, this writer is happy to present Alfred P. Adamo of Detroit, Mich., who has unceasingly spearheaded great battles in defense of Columbus as the discoverer of this new world.

He states: "We honor Christopher Columbus as one of the great souls that ever wore the clay of the earth about him. We honor ourselves by remembering to honor him. We can see backward across the centuries of the past, yet a few sunken mountain peaks just out of oblivion's sea. We can see through the telescope of time the historical horizon. We can see the great stars whose magnitudes are unabated thru the cycling ages. We can see among them Columbus. He was a man of faith. He acted by faith; he achieved by faith and he lived by faith. He became, by his faith in God, the divine instrument to blaze the pathway that marks the destiny of the centuries. He has brought to humanity a treasure house of God-given gifts beyond the wildest dreams of humanity." So speaks Mr. Adamo, who cries out like a stormy torrent . . . Columbus Day should be a national holiday!"

This writer has the singular honor to be a warm corresponding friend of the distinguished author and lecturer, writer and patriot, Peter T. Campon of Binghamton, N.Y., now 90 years young. This Italian immigrant has sparked a crusade of patriotism and enhancement of the Italian culture image that is beyond any parallel in our generation. He has been the recipient of many awards for his dynamic and dramatic lectures on Americanism and on Italy's contribution to the world. Just recently he was honored by the Italian government with the honor of "Cavalier of the Order of Merit of the Italian Republic." It was presented to him by Dr. Leopold de' Stefani of the Italian embassy in the office of the Italian consul general of New York, Hon. Vittorio C. Montesemolo.

Mr. Campon has traveled throughout this land inspiring audiences everywhere with his eloquence and magnetic personality. Recently, as he sat at the speaker's table at a Kiwanis meeting in Milwaukee, a man came up to him and blurted out; "I want to tell you that you have a hell of a nerve to come here on Ericson Day and talk about Columbus. (Oct. 9th is Ericson Day in Wisconsin). Mr. Campon replied that he had no intention of hurting the legend of Ericson. He told this story . . . of the chicken and the duck; When a duck lays an egg she usually goes to sleep. But when a chicken lays an egg the whole world is bound to know and to hear about it. And Columbus, evidently, was the chicken!

STANDS OUT

He continued: "However, I do somehow regard the claim of anyone who preceded Columbus as legendary because in no sense was there any actual contact established between the eastern and western parts of our planet until 1492. And we have since come to realize that the stream of human life which had flowed on for centuries apart, was henceforth to flow onward together, from 1492 forward. Assuming that Ericson touched Newfoundland, as it has been claimed because of a map, I ask, "What did he do about it?" Whatever claim is made of the discovery, I can only say that Columbus completed our world, and, while another gave it a name, the New World will ever be a monument to his memory."

States Campon: "In the American annals of history three men stand out, Washington, Lincoln and Columbus. The great Italian navigator might have lacked in formal education but he made up for it with his enthusiasm, determination and doing. In order to gain his end he knocked at the doors of several European royalties but was turned down. Finally his persistence was rewarded on April 17, 1492, when King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain agreed to subsidize his voyage. The signed contract between him and their Catholic majesties contained the provision that he was to become viceroy of all territories discovered by him and provided with other rewards, including an hereditary peerage and one tenth of all precious metals found within his jurisdiction. The lesson we learn from Columbus' life is that he was a man of determination. Although he was a dreamer he worked hard for the realization of his dream and succeeded. Result . . . the western hemisphere and the United States of America. Truly we can sing out unashamedly: proudly and fiercely . . . Columbus was an Italian! . . . Columbus discovered the New World. God bless America! God bless Christopher Columbus! There might never have been a Washington, the Maker or Lincoln the Savior and the Emancipator had there not been a Columbus the Discoverer!"

To quote another great Italo-American who has brought forth priceless documentary proofs of Columbus' discovery of this vast continent, so speaks, Giovani Schiavo, celebrated national and international scholar and author of numerous volumes on Italo-American histories. "No voyage in the history of the world ever surpassed in drama Columbus' plunge into the uncharted ocean. Danger lurking from every side, not only from the elements or from the mystery of the unknown, but also from the crew itself, superstitious and quick to mutiny, only a man with an almost superhuman character like Columbus could persist in what practically all his men soon came to consider a foolhardy adventure. But, had not Columbus possessed such an indomitable will, he would have not discovered America. God willed Columbus to weather the storms of both nature and men, amid sudden hopes and even more sudden disappointments, but always supremely confident of God's help and his own calculations."

RECORD OF GREATNESS

This writer calls on every Italo-American citizen, every lover of truth and of faith in the destiny of men like Columbus to rise up and to write letters and send telegrams to every senator and congressman that the nation make Columbus Day a national holiday. These words and this article are also directed to every Italo-American organization from the 150,000 membership of the Order Sons of Italy in America, to every large and small Italo-American group. Stand up and be counted. Stand up and be heard. The honor to Christopher Columbus is long overdue! The honor and tribute is not only for that immortal Genovese navigator and intrepid sailor of the oceans, but for the honor of Italy, immortal cradle and heart beat of the world.

Italy gave us her theme of freedom. She has given to exploration, a Columbus, a Vespucci, a Verazzano. She has given to sculpture and art, a Michelangelo; she has brought to painting, a Titian; she has given the incomparable Leonardo DaVinci; she has given to science a Marconi, Enrico Fermi, who helped split the atom; she has given to military art, Garibaldi; she has given to theology, a St. Thomas; she has given to education a Montessori; she has given to music a Toscanini, Caruso, Martinelli, she has given to the world a code of laws and the wonders of Roman civilization. She has brought forth upon this continent over 20 million Italo-Americans who have worked and sweated in every area of labor and business; whose forefathers have fought in every war and revolution of this land; from William Paca, signer of the Declaration of Independence and a chief justice of Maryland, to Philip Mazzei, political author and patriot, friend of Jefferson and Washington and Franklin; Paul Revere, senators like John Pastore, cabinet members like Anthony J. Celebrezze, Deputy Postmaster General James LaPenta, Jr., governors like LaSalle and Rosellini, our very own distinguished governor, John A. Volpe of Massachusetts, and for the 14 Congressional Medal of Honor winners who fought and died for this incomparable land of ours that it be perpetuated as a sanctuary for the millions of hungry, helpless peoples of the enslaved countries, victims of tyrannical communism and the ravages of famine and disease.

The incontrovertible record of this history cried out to America and to the world. Make Columbus Day a national holiday!

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—OCT. 12, 1966

(A poetic symphony in tribute to the immortal Italian navigator and discoverer of America)

America, the lovely virgin, slept
In fragrant woodlands, home of beast and bird,
Where faithful ages slowly, softly wept
To hear the stranger's resurrecting word.
And then he sailed in 1492
To open wide the gates for all of man.
He proved his faith, His dream at last came true,
And all the world had bridged the fearsome span.
Out of the Roman earth Columbus came.
The cradle home of Caesar, Pope and saint.
He vanguished fear and superstition's shame
And cleansed the mind of doubts' degrading taint.
Let all the world rejoice that happy day
And humbly thank the Lord for such a grace.
We must remember how to kneel and pray
For men had found a new and hopeful place
Oh, blessed land. You torch of freedom's flame,
Columbus gave his all to give you birth.
You should have borne his valiant haloed name
But fate contrived to change your history's worth.
The blossomed world now celebrates his date.
Columbus gave the blind a hope-filled sight,
And was the master of his destined fate
That all of men shall never fear the night!

—ANTHONY CAMA.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Columbus Day.

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

There was no objection.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. HALL. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate one of the great days of the year, Columbus Day. It is a day known to every man, woman, and child in America, and the name of Columbus is as well known as the names of Washington or Lincoln.

It is a day that will be celebrated by every American, but it will be celebrated most particularly by the sons of Italy, because Columbus was one of the great Italians whose lives have made the world's history richer.

It would be fruitless for me to recount to this august body the story of the *Nina*, the *Pinta*, and the *Santa Maria*, of the fantastic voyage of these three tiny ships out into the vastness of the Atlantic Ocean, beyond all known limits of navigation. It would be fruitless to tell of the despondency which struck the crew as they sailed on, day after day, into the unknown, or of the courage of the man who stood on the commander's deck aboard the *Santa Maria*. Most of all, it would be fruitless to tell of the final moment of unbelievable triumph when Columbus walked ashore on the soil of the New World. The story is too well known for me to repeat it here before you.

But there is a significance to this which we should all note. Columbus may have been the first Italian to leave a mark of greatness on this country. He is certainly not the last. The country that produced Columbus, that produced Dante, that produced Petrarch, that produced Da Vinci, and a host of other great men, has enriched America most notably.

There was Fra Marco da Nizza, who explored what is today Arizona; Francisco Chino, who laid the foundation of the great cattle industry in the Southwest; Enroco Tonti, who founded the first trading post in Chicago; his brother, Alfonso Tonti, who helped Cadillac found the city of Detroit; Umberti Beltrami, who discovered the sources of the Mississippi; Dr. Filippo Mazzei, physician and counselor to President Thomas Jefferson, who was instrumental in having incorporated in the Declaration of Independence the words "That all men are created equal."

These are men who might well be called founders of our Nation.

The men of Italian descent have enriched our lives in other ways. Right in this very Capitol you will find that nearly 90 percent of the art work, the frescos, the paintings, and the sculptures are the work of such men as Constantine Brumidi, Joseph Franzoni, and John Andrei.

They have shown their bravery in war. In the Second World War nearly a million men of Italian descent were members of the American Armed Forces. They have won 20 of the Congressional Medals of Honor—one of them by our own Gino Merli of the 10th Congressional District.

They have shown their greatness in other ways, also. When the first atom bomb was exploded over the desert at Los Alamos, and when the first bomb was dropped to bring about the beginning of the end of the Second World War, the hand of Enrico Fermi was a major hand in the building of these bombs.

I join today the celebration of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. It is an event almost without equal in significance in the history of the world. Out of this discovery eventually came the birth of the most powerful nation the world has ever known. But more than this, I salute all the other great men of Italy who have given to Italy, to America, indeed to the world, a wealth of adventure, of culture, of religion, of philosophy, of science. I rejoice that they have done this in the past. I rejoice that they are doing it today. Most of all, I rejoice that we have among us great Italians who will enrich America as long as she will last.

MAJOR LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, again at the close of another session of Congress, it is my privilege to report to you on the major legislative accomplishments.

Adjournment of the 89th Congress marks another milestone—the 16th year of my service in Congress, exceeding the longevity of any Member of the House who has represented South Dakota's Second District, and I am grateful for the trust placed in me these many years. The experience and seniority thus achieved has, I hope, proven beneficial to the district and the State.

I am mailing under separate cover a résumé of my votes cast on all important legislation this past session. Through my annual questionnaire, regular trips to the district, radio reports, newsletters, and correspondence, I have endeavored to keep in close touch with all of the people of the district, and I feel this voting record reflects the views of the majority of you good people in the Second District.

The 89th Congress produced much legislation during its long 10-month second session. Many of the bills enacted were the result of compromise between measures requested by the administration and modified by congressional action. In a number of instances, however, the 295 Democratic majority to the 140 Republicans delivered to the President legislation much as he demanded. I shall endeavor to cover the highlights.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

To provide additional revenue for the Vietnam war and domestic spending, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 was passed providing for accelerated corporate and personal income tax withholding. In addition, the act reimposed the 10-percent excise tax on telephone service, and the 7-percent excise levy on automobiles, both of which had just been reduced January 1, 1966.

Late in the session the House agreed to the request of the President to suspend for 16 months the 7-percent investment credit as an anti-inflationary measure. An amendment beneficial to South Dakota farmers and small businessmen was added in committee to exempt $15,000 of machinery and equipment purchased.

Once again the administration asked Congress to increase the temporary ceiling on the national debt. This time Congress approved a rise from $328 to $330 billion. This increase has become an annual ritual, since the budget has not been balanced any year since President Eisenhower left office. Interest on the debt now costs $12.5 billion a year, or about $250 per taxpayer.

VETERANS

More than 3 million cold-war veterans with a minimum of 180 days' active duty since January 31, 1955, are receiving educational and housing benefits under the Peacetime Veterans Benefits Act. College and vocational training is provided, with an allowance of $100 per month for a single veteran taking a full-time course. Home loans are guaranteed up to $7,500.

A cost-of-living increase averaging 5 percent was also approved for many veterans and their dependents.

DEFENSE

Final action on the defense appropriation bill was held up until the closing days of the session because of the controversy over the Senate amendment dealing with the callup of individual reservists. The compromise worked out in conference empowers the President to call up entire units of the National Guard or Ready Reserve without a declaration of a national emergency. Individuals not assigned to active units who have not served at least 24 months on active duty and have not fulfilled reserve military requirements would also be subject to callup.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been directly involved in the hearings and drafting of a number of important bills in this field, including the foreign aid authorization. We were able to cut funds in the final appropriation to $2.94 billion, the lowest financing for this program in 9 years. The administration had requested a 5-year authorization, but Congress refused to abdicate its authority in this vital field, and held the authorization to 1 year.

The Peace Corps was also extended and $110 million authorized for it during fiscal 1967.

LABOR

Of far-reaching effect is the law increasing and extending minimum wage coverage to 8 million additional employees. For those now covered, the minimum wage will be boosted from $1.25 to $1.40 next February, and to $1.60 in February 1968. Coverage will be ex-

tended to workers in retail stores, restaurants, hotels and a number of other businesses with sales of $500,000 or more next February. This sales volume will be reduced to $250,000 on February 1, 1969. Newly covered employees will start at a minimum of $1 an hour, with annual increases of 15 cents until they reach $1.60 in 1971.

As this is being written, the bill extending unemployment compensation benefits to 3.5 million additional workers is stalemated in conference. The administration bill would have ignored 30 years of successful experience with a Federal-State coordinated program by superimposing Federal standards as to benefits, duration of eligibility, and disqualifications. The House-passed bill permits an additional 13 weeks of benefits under certain conditions, and also raises the tax rate and wage base which are wholly financed by the employer.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Another Cabinet-level agency was created establishing a Department of Transportation to which are transferred activities in this field now administered by the Department of Commerce and the Federal Aviation Agency, and safety functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board and of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

CIVIL RIGHTS

After more than 2 weeks of debate, the House passed the Civil Rights Act of 1966, banning discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or national origin in housing and in the selection of juries. Much controversy focused on title IV, the so-called fair housing section, and when the measure reached the Senate, a motion to invoke cloture and shut off debate failed. Faced with the threat of a prolonged filibuster, the measure was thus killed for this session.

AGRICULTURE

A 2-year $5 billion extension of the food-for-peace program was approved, but I was greatly disappointed that the conferees initially deleted the provision to prohibit the subsidized sale of food to those nations that trade with North Vietnam and Cuba. As passed by the House, any nation selling or shipping supplies to these Communist countries would not be eligible to receive our farm commodities at bargain prices. I fought for this because I could not see how we could conscientiously give our food to countries shooting American boys. As this is written the matter has been returned to conference after the House rejected the original conference report.

Of benefit to South Dakota especially was the measure increasing authorization under the Small Reclamation Projects Act from $100 to $200 million for use in the revolving fund. We are hopeful a project in the Wagner area with great potential for truck farming may qualify under this program.

EDUCATION

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was extended for 2 more years after bitter debate over the issue of school desegregation.

Conferees are now resolving the differences between the House and Senate versions, but the authorization will be far in excess of the $1.75 billion requested by the President by fiscal 1967. The House authorized $2.18 billion, and the Senate $2.71 billion.

Also in conference is the college aid bill, and it, too, will probably be higher than the administration requested. The Senate version authorizes over $4 billion for 3 years, and the House earlier voted $2.9 billion.

RENT SUBSIDY

By a mere four votes, in spite of a 2 to 1 Democrat majority, the House restored funds to implement the rent subsidy program after the Appropriations Committee had refused to provide the necessary money. The program had been authorized last year as a part of the Omnibus Housing Act.

AUTO AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

In an effort to curb the mounting death toll on the highways, two bills were enacted—the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act and the Highway Safety Act. The $381 million in Federal funds are provided over 3 years for setting auto safety and tire standards and research for State and local safety programs. Starting with 1968 models, new cars manufactured must carry as standard equipment such safety features as head rests, shoulder harness anchorage, dual braking systems, retractable steering column, safety door latches, and additional interior padding. Safety standards for used cars would go into effect by September 9, 1968.

VIETNAM

One of the first major bills enacted this session was a supplemental military appropriation authorization totaling $4.8 billion to meet our military needs in Vietnam. In addition to the regular defense appropriation bill, it is expected another substantial supplemental request will be sent to Congress early next year to meet the rapidly rising costs of the Vietnam war. A $415 million supplemental foreign aid assistance was also enacted in March, with the majority of the funds earmarked for Vietnam.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

This measure was passed on the assumption that the American people have the right and the need to know more about the affairs of government. It clarifies and protects the right of the public to essential information and should help blaze a trail of greater truthfulness and complete disclosure of facts by our growing Federal Government.

PARTICIPATION SALES ACT

Congress gave President Johnson authority to sell $4.2 billion in Government-held securities to private investors. The proceeds from the sale of these securities goes back in cash to the agency involved, such as the Federal National Mortgage Association. This should help bring the budget for fiscal 1967 closer in balance, on the books, at least although it is using capital assets to help balance the 1967 budget. Although at the time of passage of the act the administration said the participation certificates would carry interest rates only one-quarter of 1 percent above the cost of Treasury borrowing, they have in fact been bearing 5¾ percent. I have, therefore, joined in the sponsorship of legislation to suspend this program.

FEDERAL SALARY ACT

An estimated 1.8 million Federal civilian employees were granted pay raises of 2.9 percent effective July 1, 1966. Members of the Armed Forces were also granted a 3.2-percent pay increase.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

Daylight saving time would become automatic in all States beginning in 1967 except when a State legislature voted to keep the State on standard time. "Fast time" would go into effect the last Sunday in April and remain in effect until the last Sunday in October. My attempt to amend the bill to strengthen State control by permitting a State legislature to exempt any one of its time zones was rejected by the House, included in the Senate, but deleted in conference.

POVERTY

Conferees are now working on the $1.75 billion antipoverty program which has cleared both Houses. An attempt in the Senate to increase this figure to $2.5 billion was defeated.

A GREAT FUTURE

We have been fortunate in being able to obtain appropriations not only to maintain and improve the many Federal installations in South Dakota, but to finance new projects and new programs as well. South Dakota's greatest development project, the vast Oahe irrigation unit, will be up for authorization next year. I have the assurance of the gentleman from Colorado, Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, chairman of the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee upon which I serve, that hearings will be started soon after Congress convenes in January, and he has assured me that, if possible, field hearings will be held this fall.

COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CHINA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for some months now, the irresponsible and un-American behavior of the so-called new left has dominated the headlines of our Nation's newspapers, giving the false impression to many citizens that most young Americans are contemptuous of American traditions and principles. While we all know this to be untrue and that the new left represents only the most minute percentage of our young people, the responsible activities of the overwhelming majority of students have not been widely publicized. After all,

there is nothing very dramatic or sensational about attending classes, studying hard, reading goods books, or engaging in seminars and discussions about vital issues of the day. Constructive actions by our youth on campus are not played up as much as leftist rioting, war protest, blocking troop trains, and so forth.

To balance the picture, then, I am pleased to report the formation of an ad hoc student organization which is concerned about one of the most important problems of this decade—U.S. policy with regard to Communist China. The Student Committee for a Free China has been created under the auspices of the World Youth Crusade for Freedom to disseminate information, sponsor meetings, seminars, and conferences, and to cooperate with and help stimulate existing student organizations.

As part of its campaign to present the facts about Communist China to the American student and the Nation in general, the Student Committee for a Free China has prepared a memorandum about the question of Red China's admission to the United Nations. This memorandum is one of the most closely reasoned and carefully documented studies I have ever read. It is sober, it is sound, and it is convincing. I recommend it to my colleagues and their constituents.

The Student Committee for a Free China is headed by David Keene, a senior at the University of Wisconsin, who spent this past summer in South Vietnam talking and living with South Vietnamese students and leaders. He has prepared a brief report about his visit to Vietnam and the reasons for the formation of the Student Committee for a Free China. His report, too, deserves reading and reflection. As Mr. Keene states succinctly:

The greatest single enemy of freedom in Asia is Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the Memorandum on Red China of the Student Committee for a Free China, as well as the report of its chairman, David Keene, in the RECORD following my remarks.

MEMORANDUM

Re: Report and prospectus.
From: David A. Keene.
To: Senior American Advisory Council, contributors and associates.

I have just returned from two months in Vietnam as one of the nine volunteers in the first pilot Freedom Corps project of the World Youth Crusade for Freedom. In addition to Vietnam, our volunteers worked in Free China; India; Australia; The Philippines; Singapore; Indonesia; Hong Kong; and Japan.

Our basic mission was three-fold: to meet with as many young people as possible, in the countries to which we were assigned, to let them know that the majority of American youth were anti-Communists; to learn as much as possible about the true situation in these areas so that we could report back to young Americans throughout the country; to lay the organizational groundwork for effective local anti-Communist youth action and—through the liaison activities of the WYCF—to provide the basis for coordinated anti-Communist youth action throughout the world. This was a challenging and difficult assignment. Great headway was made. You will be receiving a full and detailed report in a short time.

I learned a lot—as did all of us in the Freedom Corps. Now that we are back home again, we have the responsibility of making this knowledge and experience available to other young Americans on the campuses and in the communities of our nation. How to do this?

There is one thing that we all learned: the greatest single enemy of freedom in Asia is Communist China. It is Communist China that is supplying the enemy in Vietnam with guns, ammunition and trained Chinese officers and men which are used to kill young Americans and Vietnamese. It is Communist China that has spread its web of subversion and infiltration throughout all the free nations of Asia. It is Communist China that is the threat to the independent nations of Asia and the self-avowed enemy of our own country as well.

Since 1948, when Communists seized power on the mainland, there have been those in America who advocated policies of appeasement of Communist China. During the past 2 years, this advocacy has turned into a well-financed and well-publicized campaign.

Those who call for unilateral American concessions to Peiping seem to grow more desperate with each new defeat suffered by the Red Chinese in other parts of the world: when the Indonesians rejected Communist Chinese influence, some American church groups called for United States recognition of Peiping; when United States soldiers make any advances in Vietnam, some American business groups call for trade with Red China; when various African states expelled Communist Chinese diplomats and "technicians", some hurriedly-organized American academic groups called for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The Chinese Communists are losing ground everywhere in the world but in the United States. It is here—in our own country—that they seem to be gaining!

Two national organizations have recently been organized with the specific purpose of promoting appeasement of Red China: the National Committee on United States-China Policy and Americans for Reappraisal of our Far Eastern Policy. This latter group is of particular concern.

Americans for Reappraisal of our Far Eastern Policy was organized at Yale University early in 1965. It was set-up as a "student" group and aimed primarily at the nation's campuses. Through distortion of fact and the utilization of effective and expensive propaganda techniques—and under the umbrella of sponsoring professors—this group has begun to make an impact on the minds of young Americans. It is these same young Americans—the young men of our own generation—who will be called on to fight for their country wherever we are threatened. And if their minds are poisoned by the enemy, what can we expect of them?

After consultation with my Freedom Corps colleagues—and with various members of the Senior American Advisory Council—we have decided that the primary objective of the WYCF during the next several months is to make young Americans aware of the realities of Red China and of the great issues at stake. In order to concentrate our efforts on this urgent matter of consent, we have organized the Student Committee for a Free China (SCFC) as an auxiliary and affiliated group working with the American Secretariat of the WYCF.

Following is a brief outline of what we propose to do:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AFFILIATION

In order to avoid duplication of effort and volunteer personnel, the SCFC will be established as an ad hoc organization affiliated with the WYCF. By so doing, the SCFC will have the benefit of an already established and sympathetic constituency—including the members of the WYCF Senior American Advisory Council—and will be able to utilize returning Freedom Corps volunteers, and their overseas contacts for speaking engagements on campuses throughout the country. Administration and policy, during the first months of operation, will be carried out in consultation with members of the WYCF Senior American Advisory Council.

National headquarters will be established in New York City with three major responsibilities: raising the funds required to carry out an effective program on the campus; providing direction, material and speakers for campus activities; serving as a spokesman for what we believe to be the sentiments of the overwhelming majority of the American students on America and Communist China. These headquarters will also be used to consolidate and continue the international program of the WYCF.

CAMPUS ORGANIZATION

The SCFC has no intention of establishing itself as another permanent organization. Instead, we hope to stimulate existing groups, both national and local, who agree with our basic position to carry out specific campus activities in the area of concern, i.e., Young Americans for Freedom, Intercollegiate Society of Individualists, College Young Republicans, the College Conservative Council, College Young Democrats, etc. Therefore, instead of setting up campus "chapters", we have already begun enlisting campus "representatives" of the SCFC who will undertake to stimulate the following type of activities on their own campus in cooperation with already-existing groups:

(a) Meetings: Campus representatives will stimulate the organization of meetings, seminars and conferences, in cooperation with other campus organizations, to discuss questions concerning the United States and Communist China. These meetings will be provided with knowledgeable speakers through the speakers bureau of the SCFC. Films and film-tapes on the subject of concern will also be made available for such meetings.

(b) Participation in other youth conferences: The pro-appeasement forces have organized any number of conferences and seminars on the campus. All of these have been completely one-sided. One of the functions of campus representatives will be to demand full participation in such meetings so that our side can be adequately represented.

(c) Literature: Literature and informational material will be made available for circulation on the campus which will be prepared directly by the SCFC or will be made available for circulation by other national organizations.

(d) Public action: The student left has had a monopoly on demonstrations of various kinds. We believe it is time for anti-Communist students to enter this field—albeit in a more responsible manner. Whenever necessary, campus representatives will stimulate appropriate student action which will focus public attention on the issues of concern.

NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

As of this writing, our preliminary plans call for the holding of several regional off-the-record seminars under the leadership of experts on various aspects of Communist China. These conferences will be restricted to SCFC campus representatives and will serve to provide them with the intellectual and political ammunition required to carry out their responsibilities in an effective manner on their own campus. In addition to these regional conferences, we are planning a National Student Conference on China, to be held in Washington, to which college

newspaper editors and student government presidents will be invited. Representatives of all major youth organizations will also be invited to participate. This conference will be addressed by distinguished experts on China and will serve to educate and inform student leaders, who may not necessarily be committed to our point of view, on this question.

CONCLUSION

We have already begun to organize the preliminary stages of this undertaking. As of this writing, we have representatives on 67 college campuses. We want to emphasize again that the Student Committee for a Free China is not being established as a permanent organization. Rather, it is organized as the major project of the American Secretariat of the World Youth Crusade for Freedom during the coming school year. In addition to this work, the WYCF will also carry out other activities of importance, in the United States and throughout the world which, we hope, will merit your continued support and confidence.

We, who have undertaken this initial reface. However, the stakes are high indeed. sponsibility, are aware of the problems we As young Americans, we are deeply concerned over the inroads made by the pro-appeasement forces on the thinking of our fellow students. We believe it is incumbent on us to do everything possible to counter this attack on the minds of American youth with constructive action. We are ready to do trust that sufficient support will be forth-a job that must be done and we hope and coming to enable us to do it.

MEMORANDUM OF STUDENT COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CHINA

OCTOBER 1966.

To: All concerned.
From: Student Committee for a Free China.
Re: Background on the question of the representation of China in the United Nations.

The so-called "question of the representation of China" will again be one of the most heatedly debated items on the agenda of the 21st session of the General Assembly. It involves not only the position of the Republic of China in the United Nations; the basic principles of the Charter and the very future of the Organization itself are involved.

The vital importance of this question has been recognized by the majority of the General Assembly since it was first raised some 16 years ago. At its 16th session (in 1961) the General Assembly, in resolution 1668 (XVI), formally declared that inasmuch as the representation of China is "vital and crucial" for the future of the Organization, of China is an important question" within "any proposal to change the representation the meaning of Article 18 of the Charter. This decision was reaffirmed by the General Assembly at its 20th session last year.

UNITED NATIONS THROUGH CHINESE COMMUNIST EYES

Through the years, the pro-Peiping protagonists have made light of Peiping's official pronouncements or else interpret them in such a way as to mislead an already bewildered world.

There is no doubt that Mao Tse-tung aims at the conquest of the world for the Communist system. The Chinese Communist regime has repudiated the most fundamental rules of established international law and is in the grip of an ideology which imbues it with unquestioning confidence in the invincibility of its cause. Yet no matter how plainly Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts speak and act, there are always those who simply refuse to be convinced of the danger posed by Chinese Communism.

Recent events, however, seem to indicate that the real nature and goals of Chinese Communism are beginning to be better understood. In Asia, Africa and Latin America a greater awareness is evolving of the danger posed by Peiping. Countries which were, only a short time ago, receptive to Peiping's blandishments are now wary of Peiping's gestures of friendship.

There is also a growing realization that the seating of the Chinese Communists could spell the ruin of the United Nations as a potential instrument for international peace and security. The torrent of words and deeds from Peiping have made it abundantly clear of the grave consequences which would follow if the Peiping regime were permitted to occupy China's seat. A few excerpts from Peiping's official press will suffice to show this.

"The 20-year record of the United Nations provides proof that this organization is nothing but the tongue of the serpent—U.S. imperialism—for preying upon other nations. Whichever country relies on the United Nations for its security and development runs the risk of being devoured by U.S. imperialism." (People's Daily, 1 February 1965)

"The Khrushchev revisionists have deliberately been trying to cover up the truth and spreading illusions about the United Nations . . . The reason is simply that they want the United Nations to be a center for political transactions between the Soviet Union and the United States, and a tool for paving the way for Soviet-U.S. cooperation to dominate the world." (People's Daily, 25 June 1965)

A more grotesque distortion of the facts would be difficult to imagine.

Such being the Chinese Communist view of the United Nations, it follows that a "thorough reorganization" of the United Nations according to Peiping's specifications must be effected.

"The United Nations has gone from bad to worse as a result of the collaborations between the Soviet leaders and the U.S. imperialists to use the United Nations to oppose the people's revolutionary struggles. . . . How to cure it? First aid measures will certainly not do. What it requires is adequate clinical treatment—a thorough reorganization." (People's Daily, 26 June 1965)

"The United Nations has committed too many mistakes . . . It must be reorganized. . . . In these circumstances, another United Nations, a revolutionary one, may well be set up so that rival dramas may be staged in competition with that body which calls itself the United Nations but which is under the manipulation of U.S. imperialism and therefore can only make mischief and do nothing good." (Chou En-lai's speech at a banquet honoring Indonesian Foreign Minister Subandrio in Peiping, 24 January 1965)

This so-called "revolutionary United Nations" was to be set with Peiping, Indonesia and possibly Cambodia as founding members. In fact, it was due to Peiping's pressure on Jakarta that Indonesia withdrew from the United Nations. But this projected "revolutionary United Nations" never progressed beyond the verbal stage. Subsequent political upheavals in Indonesia prevented Peiping from translating the plan into reality.

STRATEGIES OF WORLD REVOLUTION

The stress on its role in the struggle for "national liberation" has been the unvarying theme of Peiping's declarations. The eventual objective, however, is the establishment of the Communist system on a worldwide basis through three basic tactics: revolutionary subversion and overthrow of all non-Communist governments; display of military might in order to gain recognition as a major world power and a model for revolution in all developing countries; exploitation of every conflict situation in order to create confusion and disorder.

In the developing countries, the strategy to accomplish the goal of revolutionary subversion and seizure of power follows two main lines of attack: support of local Communist Parties which, whenever and wherever feasible, forment revolutions to bring about a direct accession to power, alone or in alliance with whatever discontented or "progressive" elements can be exploited; alliance with national revolutions in "colonial" or "semi-colonial" countries in the struggle for national liberation. Both lines have been applied by Peiping in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In Indonesia, where a strong Communist Party (the PKI) existed, Peiping used the first line. With Peiping's support and encouragement, the PKI had long been prepared to take over the political apparatus of Indonesia. It was with this objective in view that the coup of October 1965 was staged. The coup, however, proved abortive and the Indonesian people have since turned against Peiping.

The Chinese Communists are firm believers in the efficacy of force and violence. "The key question in the proletarian revolution," said Red Flag (3-31-64) ideological organ of the Chinese Communist Central Committee, "is the seizure of state power and the smashing of the bourgeois state machine by violence, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the replacement of the bourgeois state by the proletariat state." "Marxism," it goes on to say, "has always openly proclaimed the inevitability of violent revolution. . . . The seizure of power by armed force, the settlement of issues by war, is the central task and the highest form of revolution. This Marxist-Leninist principle of revolution holds good universally, for China and for all other countries."

This is an elaboration of Mao Tse-tung's often quoted dictum: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." And this dedication to violence and bloodshed forms the core of Maoism. "The sacrifice of a small number of people in revolutionary wars," declared Peiping's Defense Minister Lin Piao on September 3, 1965, "is repaid by the security for whole nations, whole countries and even the whole of mankind; temporary suffering is repaid by lasting, even perpetual peace and happiness. War can temper the people and push history forward."

The world was shocked by Lin Piao's brazen advocacy of so-called "people's war." In essence, Lin stated that the Communists and their allies must first of all establish revolutionary bases in the rural areas, and then move to encircle the cities in order to achieve victory. "The countryside, and the countryside alone, can provide the revolutionary bases from which the revolutionaries can go forward to final victory." He made it clear that the Chinese Communists intend to incite a series of guerrilla wars in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America for a twofold purpose: to struggle against the "imperialists" in a national revolution; to complete the proletarian revolution by the overthrow of established governments.

"Taking the entire globe," Lin continued, "if North America and Western Europe can be called 'the cities of the world,' then Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute 'the rural areas of the world.'"

This nightmarish blueprint for world conquest is no new invention of Lin Piao. It has long been the central thesis of the Maoist strategy of world revolution.

PEIPING'S SETBACKS IN 1965

Responsible leaders in Asia, Africa and Latin America do not regard the "people's war" as an empty threat.

The present Indonesian leaders certainly are not complacent about the threat posed

by Peiping. Nor are the leaders of Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia. If the October coup in Indonesia had been successful—and it came close to succeeding—it would have been followed by an intensification of the "crush Malaysia" campaign, which was first formulated by the PKI with the approval of Peiping; Thailand and the Philippines would have been caught in a pincers; and the security of all of Southeast Asia would have been jeopardized.

Africa has high priority on the Chinese Communist agenda. Chou En-lai, in his speech at a mass rally in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania in June 1965, spoke of Africa as the region of the world "exceedingly favorable for revolution." Communist Chinese missions to Africa have been frequent and varied, and there have been generous offers of economic and technical aid. For a time, it seemed that Peiping had achieved considerable success in that important region of the world.

However, the Chinese Communist push in Africa has recently received a series of major setbacks. Its agents were unable to persuade Asian and African countries to accept their views on a number of substantive questions in regard to the second Afro-Asian Conference in Algeria. Their diplomatic missions have been expelled from Burundi, Dahomey and the Central African Republic. Their technicians have been expelled from Ghana. The Governments of Kenya and Tunisia have warned them against fomenting revolution in Africa. More and more African leaders are realizing that the Chinese Communists are in Africa not to promote stability but to sow the seeds of instability and confusion.

In Latin America, even Fidel Castro has turned against Peiping. He has accused the Chinese Communists of trying to subvert the Cubans "in a cunning and subtle manner." The very fact that they do not even hesitate to subvert a fellow Communist country is food for thought for the rest of the world.

Here is what some outstanding African leaders have to say about the Chinese Communists.

Former President Maurice Yameogo, of Upper Volta, said at a news conference at San Francisco International Airport, April 2, 1965:

"The case of Burundi is clear. As soon as the Government realized what was happening, they expelled the Chinese (Communists). Wherever the Communists get in, not only does subversion set in, but also a backward movement set in. I am one of those who are strongly opposed to such interference."

Mr. Yameogo said on another occasion September 27, 1965 in Upper Volta:

"We continue to oppose the CPR's entry into our country, because wherever the CPR is allowed to enter there is always trouble and confusion and even plots to overthrow the government."

According to a UPI dispatch (March 13, 1965) President Hamani Diori of Niger was quoted as saying that "Africans have been taken to (Communist) China and given training in Marxism, Leninism and military training." They then returned to Africa and tried "to teach the new doctrines with machine guns."

Dr. Kamuzu Banda, Prime Minister of Malawi, said on October 1, 1965:

"It is not only Chiume that the country is facing but it is in fact the Chinese (Communists). Chiume is a tool in the hands of the Chinese (Communists). The Chinese (Communists) are training Malawians for Chiume, some in Peking and others in Cuba and Algeria. . . . They will be sent back to this country during the rainy season."

After the downfall of Kwame Nkrumah in Ghana, further evidence of Chinese Communist subversion in Africa came to light. A broadcast from Accra (January 28, 1966) reported that over 30 local and foreign correspondents had visited a secret Communist training camp in Ashanti. The camp was staffed by Chinese Communist instructors who trained nationals from other African states in guerrilla warfare, the use of weapons, and the handling of explosives. "Asked why the Cameroonians are also undergoing such training, a spokesman of the trainees, Ballerino Anama, said that they were sent by the leader of their party and that they hope to return to their country to overthrow their lawfully constituted government through subversion."

President Bokassa of the Central African Republic said at a rally on January 7, 1966:

"After the coup d'etat, my Government and I discovered the existence of a popular army. We also discovered some arms bearing foreign marks and ammunition."

Dakar radio announced on January 21, 1966 that the Director of the Central African National Police had presented to President Bokassa "a pile of documents which were found at the former residence of the Chinese (Communist) diplomats who were expelled after the coup. These documents are illustrated leaflets intended to popularize guerrilla methods. Competent sources think they were to be used for educating the people's army."

The evidence is incontrovertible. It is thus clear that Chinese Communist subversion in Africa is directed not so much against the "imperialists" and "colonialists" as against independent African governments.

The Peiping regime has no more tolerance for the non-aligned nations than it has for the so-called "imperialists." It has tried to exploit the non-aligned nations for its own advantage but, when the chips are down, it has not hesitated to revile them for treachery and hypocrisy. Thus, when 17 non-aligned nations appealed last year to Peiping for peace in Vietnam, the People's Daily (April 23, 1965) charged that the action was inspired by Tito and went on to say:

"For years the Tito clique has pretended to uphold peace and maintain neutrality under the mask of non-alignment. In practice, it has been working as a Trojan horse for U.S. imperialism to undermine the struggle for the peoples for winning and safeguarding national independence."

India, the architect of modern non-alignment, was mercilessly attacked in connection with its dispute with Pakistan. Chou En-lai, in a speech on September 9, 1965, said: "India's armed aggression against Pakistan thoroughly exposed the Indian reactionaries' vaunted nonsense about their policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence."

The late Prime Minister of India, Shastri, and Tito of Yugoslavia, were smeared as "lackeys and precious pets" of U.S. imperialism.

THE UN-CHINESE NATURE OF MAOISM

The doctrines of Mao Tse-tung represent the most militant and aggressive form of Communism. Maoism is alien to Chinese culture and tradition; it is, in fact, at war with them. It attempts to break all the loyalties and beliefs of the past and to replace them with loyalty to the Party and to Mao Tse-tung himself. The un-Chinese nature of Maoism has recently been made clear in the antics of the so-called "Red Guards" who are out to wipe out "old ideas, old culture, old customs and old habits" and who plunged mainland China into chaos and turmoil. It is significant to note that the terrorism unleashed by the Red Guards has already provoked determined resistance from the masses of the Chinese people. Foreign observers in China have reported disorder in many localities—including such cities as Peiping, Tientsin, Canton and Tsinan.

Some of Peiping's apologists tell us that Chinese Communist aggressiveness is a continuation of the old Chinese imperial tradition. Nothing can be further from the truth. The Chinese emperors of yore did not seek to impose their administrative structure, their economic system or social order on territories outside China proper. Their control over other ethnic groups was for the most part shadowy and ritualistic. They never attempted anything like what Peiping has been doing in, say, Tibet—or, in fact, wherever they operate.

Tibet has for centuries been part of the Chinese Empire. After the downfall of the imperial Manchu Dynasty in 1911, the Tibetan people became one of the five great ethnic groups forming the Chinese nation. In theory as in fact, they enjoyed complete freedom of religion, they had their own system of government, and they maintained a social structure which was totally different from that which prevailed in China proper. In every sense of the word, Tibet was self-governing.

The Communist purpose in Tibet has been entirely different. They seek not merely political domination; they are out to destroy the Tibetan way of life. By means of terror and violence, Tibet has been transformed out of all recognition. The traditional cultural, social, economic and religious foundations of the Tibetan people have been razed to the ground. The "feudal" and "reactionary" elements of Tibetan society have been ruthlessly and systematically liquidated. The totalitarian Communist system has replaced Tibet's immemorial theocracy. What has happened and is still happening in Tibet can only be described as genocide.

Thus, the Chinese Communist goal is vastly more far-reaching than that of the imperial Emperors. It is vastly more ruthless and frightening than anything that European colonialism has done. Nor can this be accurately described as Communist "imperialism." Western imperialism, in its heyday, never attempted to obliterate the cultural and social traditions of the subject peoples. To call Chinese policy in Tibet imperialism is to underestimate its real purpose.

What has happened in Tibet has implications for all Asia—and the world.

THE MEANING OF THE PEIPING-MOSCOW "SPLIT"

Basically, both Moscow and Peiping adhere to the same Marxist-Leninist ideology. They both seek to conquer the world for Communism. In Stalin's day, the leadership of the international Communist movement was exercised by the Soviet Union. Other Communist Parties had to accept the dictates of the Kremlin with unquestioning obedience. Khrushchev, conscious of the dangers of general war in this nuclear age, tried to camouflage the Stalinist line and proffer "peaceful coexistence" and "peaceful competition." Khrushchev did not abandon the overall goal of world Communism; he only launched a new strategy.

The Chinese Communist leadership challenged this new strategy. The rift between Peiping and Moscow, which has come to a head since 1958, is a power struggle for authority to decide the strategy for the camp. As is inevitable in such a conflict, both sides claim the right to interpret the doctrine and to be the true repository of Marxism-Leninism. It is only in this sense that the split can be said to be ideological.

But the ideological aspect of the quarrel is no more than window-dressing. The substance is more strategic than ideological. Mao Tse-tung does not take kindly to the strategy of "peaceful coexistence," even though it is, in fact, neither "peace" nor "coexistence." He wants the international Communist movement to be more militant

and aggressive. He does not think that the Communist camp should try to live with the "imperialists," who are mere "paper tigers." He believes that "the East Wind has already prevailed over the West Wind," and that the days of the imperialists are numbered.

The removal of Khrushchev from the Soviet political scene has not in any way mollified Peping's anti-Moscow stand. Mao Tse-tung and his cohorts continue to carry on a bitter verbal war with the new Soviet leaders. "Khrushchev's downfall," commented the People's Daily on June 14, 1965, "was a signal victory for Marxism-Leninism. But it meant neither the disappearance of Khrushchev revisionism nor the end of the struggle against Khrushchev revisionism. As a matter of fact, the new leaders who have replaced Khrushchev are Khrushchev's old cast. They say they want to oppose U.S. imperialism, but at the same time they declare that there exist 'sufficiently broad areas for cooperation' between the Soviet Union and the United States."

The war in Vietnam has furnished the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party with an additional reason for lashing out at the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders are not only being attacked for their failure to give the Viet Cong and Ho Chi Minh sufficient aid; they are being accused of cooperating with Washington "to bring about peace negotiations in a painstaking effort to find a 'way out' for the U.S. aggressors." It is not without reason that Moscow has retorted by saying that Mao Tse-tung would not be content until he has pushed the Soviet Union into a war with the United States. Thus in a letter to other Communist Parties, the Soviet Party said:

"It becomes clear that the Chinese (Communist) leaders need a lengthy Vietnam war to maintain international tension, to represent China as a 'besieged fortress.' There is every reason to assert that it is one of the goals of the Chinese (Communist) leadership in the Vietnam question to originate a military conflict between the USSR and the United States. They want a clash between the USSR and the United States so that they may, as they say themselves, 'sit on the mountain and watch the fight of the tigers.'" (The New York Times, March 24, 1966).

Surely no one could have spoken more convincingly about the designs of the Chinese Communists than their comrades in the Kremlin.

PEIPING AND THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

In the light of the facts briefly outlined in the foregoing pages, it is clear that Peiping's promotion of war and violence, its subversive and aggressive activities in various parts of the world, and its disregard of every standard of law and decency, negate all the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. To seat such a regime would be to encourage aggression, to act as accomplices of the aggressor, to undermine the rule of law in international relations, and to undercut whatever claim the United Nations may have to being a moral force in this conflict-ridden world.

The Charter, in Article 4, lays down specific conditions for membership—being "peace-loving," and willing and able to carry out obligations.

It may be difficult to define and determine what is meant by "peace-loving," but it is certainly not difficult to know who are breakers and disturbers of peace. Even the Soviet Union is alarmed by the bellicosity and aggressiveness of Peiping.

As to obligations, Article 2 of the Charter reads, in part, "All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means," and "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat to use force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any matter inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." Peiping, by virtue of its ideology, is incapable of carrying out these obligations.

The Charter is the basic law of the Organization. When one or two members break the basic law of an organization, it may not prove fatal to the existence of that organization. But if the organization itself votes to disregard its own rules and standards in order to accommodate some lawless elements, it is starting down the road to its own destruction. It is hard to understand how some members of the United Nations who advocate the maintenance of international peace through world law can, at the same time, advocate brazen violation of the nearest approximation of world law that we have—the United Nations Charter.

THE SO-CALLED "RESTORATION OF LAWFUL RIGHTS"

But, it is argued, the question is not one of admitting a new member. China is already a member, a permanent member of the Security Council at that. The question is simply the "restoration of their lawful rights."

The fact is that China's seat in the United Nations is not unoccupied; it is held by the Government of the Republic of China which is a founding member and which, in the eyes of the Chinese people, including those on the mainland of China, is the legally constituted Government of China.

The Government of the Republic of China is no exile government; it is based on Chinese soil. The fact that it does not, for the time being, physically control the mainland, does not in any way affect its legal status. Nor does the armed occupation of the mainland confer any legality on the rebel regime in Peiping.

The criterion of legality is whether a given regime does or does not truly represent the will and aspirations of the masses of the people over which it exercises control.

China is primarily an agricultural country. Over 85% of its population are peasants depending on their livelihood on the produce of the land. Since the establishment of the Peiping regime the peasantry has been ruthlessly collectivized. Individual peasants have nothing they call their own. Since the "Big Leap Forward" campaign in 1958, they have suffered untold misery and privation.

Like all peasants, the Chinese masses are a home-loving people. Under the Communist regime, families have been torn asunder. The principle of "struggle" has been applied in family relations, and it is not uncommon for children to betray against their parents, wives against their husbands, brother against brother.

The Chinese people are being deprived of every elementary freedom—freedom from arbitrary arrest and from interference with privacy; freedom of movement and residence; freedom of opinion and expression, of conscience and religion; freedom to own property, to choose their work and to enjoy the fruits of their labor.

The Communist regime has kept itself in power by bloody purges and by unlimited terror and ceaseless intimidation. In the name of class struggle, millions have been liquidated. The purpose has been to eliminate all elements of society who, in the Communist view, constitute a threat or potential threat to the regime.

The Communist regime does not have the support of the masses of the Chinese people. To seat this regime in the United Nations would be to put the stamp of acceptance on tyranny and oppression, to give it an aura of legitimacy, and to tell the suffering Chinese masses that the world community is accepting their subjugation. This would be to fly in the face of one of the basic purposes of the United Nations, namely, to promote and encourage "respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all."

RECENT PURGES AND THE BANKRUPTCY OF MAOISM

The regime's sense of insecurity is such that it has lately felt it necessary to wage a nation-wide campaign against "anti-Party" and "anti-Socialist" elements within the ranks of the Chinese Communist Party. This has been carried out in the name of a "cultural revolution." The first victims of the purge have been writers and workers in the cultural and educational fields. The avowed purpose has been to root out the "remnants of bourgeois ideology" which has been "poisoning" the minds of the masses and which is "antagonistic to Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung." These elements are said to be "more dangerous than open enemies because they oppose the red flag with a red flag, and Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung under the cloak of Marxism-Leninism and the thought of Mao Tse-tung." (Liberation Army Daily, June 7, 1966)

Among the victims of the cultural purge are some of the leading intellectual ornaments of the regime. They have been accused of using "various covert and devious means to propagate bourgeois and revisionist ideas" in the media of mass communication. They have even been condemned for "plotting restoration."

Thus, after 17 years of unremitting indoctrination and repression, the regime is still quite unsure of itself. Guilt-ridden by awareness of their own crimes, Mao Tse-tung and his gang labor under special fears. Themselves masters of intrigue and duplicity, they know better than any others, that even a relatively small group of "internal enemies," given propitious conditions, can overturn a seemingly impregnable system. It is not without reason that they are in constant dread of being effectively plotted against. It is not without reason that they regard the current purge as "a life-and-death struggle between the bourgeoisie plotting for restoration and the proletariat fighting against such restoration." (People's Daily, June 6, 1966.)

The purge has been extended to the schools and universities. Lu P'ing, President of Peking University, has been dismissed on the ground that he and his professors have failed in the task of arming the students with Mao's ideas and of "cultivating successors to the cause of the proletarian revolution." Kuang Ya-ming, President of Nanking University, has met with a similar fate; he has been accused of trying to "divert the serious class struggle of the great cultural revolution and to conceal the black anti-Party and anti-Socialist line." Thus, the universities are no longer institutions of higher learning; they have become battle-grounds in the class struggle.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party and the State Council of the regime issued on June 13, 1966 an order postponing all admissions to colleges and universities for six months in order to "insure the thorough and successful carrying through of the cultural revolution." Entrance examinations are to be abolished. Admission is to be based not on the basis of scholastic aptitude but on the basis of political reliability. Special consideration is to be given to "revolutionary young people from among the workers, peasants and soldiers."

The impact of the purge has been felt in political and military circles as well. Among the prominent political and military leaders who have fallen victim are Peng Ch'in, Mayor of Peiping and a leading Member of the

Politburo; Lo Jui-ching, Chief of the General Staff and ex-Chief of the Secret Police; Lu Ting-i, Vice Premier and Minister of Culture; and Chou Yang, Vice Minister of Culture. Even so exalted a personage as Liu Shao-chi, who has until very recently been looked upon as the most likely successor to Mao Tse-tung, has become the target of veiled attacks. "If a person acts against the thought of Mao Tse-tung, regardless of how high his position is and what kind of 'authority' he may be," declared an article published in the Liberation Army Daily, "we must expose him, bring him to light and refute him till he stinks . . . Those who oppose the thought of Mao Tse-tung will be destroyed by our whole Party and denounced by the whole country." (Reproduced in People's Daily, June 6, 1966.)

The current purge has been interpreted by foreign observers as a struggle for succession. It is much more than that. It is the outward manifestation of a gigantic clash between rival groups of men over domestic and foreign policies. Judging by the role he has played, Lin Piao seems to be the prime mover of this purge. He is presently riding high. But the end of the struggle is not yet in sight. There is no telling what eventually might happen. The fact that the anti-Party and anti-Socialist deviation has even penetrated the highest echelons of the Party indicates that the regime is faced with a crisis of unprecedented magnitude.

THE ARGUMENT OF "UNIVERSALITY" AND "REALISM"

The so-called "principle of universality" has been much resorted to as one of the principal arguments for seating the Peiping regime in the United Nations. Whatever may be the merit of this principle, it is certainly not a principle of the Charter. Indeed, at San Francisco in 1945, the concept of "universality" was substantially discussed and was rejected.

The framers of the Charter never intended to make the Organization universal; on the contrary, they sought to create a union of "like-minded" states in which members were expected to be motivated by common purposes. The Charter does not provide for universality. Article 4, providing conditions for admission to membership; Article 5, providing for the suspension of membership; and Article 6, providing for the expulsion of a Member State for persistent violation of Charter principles—all testify to a principle of selectivity rather than of automatic universality.

Universality of membership may be a desirable goal toward which the United Nations should move. But this does not mean, and should not mean, that vital principles of the Charter should be compromised and even abandoned in order to accommodate a regime which is under indictment by the United Nations as an aggressor in Korea, which violates every rule of international law, which makes violence and war its instrument of policy, and which has shown nothing but contempt for the Organization itself.

There is another familiar argument which is used: the existence of the Communist regime is an incontrovertible fact and it would be unrealistic to ignore it.

No one has ignored it. It is precisely because the Peiping regime is known to be a dangerous fact that it must be excluded from the United Nations. The strength of the United Nations lies in its moral authority. To take away this moral essence is to reduce it to a hollow shell. The "realist" of the 1930's mocked at the moral principles written into the Covenant of the League of Nations, and they paid a high price for their mockery. The United Nations, this second experiment in international cooperation, is still a fragile institution. It must not be allowed to go the way of the League of Nations.

The champions of the Chinese Communist cause are in the habit of shedding crocodile tears for the Chinese people who, they say, though more than 600 million strong, are not even represented in the United Nations. The Chinese people have no reason to be grateful to anyone who is bent on giving aid and comfort to their oppressors.

The "realists" are not unaware of the bellicosity of the Chinese Communist leaders. But they attribute this to the "isolation" in which Peiping now finds itself. They contend that once inside the United Nations, the regime would be exposed to the civilizing, restraining influence of the world community and would in time become less aggressive and more cooperative.

The Chinese Communists would be the first to challenge the validity of this argument. They categorically deny that they are isolated. Chen Yi, Peiping's Vice Premier and Foreign Minister, said on May 4, 1966, at a reception in Peiping:

"I, as the Foreign Minister of China, have not the slightest feeling of isolation . . . It is the U.S. imperialism and the reactionaries of various countries who have really become isolated. We see the question whether one is isolated or not from the standpoint of the masses of the people of the world. China has received sympathy and support from the people of the world . . . and has established diplomatic relations with 49 countries and economic, trade and cultural relations of friendship with more than 100 countries and regions . . . Our friends are all over the world."

It is clear that Peiping would not join the United Nations to help make it an effective instrument for the maintenance of international peace and for the pacific settlement of disputes. Its purpose for joining would be twofold: to transform the United Nations into an instrument of its own policy or, failing that, to hamper and obstruct its functioning.

PROPONENTS OF EXPEDIENCY

There is still another school of thought which gives top priority to expediency. They say that in this nuclear age the reduction of international tension must be the first consideration. Granting that the Chinese Communists are as intractable as they are said to be, they must nonetheless be admitted. It is less dangerous to have them inside the United Nations than outside the Organization. Moreover, without them many of the vital and crucial problems facing the world organization, problems affecting war and peace of the world, will not be resolved. Their presence is thus necessary and urgent. Whether they are qualified for membership or not under the Charter does not really matter.

Although the proponents of expediency do not say so, it is obvious that they are for the seating of the Chinese Communists unconditionally, Charter or no Charter.

It is fantastic that members of the United Nations who have solemnly pledged themselves to uphold the Charter can at the same time urge complete disregard of it.

It is difficult to see how the presence of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations could help resolve the problems with which the United Nations is confronted. One such problem is the war in South Vietnam. The United Nations has been approached by the United States and other powers to seek some sort of peaceful and just settlement. The efforts of the Secretary-General have been met with insults and arrogance from Peiping. The Secretary-General has been called a "political broker" for Washington who has "knocked at the wrong door." The appeal of the 17 nonaligned members of the United Nations has been summarily dismissed as the machinations of the "Tito clique." There is no reason to believe that as a member of the United Nations, the Peiping regime would be more amenable to reason.

Another urgent problem is disarmament. The wishful thinkers are forever saying that unless Peiping is a member of the United Nations and participates in the disarmament talks no agreement can be reached. But the fact is that Peiping wants no disarmament. It has repeatedly declared that it is "nonsensical and totally unrealistic" to talk about disarmament before "mankind has eradicated the system of imperialism-capitalism" from the world; that is to say, until Communism has triumphed all over the globe. The United Nations, it went on to say, is "absolutely incapable of settling the disarmament question or any other major international issues." (People's Daily, January 14, 1965)

Such being the Chinese Communist attitude toward disarmament talks, how can anyone expect them to contribute constructively to the whole question of reduction of armaments?

Peiping regards itself as a great power. It has assiduously tried to condition the world into believing that its military might is invincible. Its explosion of a third atomic bomb has helped to deepen that impression. But its embryonic nuclear capability has more of a political and propaganda value than a military one. Indeed, it is on the political significance of its bomb that the regime has laid its major emphasis. It has attempted to use the explosions to raise the morale and militancy of the revolutionary forces throughout the world, and to convince them of its continuing determination and increased ability to support the subversive forces in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It has blasted the "revisionist leading group of the Soviet Union" which, "in collusion with U.S. imperialism, is actively engineering a treaty on the 'prevention of nuclear proliferation' so as to maintain their nuclear monopoly, intimidate the oppressed nations and peoples and realize its dream of world domination through Soviet-U.S. collaboration." (Chou En-lai on Peiping's Third Nuclear Test, May 10, 1966)

APPEASEMENT NO ROAD TO PEACE

Weariness with the recurrent conflict of our time and fear of nuclear war have engendered a yearning for normalcy and a craving for final and formal settlements. Some world leaders seem ready to buy peace at any price. They are prepared to go to all lengths to appease Peiping. The free world has thus exposed itself as a ready, vulnerable and profitable target for blackmail.

Proponents of appeasement assess Peiping's intentions and ambitions in terms of their own reasoning. Just because they are anxious for normalcy and settlement, they believe Peiping must desire the same. Nothing could be more incorrect. Conflict to the bitter end is the stuff from which Communism, particularly the Maoist brand, draws its very sustenance. Maoism thrives on crisis. If there are no crises, they must be created. The last thing the Chinese Communists want are conclusive settlements.

This does not necessarily mean that Peiping wants to involve itself in a war with the United States. Such a war would endanger its very existence. The self-imposed limits set by the United Nations forces in Korea rescued Mao Tse-tung from the horns of a dilemma; either defeat or retreat with loss of face. Thanks to the military impositions applied on U.N. Forces, Mao was able to claim a victory. In Vietnam there are no such limits as yet. This accounts for the fact that, for all its bluster and bellicosity, Peiping has refrained from direct military embroilment. This is another proof

that the language Peiping understands is not that of logic and reason but that of force. The danger of appeasement is that it may mislead the Chinese Communist leaders into believing that the world has neither the will nor the courage to face up squarely to their aggressions, direct or indirect, open or camouflaged. This could encourage them to embark on more and more dangerous courses of action until a time when there remains no tolerable alternative to war.

The Maoist strategy of protracted conflict seeks to avoid a general, direct and decisive encounter with the enemy until overwhelming physical superiority, sufficient to ensure the enemy's complete destruction, has been acquired. This, however, does not mean that the Chinese Communists will not do everything possible to push other contenders into war, so that (as has been made clear by the letter of the Soviet Communist Party already quoted), "they may sit on the mountain and watch the fight of the tigers," thus reaping the benefit of the conflict without danger to themselves.

In order to avoid direct military encounter, the Chinese Communists have placed the fullest possible reliance upon indirect, irregular and unconventional methods of attack—infiltration, subversion, promotion of guerrilla warfare and insurrection in vulnerable regions.

Recent setbacks have not daunted them in this enterprise. Indeed, they do not regard these setbacks as anything unusual. In revolutions there are bound to be ups and downs, rising tides and ebbing tides. Temporary setbacks may well be preludes to new upsurges. The actions taken by African leaders to check Communism have been attributed to the "counter-offensive" set in motion by the "imperialists and old and new colonialists headed by the United States" who, according to the People's Daily of May 6, 1966, "are attacking to regain their privileged colonial positions" and are "desperately maneuvering to stage a comeback and reshackle the African peoples." The paper added:

"On the surface these counter-attacks appear weighty, but in actuality they represent the important deathbed struggles of the imperialists and colonialists. Their efforts are only rousing the African peoples to greater awareness and strengthening their fight against the imperialists and colonialists."

Thus, the Chinese Communists have no intention to put a stop to their promotion of revolution and instability in Africa. Their revolutionary activities will in all probability be increased and intensified as time goes on. Lin Piao's "people's war" is no mere empty threat. It will be used, in Africa as in other parts of the world, whenever and wherever it is feasible.

Admission to membership in the United Nations would further convince Peiping of the invincibility of Maoism and encourage it, not only to redouble its subversive activities in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but to carry out its strategy of protracted conflict with the United Nations itself.

ALL THE NEWS THAT'S FIT TO TINT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Allen Drury, the celebrated novelist whose recent book "Capable of Honor" deals with bias in the national press, refers obliquely in that book to the New York Times as "The greatest publication that absolutely ever was." Drury is being sarcastic, but it is true that the Times tries to perpetuate itself as the world's greatest publication by advertising immodestly on its front page "All the News That's Fit To Print."

A story in the October 10 edition of that newspaper under the byline of John Herbers has convinced me that the tagline should be changed to: "All the News That's Fit To Tint." Mr. Herbers' story had a three column headline which read: "GOP Moderates Call for 'Rebirth' of the Party." In 15 column inches of type, he reviews the paperback book recently published by the Ripon Society entitled "From Disaster to Distinction: The Rebirth of the Republican Party." I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Herbers' article at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Oct., 10, 1966]

GOP MODERATES CALL FOR "REBIRTH" OF THE PARTY—RIPON SOCIETY BOOK CRITICAL OF A LACK OF DIRECTION—URGES APPEAL TO THE YOUNG WHO REMEMBER KENNEDY

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, October 9.—The Ripon Society, a group of young Republicans who call themselves moderates, have taken a look at their national party two years after the great defeat of 1964 and found it totally unprepared for "the new order of American politics."

This evaluation is contained in a 126-page paperback entitled "From Disaster to Distinction: The Rebirth of the Republican Party."

The rebirth, the authors say, is yet to take place and, like Lincoln, they invite "all the shrewd, wild boys about town" to help start the process.

The society, organized on the campus of Harvard University in 1963, is composed mostly of students in the Boston area. Its name is derived from Ripon, Wis., one of several cities that claim to be the birthplace of the Republican party. The president of the society is Dr. John S. Saloma 3d, a professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

According to the authors, the national party's chief mistake since 1964 has been to try to achieve unity without developing an ideology. They point out that Ray C. Bliss, the chairman, has "diverted the party's attention from ideological strife, concentrating it instead on organization and precinct politics."

As a result, the society says, the Republicans are a party "without direction" at a time when a new order in politics is about to usher in new issues, new ideas and even a new vocabulary.

The nature of what the society thinks the party ought to be is contained in its definition of a "moderate" who would provide the leadership:

"The moderate chooses the center, the middle road, not because it is halfway between left and right," the society says. "He is more than a nonextremist. He takes this course since it offers him the greatest possibility for constructive achievement."

The moderate, the society says, rejects the simple solutions and "cries out that such solutions do not exist."

It continues:

"The moderate holds the greatest danger for the extremist because he holds the truth and there is no absolute 'truth' that can make the complexities of man and his society simple.

"It is time to put away the tired old notion that to be 'real Republicans' we must be as different as possible from our opponents. If we let the Democrats pre-empt good positions on every issue while we simply react, then we are doomed to continuing futility."

The new party, the society says, must appeal to a younger generation that "remembers John F. Kennedy and cannot quite believe in Lyndon Johnson."

The new generation of voters, it says, "is waiting, searching for something it does not yet see. It is eager, receptive."

In addition to the young, according to the society, the new party must appeal to Negroes, urban voters, the burgeoning middle class and technicians.

"Republicans," the society says, "must leave behind the meaningless arguments of conservatism versus liberalism, public versus private, business versus labor, hard line versus soft line and come to terms with the truly new challenges."

To achieve this, the book says, the party must have an influx of new blood. It quoted from a letter that Lincoln wrote as a young Congressman to a supporter in Springfield, Ill., urging him to "gather up all the shrewd, wild boys about town" to help in politics.

"We believe that Lincoln also wrote that letter to us," the book says.

The Ripon Society, as many of my Republican colleagues know too well, is for the most part composed of a handful of college students who are being egged on by their liberal leaders to help shape a liberal Republican takeover of the GOP. They have been notably unsuccessful in trying to sell their nonphilosophy of "Amorphous Moderation" to any bona fide Republican organization. Their pronouncements, unfortunately, are given all the dignity of a major GOP policy statement in our Nation's most established newspapers. Thanks to plenty of money and the services of a talented public relations professional, the disorganized ramblings of their position papers and newsletters have been seriously reported in nationally syndicated columns and on the front pages of big metropolitan dailies.

National polls show that today 25 percent of all Americans consider themselves to be Republicans. While I deplore the fact that the GOP is a minority party, it would still seem that 25 percent is a very large proportion of the reading public. Would it not be fair to expect "the greatest publication that absolutely ever was" to present other views on the future of the Republican Party, views opposed to the destructive criticism of the Ripon Society?

In all fairness, I think any large daily newspaper has an obligation to do so. And yet, Mr. Herbers' story and a column by Mr. Thomas O'Neill of the Baltimore Sun on October 9 reviewed the Ripon paperback with no indication that a dissenting theory existed.

Of course, this is not the first time members of our party have noticed this lopsided view in the press. Ever since 1963, when the Ripon Society came into existence, news coverage of their activities has far outstripped their reputations within the GOP. For this reason, I felt that an exposé of the methods of this

little group, which seeks to take over and make over my party, was in order. Accordingly, I asked that such a study be undertaken by the staff of the American Conservative Union, an organization of responsible conservatives with a serious interest in the preservation of the two party system.

The ACU Study on the Ripon Society was released to the press and to Republican Congressmen and Senators on September 23, 1966. News releases and copies of the study went out to Washington correspondents, editorial writers, wire services, and columnists. Under unanimous consent, I ask that a copy of the covering news release on that study be printed in the RECORD.

A.C.U. ISSUES STUDY ON THE RIPON SOCIETY; CITES LACK OF GOP SUPPORT FOR LIBERAL GROUP

WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPT. 23, 1966.—The Ripon Society, self-styled liberal Republican "research" organization, has been critically analyzed in a study issued today by the American Conservative Union.

Representative JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Republican of Ohio, Chairman of the ACU, says in an introduction to the 26-page study that the Ripon Society represents the "intellectual elite" of the liberal minority wing of the GOP. ACU's study charges that the positions taken by the Ripon Society have no grass root Republican support.

"Many Republicans," ASHBROOK said, "have gotten the false impression, mainly through news stories, that the positions of the Ripon Society represent the thinking of the national leadership of the party. They do not! Every signpost thus far in 1966 indicates to us that the Republican Party is very much the conservative party. We think it is important, therefore, that all Republicans have the facts about this little group that seeks to reshape our party in a liberal image. They represent only themselves."

The Ripon Society is headquartered at Cambridge, Mass., and has issued papers on the 1964 election, on tax sharing, on U.S. China Policy, and civil rights. Its membership consists primarily of graduate students.

The ACU study on the Ripon Society challenges the liberal positions taken by the Society, and cites its links with other groups, such as Republicans for Progress, the now defunct Advance magazine, and the eastern liberal wing of the GOP.

"Most of the material in our study comes straight from the public record," ASHBROOK stated. "We do not accuse the members of the Ripon Society of fomenting any sinister plot, but Republicans concerned about the future of their party ought to consider carefully the source of the Society's attacks on conservatives.

"This study of the Ripon Society, its methods, its leaders, and its supporters, provides an accurate picture of the current strength of liberal Republicanism today."

Two nationally syndicated columnists, David Broder and William F. Buckley, Jr., wrote columns on the ACU study on September 27, 1966, and September 28, 1966.

The Ripon Society paperback went into the mails the first week of October. And yet, neither Mr. John Herbers, of the New York Times, nor Mr. Thomas O'Neill, of the Baltimore Sun, mentioned in their stories on the Ripon book that the ACU had released an exhaustive study on that group. What would a rank-and-file Republican be led to believe? I am very much afraid that he or she might think that conservative Republicans had somehow fallen silent. The only group that is concerned about the future of the Republican Party, he might surmise, is the liberal wing of the party. And yet, as Mr. O'Neill does point out in his column, the voters in Republican primaries this year have turned down bids by liberal Republicans for party nominations. Mr. O'Neill uses the old liberal smear line and calls those who won the nominations "Goldwater neanderthaloids." The fact is that among those so-called "neanderthaloids" are some of this body's most respected Members, whose absence from this Chamber during the 89th Congress is only temporary.

There can be doubt that Mr. O'Neill is in complete sympathy with the desire of the Ripon Society to alter radically the foundations of the Republican Party. His choice of words betrays him. Under unanimous consent, I ask that his column, "Politics and People," from the October 9 edition of the Baltimore Sun, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

POLITICS AND PEOPLE: TAKING STOCK

(By Thomas O'Neill)

WASHINGTON.—One group of active Republicans finds so many things wrong with their party that they have made a book out of them.

Coming off the presses this week from the pens of university Republicans who believe their party must modernize or perish, the book is described in advance reports as tracing Republican woes to the dominance of an old order leadership which scampers to fallout shelters at the threat of a new idea. It is the product of the three-year-old Ripon Society, named for the town in Wisconsin at which Republicanism was born as a party of radical ideas, 112 years ago.

The work is timely at the close of a series of primary elections which on balance amounted to decided victories for the old order.

Strikingly, the way out of the electoral woods pointed by the progressives is almost word for word that of a July report of the conservatively tilted Senate Republican Policy Committee—go where the votes are, adapt to changing conditions. The parting comes at the point of prescribing what to do after going where the votes are.

The Ripons want the GOP shaken to its foundations, challenged, renewed and rejuvenated. The Senate policymakers think the party need only keep its eye on the ball as the United States becomes increasingly a nation of young people, of a greater proportion of women, of increasing concentration of population in metropolitan areas, and adjust to these.

After what happened at the election two years ago, of course, it would be surpassing strange if Republicans of whatever stripe failed to sense that something is wrong, excepting Barry Goldwater, who has taken to insisting that the disaster to him was no judgment upon the outlandish collection of notions he presented in the name of conservatism.

Yet there are strong indications that the party rank and file is unconcerned about adjusting to a position closer to public opinion.

Voters in the party primaries this summer gave nominations to Goldwater neanderthaloids from New England to California, most of them political castaways of the 1964 election, now restored to party eminence. Only in Michigan were they thrown back.

Most important of the Old Guard victories was the nomination of Ronald Reagan for governor of California over a moderate. Mr. Reagan is wearing sneakers in his general election campaign as he glides away from the past. His admirers of the far right are undisturbed. A party official in South Carolina, tuned to Senator STROM THURMOND, for example, provisionally supports Richard Nixon for the next presidential nomination, subject to change should Mr. Reagan win in California and so become an eligible.

Against the Reagan advance, the party moderates took a severe blow when their strongest voice in party councils, Gov. Robert Smylie of Idaho, was turned down for a new nomination in favor of a John Birch type.

The old order seems pretty secure. Whether its thinking that the attitudes which kept the GOP dominant during 80 years of the nation's history is the sort of thing to excite a changing electorate in the last third of the Twentieth Century is something else again. First voters this year, born in 1945, know nothing of those bygone years, and the squeals and jumping at sight of BOBBY KENNEDY suggest they look ahead rather than backward. By 1970 half the population will be in the age range under 27 years.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a contributor to the Ripon blueprint for revival, has advice for his fellow Republicans.

Says Senator SCOTT: "Politics in a free society is influenced heavily by the survival of the fittest. Those in the Republican party who best represent the public view will survive—and prevail."

He leaves unmentioned the consequences of a standoff, which is possible. It is conceivable, for instance, that HOWARD CALLAWAY, of the Goldwater wing, will best represent the public view in Georgia and win the governorship there, while Governor Rockefeller best represents it in New York and is reelected there.

In such circumstances, the title of the Ripon book would be a mite overly hopeful. It is: "From Disaster to Distinction: the Rebirth of the Republican Party."

The downward course of the Republican party as a major force in American affairs traces to 1912 and a schism between progressives and standpatters in that year. The standpats prevailed, but the schism has never healed.

Senator SCOTT, a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, believes the party would be better served if it vested greater authority in that committee and its chairman, now Ray Bliss, who is neutral between the contending wings. Archaic rules make him subject to an executive committee which, in the present case, was named by the discredited party leadership of two years ago.

Mr. Herbers and Mr. O'Neill are supposed to be political writers. Their stock in trade is a thorough knowledge of the intricate workings of national and intraparty politics. Yet, neither one of these writers recognized the sloppiness of the Ripon Society book. Anyone who regularly reads the Ripon Society's special reports, position papers, and the Ripon Forum—newsletter—can immediately recognize that the book is essentially a pasting together of old Ripon Society reports and Ripon Forum editorials. They are clever fellows, but not clever enough, because there is not a shred of fresh, new thinking in this entire 128 page booklet. Nearly all of it has appeared before in Ripon publications. The first two-thirds of the book is devoted to a vicious attack on former Senator Barry Goldwater and his campaign for the Presidency. Almost

all of it is directly lifted from their Election '64 Report, issued last year. The final third of the book is devoted to their ideas on how to change the party. And page after page of the copy is easily recognizable as having first appeared in previous Ripon publications. Apparently, anything published by the Ripon Society is immediately accepted as bearing on the great debate going on within American politics today. Yet, so self-confident are the political writers of the Times and the Sun that a comprehensive study of the origins, leaders, financing, and techniques of the Ripon Society is completely ignored. For the record, I would like to ask unanimous consent that a column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., on the ACU Study on the Ripon Society be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 28, 1966]

ASHBROOK ON THE RIPONS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Congressman JOHN ASHBROOK, who is by all odds the most exciting young man in the Republican Party, has completed a study for the American Conservative Union on the activities and interests of The Ripon Society, an organization of liberal eastern seaboard intellectuals which will not rest until the Republican Party becomes an exact duplicate of the Democratic Party, give or take a shadow here or there.

The study is particularly interesting reading midway through the congressional campaign, which reminds us of the fracture within the Republican Party and its consequent incapacity to strike out with a single voice against the deficiencies of the present Administration.

The reason for the prevailing impotence is less a lack of imagination by Republican conservatives or the strength of Republican liberals, than the fact of the Republican torment issuing out of the defeat of 1964: the great fear to speak out as Barry Goldwater did lest, like Barry Goldwater, the Republicans should once again be overwhelmed.

That is the great handle of The Ripon Society and Republican liberals throughout the country—the disastrous consequences of the Goldwater nomination. Congressman ASHBROOK looks at the figures for 1964 and furnishes a moderate historical context which serves to put them in focus; after which he draws a significant conclusion.

In the year of the Great Defeat under the leadership of Goldwater, the GOP lost: 2 governors—but on the other hand elected 3, for a net gain of 1. The GOP also lost 2 Senators, and 38 Congressmen.

But go back to 1948, when the Party was being led by Thomas E. Dewey, a 24-karat representative of the liberal wing of the GOP. The GOP lost: 7 governors; 9 senators; 75 congressmen.

The year 1958 was late in the golden summer of the Eisenhower Administration—six years for the country to bask in progressive moderation, as President Eisenhower triumphantly called it. That November the GOP lost: 5 governors, 13 senators, 48 congressmen.

What happened to the GOP nation-wide, Congressman ASHBROOK suggests, cannot then be blamed so easily on Goldwater, unless we are also to blame Mr. Dewey and Gen. Eisenhower for losses more spectacular—in which case what have we learned from this conscientious allocation of blame?

What is happening, says Representative ASHBROOK bluntly, is that the Republican Party is losing strength as a national Party. Yet what is remarkable—he goes on to show—is that altho liberal Republicans here and there score publicized victories, little by little, state by state, congressional district by congressional district, the grass-roots GOP voters are emphatically indicating their preference for a conservative politics, as against such politics as the big thinkers of The Ripon Society are endorsing in the name of the future of the Republican Party.

There is a great deal of interesting material in the report, a fair summary of which is (a) the Republican Party is diminishing in strength, but the convictions of the majority of Republicans are not altering; and (b) the reform-Republicans have shown neither that the Party would increase in strength by becoming more liberal, nor in allure to young voters or activists or even intellectuals. The Ripon people have in effect proved only that if the whole lot of them went over to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party would not even feel the tremor.

CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 187th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot who fought valiantly and sacrificed his life in the American struggle for independence.

Born in Poland in 1748, he was the eldest son of Count Joseph Pulaski and a member of the Polish nobility. Pulaski fought with his father in the popular uprising against King Stanislas in 1769 after Poland had been partitioned by Germany, Russia, and Austria. When it became evident that the forces of freedom who had fought so gallantly against enormous odds and with inadequate equipment would be slaughtered by the Russians, Pulaski chose to disperse his men and seek aid for their cause abroad. Although a penniless refugee, and having lost his father and brother in the fight for freedom, he sought help in Prussia, Turkey, and then France. In Paris, Pulaski met Benjamin Franklin, who told him of the need for trained soldiers and leaders in the American Revolutionary War. The Polish hero traveled to the United States, seeing our struggle as another opportunity to fight for freedom, and presented a letter of introduction from Franklin to General Washington.

Pulaski distinguished himself in the battle of Brandywine and was commissioned a brigadier general by Congress. He was given command of the entire American cavalry. He believed fervently in the cause for which he was fighting and led his men for 2 years before being struck down during the siege of Savannah. Seriously wounded on October 9, he died 3 days later on October 12 at the age of 31, having made an outstanding contribution to the success of the American Revolution. He has gone down in history as the "Father of the American Cavalry." His heroic death has been an inspiration to all Americans who have studied our history.

In paying tribute again this year to General Pulaski, we who now enjoy American freedom must rededicate ourselves to the restoration of freedom to Pulaski's homeland, Poland, which still suffers under the foreign domination of Russian imperialism.

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

Mr. HALL. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration has had an opportunity for the past year to do something about social security cash benefits, but has refused to act upon or even consider bills introduced by 80 Republican Members of Congress, to provide a "cost of living" increase under social security, as recommended by the Republican, Task Force on Aging on which I served, as confirmed by the National Republican Coordinating Committee.

Instead the President has waited until Congress is about to adjourn, and with an obvious eye on the election, to talk about an increase in social security benefits. An increase which would not even go into effect until 1968, which, by strange coincidence, just happens to be an election year.

This is a disservice to millions of older Americans who have suffered a 3.5-percent loss in purchasing power because of inflation in the past year. Most of the last benefit increase already has been wiped out by inflation.

I think the American people have a right to know just why the Johnson administration refused to give consideration to the bill I, and others have introduced which would have done something about curbing the loss of purchasing power to people on social security.

I would remind the administration that the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration has said our proposals to provide a cost-of-living increase, without a new tax increase, are actuarially sound.

The President has had an entire year to do something, but he apparently chose to ignore a serious problem. Now, belatedly, with Congress about to adjourn, and only 4 weeks before election, he talks magnanimously about a raise in benefits. Only when one reads past the headlines does he find out that this increase will not come about until 1968. By that time, at the present rate of inflation, senior citizens would have suffered a further loss of purchasing power, possibly as much as 4 percent. These facts are clear for one to see.

FREEMAN VERSUS SCHNITTKER AND GORDON

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post carries a short article in which Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman is said to have called for a halt in the migration of farmers from the farm to the cities. This is in direct contrast to earlier statements by former Budget Director Kermit Gordon and Under Secretary John Schnittker.

In 1965, Mr. Gordon said that there was room in our farm economy for only 1 million farmers. On August 22 of this year Mr. Schnittker said essentially the same thing. When Mr. Gordon made his statement we had 3.5 million farmers. Eighteen months later and 200,000 farmers shorter, Schnittker admitted that the administration's farm programs were being administered so that the 1 million farmers Gordon referred to were receiving the major benefits.

Now it does not take a bureaucratic expert to realize that if the administration's programs are successfully kicking the farmers off their land, that these farmers are going to have to go somewhere. Mr. Freeman has deplored their movement to the cities. In this matter, I join the Secretary emphatically: Farmers should not be forced to abandon their livelihoods. But what are they to do when the administration continues to lower their returns from farming? What are they supposed to believe when the administration tells them to get off the farms and then tells them to stay out of the cities, too? People either live on farms or they live in cities, and no amount of "riding stables, fish preserves, and vacation farms" is going to change that fact.

The Post article continues:

> Freeman urged improving economic and educational opportunities in rural areas to counteract the pull of the cities.

I suggest that if the Secretary would stop his actions which lower the prices farmers receive for their labor and allow these prices to rise in response to demand, this action alone would counteract not "the pull of the cities" but the push from the farms.

CHICAGO'S COLUMBUS DAY PARADE

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, October 12, 1492 is the memorable day that Christopher Columbus, the great Italian navigator, discovered America. All our people throughout the United States, regardless of age, race, or creed, will join together enthusiastically to celebrate this momentous discovery which resulted not only in the development of our great country but of the whole Western Hemisphere as well.

Why is it, then, that we have neglected all these many years to set aside October 12 as a national legal holiday? In order to correct this oversight, I introduced in the Congress H.R. 1754 which would make October 12 a legal public holiday.

Today we are all joining together to observe the 474th anniversary of Columbus' spectacular discovery. I take this opportunity once again to urge my colleagues in the Congress to support this legislation in order that national recognition may at last be given to Columbus' faith, vision, and courage which made the discovery of America possible.

In my own city of Chicago, Columbus Day is celebrated every year with a gigantic parade on State Street. Over 225 units will march in the parade, representing every branch of the U.S. military forces, school bands, marchers, and drum and bugle corps. More than 50 floats depicting the various regions of Italy will participate in this annual patriotic event. Women and children wearing authentic native costumes of Italy will ride on the floats and march in the procession, adding to the color and pageantry of the occasion.

The parade, which attracts over 1 million people, will be televised for 1½ hours and will have an estimated television audience of an additional 2 million people. Sponsors of the telecast are Anthony Paterno of the Pacific Wine Co., Dominick Di Matteo, of Dominick's Finer Foods; and Frank Armanetti, of Armanetti Liquor Stores.

The theme of the 1966 parade will be, "America—The Land of Columbus." Joseph A. Califano, Jr., Special Assistant to the President, will be the guest of honor and will lead the gigantic parade. Joining him in leading the parade will be the honorary chairmen of the parade, Hon. Richard J. Daley, mayor of Chicago, and Dr. Augusto Russo, consul general of Italy in Chicago. And that fabulous entertainer who has endeared himself to all Americans, the inimitable Jimmy Durante, will also be at the head of the parade. Following the leaders in the line of march will be political dignitaries, civic leaders, and businessmen from the community. The procession will be preceded by a huge tank spraying lavender perfume into the air in all directions.

Some of the leaders in the Italian community who are participating in the parade are Vincent Ferrara, president of the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans; Rev. Armando Pierini, P.S.S.C., chaplain; Arthur S. Pullano, general chairman of the parade; and Dr. Mario O. Rubinelli, Frank Armanetti, Fred Bartoli, Martin R. Buccieri, Victor J. Failla, Nello V. Ferrara, and Anthony Paterno, who are cochairmen of the parade.

Also participating are Robert S. Tomaso, Mrs. Serafina Ferrara, and Joseph Fusco, cochairmen of the finance and souvenir book committee; John G. Rovetto and Joseph Rovetto, cochairmen of the floats committee; Victor A. Arrigo, chairman of the program and arrangements committee; Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, chairman of the authentic Italian costumes committee; Domenick DiFrisco, chairman of the publicity and queen contest committee; Victor J. Failla and Frank Esposito, cochairmen of the labor committee; Marco DeStefano, parade grand marshal; Anthony Bottalla and Dr. James F. Greco, cochairmen of the bands and marchers committee; and Joseph DeSerto and Frank Aliotta, cochairmen of the Italian organizations committee.

The other members of these committees are: Frank Catrambone, N. R. Dispenza, Peter Lavorata, Vincent Lucania, Fred Mazzei, Umberto Mugnaini, Charles C. Porcelli, Lawrence Spallitta, Dr. Joseph DiLeonarde, Dr. August F. Daro, Louis Farina, Peter R. Scalise, Horatio Tocco, Thomas C. Baratta, Vincent F. Lucchese, Henry Coco, Paul Iaccino, Alfred Rota, Peter Barbero, Rudolph Bilotta, Frank C. Bottigliero, Dr. Nicholas J. Bruno, Jordan Canzone, Michael Epifanio, Livio Petricca, Daniel A. Becco, Dominick Dolci, Carl Ferina, Michael R. Fortino, Fred Parisi, Dr. Michael Abene, and John Spatuzza.

Miss Linda Lucatorto, who is 17 years old, was chosen as queen of the Columbus Day parade. She resides at 2900 West 55th Street, Chicago, Ill. The prize awarded to the queen is a free trip to Italy sponsored by the Joint Civic Committee of Italian Americans via Al Italia Airlines.

Chosen as members of the queen's court were Miss Kathy Mattio, 2100 South Seventh Avenue, Maywood, Ill.; Miss Janice Juliano, 1533 North Keeler, Chicago, Ill.; Miss Carol Volpe, 1212 South Wenonah, Berwyn, Ill.; and Miss Margaret Caputo, 4159 North Mozart, Chicago, Ill.

The judges for the queen contest included Maurice Fisher, assistant managing editor of the Chicago Daily News; Mr. Al Burcover, assistant editor, travel section, Chicago Tribune; Dr. Mary Ellen Batinich, principal of the Walsh Elementary School in Chicago; and Miss Anna Mae Smith, instructor at Barat College in Lake Forest, Illinois.

The winners this year in the authentic Italian costumes are first prize, Miss Della Garvey, 637 Waveland Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, $150 savings bond; second prize, Mrs. Tena Amico, 5127 West Gladys Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, $100 savings bond; third prize, Mrs. Fran Kokinis, 525 East Turner, Roselle, Illinois, $50 savings bond; fourth prize, Mrs. Marie Pedi, 5459 West Grace Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, $25 savings bond; and fifth prize, Mrs. Elena Frigoleti, 7212 West 62nd Street, Summit, Illinois, $25 savings bond.

The judges for the authentic Italian costumes contest, in addition to Mr. Fisher, Mr. Burcover, Dr. Batinich and Miss Smith, included Mr. Carmen Duro, Mr. Fred Mazzei, and Mr. Lawrence Pucci, who are leading businessmen in the Chicago metropolitan area.

The prizes for the costume contest have been donated by the Joint Civic

Committee of Italian-Americans which sponsors the Columbus Day parade each year and is the civic organization representing over 700,000 Italo-Americans in the Chicago metropolitan area. Mr. Anthony Sorrentino is the hard-working and able consultant for the Joint Civic Committee of Italian-Americans.

The Columbus Day celebration will begin with solemn high mass at 9 a.m. at Our Lady of Pompeii Church in Chicago, after which a 9-foot, 14-ton bronze statue of Christopher Columbus will be dedicated in Vernon Park opposite the church. At noon the parade will begin at State and Walker Streets. Following the parade, there will be the annual wreath-laying ceremonies at Columbus Monument in Grant Park. The festivities will be brought to a close with a reception in honor of Joe Califano beginning at 3 p.m. at the Sherman House in Chicago. Leaders of the Italo-American organizations from Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan will be at the reception, together with the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, the senior Senator from Illinois, and officials from the city of Chicago and from the State of Illinois.

I am proud and happy that Americans of all ethnic origins are taking part in our Columbus Day parade and in celebrations throughout our Nation to honor the memory and the achievements of the great navigator. The varied ethnic pattern of the United States was foreshadowed even in Columbus' voyages, for he was an Italian who used Spanish ships and Portuguese charts to achieve the most important geographical discovery in modern history—the discovery of the New World.

Perhaps Columbus' achievement in sailing into the trackless Atlantic is more meaningful for us today than it was for previous generations because we face the vastness of outer space in the same way that Columbus faced the expanse of the uncharted ocean. Columbus' stubborn persistence despite discouragement and danger, his indomitable will, his faith in God and his absolute fearlessness insured his triumph over what seemed to others insurmountable odds.

It gives me great pleasure to join my friends in Chicago, my colleagues here in Washington, and my fellow citizens all over the United States in honoring America's first and perhaps greatest immigrant—Christopher Columbus.

FARM PRICES

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the American farmer is recognized the world over as having no peer in the field of agriculture. He produces more, and he produces it faster and cheaper than any other farmer in the world. Millions around the globe have been kept from starvation solely because of the fabulous productivity of American agriculture.

The American farmer has not always received the reward for his labors to which such outstanding achievements certainly entitle him. In fact, throughout most of our history, it has only been in times of great national crises that farm prices have remained at a high enough level to assure the farmer a fair income. Even today, in time of great prosperity, there are some inequities. The farmers of America, on the average, still earn only about two-thirds of what nonfarmers earn. Nevertheless, the gap is narrowing and I think it would be appropriate to emphasize just how much we have accomplished.

During the past 6 years, the trend in farm income has been dramatically and significantly up. Net farm income, today, is up some $4 billion above what it was in 1960. It is expected to reach a total of $15.7 billion this year.

At the risk of being accused of talking politics, I have to add that by comparison, in the 8 years between 1952 and 1960, farm income dropped more than $2 billion.

In contrast, since 1960, the average net income per farm in the United States has risen 60 percent. It has climbed from $2,956 in 1960, to an estimated $4,785 in 1966. Per capita farm income, in that same time, has risen from $1,108, 6 years ago, to $1,670 this year. We have a right to be proud of that record. This is the first time since the Civil War that farm income has continued a steady, upward climb, except in times of great world emergencies such as the two World Wars and Korea. Furthermore, we have been able to do this while reducing the huge farm surpluses which burden our taxpayers with unnecessary costs of billions of dollars for decade after decade.

Much of the credit for this achievement belongs to the five major farm bills passed in the 6 years of this administration, culminating in the far-reaching Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. They have helped us take unneeded acres out of production, stimulate the export trade in agricultural commodities, increase farm income and establish the first truly balanced agricultural economy in half a century.

When he signed the last of those administration farm bills, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, President Johnson said:

> With this legislation, we reap the wisdom acquired during three decades of trial and error.

I believe that we will continue to reap that wisdom for decades to come. And I am proud to have had the opportunity to make my own modest contributions toward the creation of the most successful and most sensible farm program ever enacted into law in this country.

THE PROBLEM OF A NEW CANAL: THE BEST SOLUTION

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, over the past decade there have been published many articles on interoceanic canal problems. No Member of the Congress has ever made a more brilliant clarification of this complicated subject than my distinguished and most scholarly colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]. The value of his contributions was recognized on August 18, 1966, by the Congress in its adoption of a concurrent resolution, which I had the honor to sponsor, authorizing the publication of a collection of Representative FLOOD's addresses as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress.

Though the canal subject has been neglected by most organs in the mass news media, I have noted that some of our important patriotic organizations have been active in its study. Among them are the American Legion and the Military Order of the World Wars.

At its 48th Annual Convention in Washington on September 1, 1966, the American Legion adopted a notable and forthright resolution dealing with the canal subject in realistic manner and reflecting mature consideration.

The September-October 1966 issue of the World Wars Officer Review, published by the Military Order of the World Wars, featured a very able paper by Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S. Navy Reserve, retired, which he delivered before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C. The occasion was the honoring by this society of the memory of his uncle, Edward Schildhauer, who was one of the most distinguished builders of the Panama Canal in the design of electrical and mechanical operating machinery of the locks.

Those two actions by the American Legion and the Military Order of the World Wars, which obviously followed informed congressional leaderships, are the best indexes of the growing public interest in the vital canal subject.

In order that they may be better known in the Congress and throughout the Nation, I quote the indicated paper by Captain Schildhauer and the American Legion resolution as parts of my remarks:

RESOLUTION NO. 547 OF THE 48TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

PANAMA CANAL

Whereas, in a joint statement on September 24, 1965, Presidents Johnson of the United States and Robles of Panama announced that the two countries were negotiating new treaties with respect to the existing Panama Canal and a new "sea-level" canal which might be constructed across Panama; and

Whereas, that statement made clear that the 1903 treaty "will be abrogated" and that its replacement "will terminate after a specified number of years or on the date of the opening of the sea-level canal whichever occurs first;" and

Whereas, there is no assurance at this time that the construction of a sea-level canal

will be determined to be feasible, either in Panama or elsewhere in the area, or that a satisfactory treaty respecting such new canal can be secured so as to provide the United States with the necessary rights for its effective operation and protection; and

Whereas, in the interim, this situation places in serious jeopardy the rights of the United States respecting the existing canal; and

Whereas, the Congressionally authorized Commission currently studying the feasibility of constructing a new interoceanic canal is restricted to studies relative to a "sea-level" canal; and

Whereas, various proposals, such as one known as the "Terminal Lakes Plan," have been advanced for the modernization of the existing Panama Canal, based upon study by competent students of many years experience in maintaining and operating the Canal; and

Whereas, such proposals would not require a new treaty with the Republic of Panama and would not jeopardize the U.S. rights in the Canal Zone; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention assembled in Washington, D.C., August 30, 31–September 1, 1966, That The American Legion (1) reaffirms its support of the basic and still existing provisions of the 1903 treaty, and the continued, indispensable sovereign control by the United States over the Canal Zone; (2) urges the enactment of legislation (similar to the Anderson-Flood-Bow bills of the 89th Congress) to establish an independent, broadly-based "Interoceanic Canals Commission," having as its mandate the examination of *all* tangible possibilities for improving and increasing trans-Isthmian transit capacity, followed by appropriate recommendation, and (3) urges that, until such a commission is duly created and makes its report, all further negotiations with the Republic of Panama be deferred.

[From the World Wars Officer Review, September-October 1966]

THE PROBLEM OF A NEW CANAL: THE BEST SOLUTION

(Address by Capt. C. H. Schildhauer, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, before the Panama Canal Society of Washington, D.C., May 21, 1966)

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentleman: Naturally, the thoughts of all of us are directed to the question of a new Isthmian Canal, either at the present route or at some other location. Because of the grave importance of the subjects involved, I venture to give you my own views on the matter of the best solution trusting that they will be considered objectively. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been legislation providing for consideration of only one solution, the canal matter is of such vast consequence that any inquiry purporting to be comprehensive should consider other treatments. In so doing, the key issues are site and type; and I shall express views which, I believe, reflect the judgment of most of the survivors of the construction of the present canal, including engineers so engaged. All these can appraise the problem realistically because of their intimate experience with, and knowledge of, the extreme difficulties which accompanied the original construction. In this connection, I especially refer to the tremendous question of slides, which would be vastly enlarged in any effort to go deeper into the earth for a so-called "sea level" project if the present site should be recommended as now seems most likely or in any other area.

In recent years much has been published about inter-oceanic canal problems. Writers have vied with one another to make the subject appear new but, as experienced students of Isthmian history well know, the major questions involved are old. The only new feature in the equation is a new crop of advocates and diplomats who have ignored the lessons of experience and have proceeded purely on the theoretical considerations.

The Panama Canal was opened to traffic on August 15, 1914, yet, within ten years, the subject of the type of canal, despite a most careful evaluation of the matter, was still being agitated. In a letter on May 31, 1924, to former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, who had designed the Panama Canal and brought the project to a point where its success was certain, Governor Jay J. Morrow, one of its ablest governors, made this incisive and prophetic statement:

"The sea-level project is a hardy perennial, and apparently there will always be someone to argue for it, no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such scheme within practicable limits of time and cost may be demonstrated."

The years passed. With the approach of World War II, our authorities became concerned about the problems of the Panama Canal and sought legislation for increasing its capacity through the construction of what was described as the Third Locks Project. Authorized in 1939 at a cost of $277,000,000 after insufficient study and inadequate investigations, this proposal provided for one set of larger locks (140′ x 1200′ x 50′) near each of the existing locks but somewhat removed from them and for connecting the new locks with the existing channels by means of by-pass channels. (H. Doc. No. 210, 76th Cong., 1st Session.)

The proposed arrangement at the Atlantic end of the canal was logical because it duplicated a sound layout that has been tested by more than 50 years of successful operation at Gatun. At the Pacific end, however, the original third lock channel plan had three sharp bends that would have created operating problems and navigational hazards of the gravest character. This appraisal is based on navigational experience, study and observation, including many transits of the Panama Canal on naval vessels. Also, it should be especially noted that this project had undisclosed features for converting the canal to sea level according to a plan that had been neither comprehensively studied nor specifically authorized by the Congress.

Active construction started in 1940 and was placed on a rush basis until it was suspended in May 1942 after an expenditure of more than $75,000,000 mostly on lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores. Fortunately, no excavation was undertaken on the Pacific side at Pedro Miguel, which left the way open for a re-examination of the project in the light of marine experience before it was too late.

The Panama Canal at that time was the scene of tremendous activities in connection with its military protection and the transit of our naval vessels to and from combat areas in the Pacific. These demands created keen interest among canal authorities, both operating and engineering problems with regard to planning as derived from lessons learned under war conditions.

Eventually, these efforts inspired the development in the Panama Canal organization itself of what today is known as the Terminal Lake—Third Lock Plan, which proposal would consolidate all Pacific locks in one set south of Miraflores similar to the existing layout at Gatun and provide a summit-level lake anchorage in the Pacific sector to serve as a traffic reservoir.

Recognized immediately by respected canal engineers as the greatest single contribution in the way of canal planning since the removal of the Bohio Dam and Locks to Gatun to form Gatun Lake, the proposal attracted wide support from navigation interests that use the canal, including local naval authorities and, eventually, Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King and Secretary of the Navy Knox.

In its study of the plan, the Navy Department sent the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and a member of the General Board to the Canal Zone to look it over in the field. The General Board recommended strong Naval support of the plan and, in its principal report, made this significant statement: "The General Board is much impressed by the great preponderance of evidence in favor of the lock-type and considers that the opinions presented, supported as they are by experience, fully justify the abandonment of the idea of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 111, pt. 5, p. 6758.)

Extensive studies at the time in the Canal Zone, and later in the Navy Department, showed the lake-lock design to be the best canal plan for the transit of vessels practicable of achievement, and at "comparatively low cost," estimated in 1943 at less than $300,000,000 and without the necessity for negotiating a new treaty with Panama. The last is a paramount consideration.

Eventually, the terminal lake proposal was submitted on September 7, 1943, by the Secretary of the Navy to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who indicated his approval of it as a post-war project. It was subsequently approved in principle by two Governors of the Panama Canal as the preferred form for the modification of the authorized Third Locks Project to meet future navigational needs.

Upset by the wide acceptance of the terminal lake idea for a new lake-lock type canal, advocates of the old and rejected "sea-level" plan, after the startling advent of the atomic bomb in 1945, seized upon that nuclear development as the psychological lever for obtaining legislation for a canal inquiry under a statute, the bill for which was drafted by themselves at the height of public hysteria.

The ensuing act of the Congress (Public Law 280, 79th Congress, approved December 28, 1945) directed the Governor of the Panama Canal to make a comprehensive investigation of the means for increasing its capacity and "security" to meet future needs of interoceanic commerce and "national defense"; and also for a restudy of the Third Locks Project, and a study of canals at other locations.

Taking advantage of the "security" factor inserted in the bill by advocates of the "sea-level" type, the 1946–7 investigators interpreted this factor as paramount and controlling, and money costs not a "governing consideration" and sympathetic propagandists urged it as a "mandate of the Congress!" According to informed members of the Congress at that time, this was a far more extreme interpretation of the statute than was intended by the Congress which enacted it.

The report of this inquiry was submitted in 1947. As expected, it recommended only the so-called Sea-Level Project in the Canal Zone on an alignment different from the existing channel for major canal construction, initially estimated to cost $2,483,000,000 primarily on the basis of its alleged greater "security." It ignored such matters as the vital treaty question involved, and what would be its costs for a huge indemnity to Panama, a greatly increased annuity, and the effect on tolls, all of which would have to be borne by maritime interests that use the canal or by our over burdened taxpayers. No wonder, such report failed to receive Presidential approval! When President Truman transmitted it on December 1, 1947, to the Congress, he did so without comment or recommendations, and the Congress took no action thereon, not even authorizing its printing. Three years later, in the Act of 1950, the Congress, on its own initiative, re-

organized the Panama Canal enterprise, placing it on a self-sustaining basis.

As time passed, transits through the Panama Canal increased, and by 1964 its capacity was approaching saturation. On Executive recommendations, without adequate hearings, debate or information, the Congress enacted Public Law 88–609, 88th Congress, approved September 22, 1964, under extraordinary circumstances for so gravely important a matter.

In the Senate, the bill for this law was passed by voice vote without debate; in the House, under a rule procedure that prevented adequate debate on the vital issue. Moreover, the House acted without the benefit of published hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that conducted them and those hearings to this day have never been printed!

The statute authorized the President to appoint a so-called "commission" of five men not subject to Senate confirmation to determine the feasibility of constructing only a "sea-level" canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. This action, unwisely restrictive and unprecedented in character, served to exclude from consideration the solution that many competent independent and experienced engineers and other experts considered to be the best and most economic solution when the problem is evaluated from all key angles.

This body is now functioning. It is not the independent and broadly-based commission that the situation requires and as was employed in the building of the present canal. The sea-level interests because of the alleged vulnerability of the present high-level lake-lock type canal are using the 1964 enactment to advance the 1947 "sealevel" recommendations with utter disregard of costs of consequences as a "mandate from the Congress" for the second time since World War II.

Meanwhile, the proper handling of the overall inter-oceanic question has been complicated by a series of developments affecting the Isthmus that started when Alger Hiss of the State Department in 1946 listed the Canal Zone as an "occupied area," thereby classifying it as a non-United States possession. Then followed in 1953 the negotiation of the Eisenhower-Remon treaty of 1955, which was supposed to end Panamanian demands for years to come. But efforts to appease, as was foreseen by informed members of the Congress and others, only resulted in greater efforts to extort. Today we are n the process of negotiation with Panama for new treaties affecting the canal that would cede back to that country full sovereignty over the Canal Zone. As to that, I can think of no greater disaster for the continued efficient maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal or to Panama itself. It would be far better for Panama if the United States stayed on the Isthmus in perpetuity, for our presence there is the only guaranty for its continued independence.

It is pertinent to observe that the United States would never have undertaken to construct the Panama Canal except under conditions of complete and perpetual control. Moreover, long experience on the Isthmus shows that the present canal could not have been built nor subsequently maintained and operated with requisite efficiency with less authority than our government has exercised under the 1903 Treaty. This is in no sense imperialism but plain common sense, for our responsibilities require adequate authority.

As to the original decision of our government for the high-level lake-lock plan, the wisdom of it has been completely established. It was not a fly-by-night action by irresponsible and incompetent officials or a political compromise as claimed by some propagandists but a reasoned decision after the fullest consideration by some of the best engineers and ablest statesmen that our country ever produced, after extensive debates in the Congress.

The principal arguments used by "sea-level" advocates during United States control have always been of hypothetical military character "security" and "national defense"; not the actual problems of navigation and operations.

During the 1904–06 "battle of the levels," it was the alleged "vulnerability" of the high-level plan to naval gunfire, which was an important factor in causing the division of the Pacific locks into two sets separated by the intermediate level Miraflores Lake—the major error in the design of the Panama Canal. Parenthetically, I may add that the consolidation of the two sets of Pacific locks were originally urged by Chief Engineer John F. Stevens in 1906 and later attempted by Colonel William L. Sibert but was not done because of public pressure in the United States for immediate action.

In 1939, it was the alleged danger of enemy bombing attacks that led to the hasty authorization of the Third Locks Project and its hazardous channel layout, and, as previously indicated, without adequate study of the crucial navigational and operational features involved.

In 1945, it was the alleged greater "security" of the "sea-level" type against destruction by nuclear attack, which fallacious premise has been extensively exposed in the Congress.

In 1964, it was the alleged greater "vulnerability" of the high level plan to destruction, even by "two sticks of dynamite."

Thus, it is abundantly evident that advocates of a "sea-level" canal adjust their terminology and justifications to their needi for advancing their predetermined objectives. They never mention the obvious facts that nothing can be constructed of indestructible proportions, that the greatest dangers in any type of canal in the entire Canal Zone are massive slides, that the critical slide area is in the high central mass, and that any canal, regardless of design, can be destroyed by nuclear attack. Nor do these advocates ever give the costs and complications involved in negotiating a new treaty with Panama to determine the specific conditions for constructing a "sea-level" undertaking in the Canal Zone, which project is not covered by existing treaty and would require a new one.

It is to be noted also that "sea level" advocates ignore the fact that the design that they have in mind is not, in any sense, an open strait, such as the Strait of Magellan, but that tidal locks and many miles of lateral dams, diversion channels, and flood control structures on both sides of the ship channel, would be necessary. They also ignore these facts: that a greatly deepened cut required by the so-called "sea-level" design would present a greater peril for nuclear attack than the existing canal and (2) that, as warned by the Board of Consultants, Isthmian Canal Studies, 1957–60, there would be "serious danger of a long interruption of traffic . . ." (H. Rept. No. 1960, 86th Cong. 2nd Sess., p. 5, para. 16). Such lack of forthrightness in a matter so grave, is indeed, incomprehensible and, in fact, constitutes a betrayal of our own and Western Hemispheric interests, including those of Panama itself.

In following the canal subject closely over a period of years, I have read extensively in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many of the thoughtful objective addresses and statements of Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania, as well as the writings and utterances of distinguished and informed authors. In the quality of their documentation, clarity of expression and force of arguments, Congressman FLOOD's contributions on the canal question are unique in our history and should be studied by all who wish to understand the canal problem. As summarized by him in a statement to the House of Representatives on March 1, 1966, the key issues in the Isthmian question are obvious and simple.

First, the transcendent responsibility of our Government to safeguard the indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority of the United States over the Canal Zone territory as granted under the 1903 Treaty.

Second, the subject of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing high-level lake-lock canal through modifying the Third Locks Project to provide a summit lake and anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with the layout at Gatun, on which, as previously stated, some $75,000,000 of the taxpayer's money has been spent on lock site excavations only at Gatun and Miraflores. The major part of these excavations can be utilized under the proposed lake-lock plan.

Third, the matter of a new Panama Canal of so-called "sea-level" design to replace the present canal, which, in addition to other structures previously mentioned, requires tidal locks near the Pacific end of the canal where the tidal range has a maximum of 22 feet.

Fourth, the question of a new canal at another site in Panama or Columbia or Nicaragua.

Despite the enactment of the 1964 canal statute, three bills were introduced in the present Congress by Representatives ANDERSON of Tennessee, BOW of Ohio and FLOOD of Pennsylvania to create an independent and broadly-based Inter-oceanic Canals Commission. The Commission would be authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for:

An increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

The construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

The construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

You will note that these bills include consideration of the major improvement of the present Panama Canal through modification of the Third Lock Project. This is not included in the 1964 statute which only refers to a "sea-level" canal to meet future requirements. The enactment of these bills include consideration of increasing the capacity and efficiency of the present canal, should be included in the full and complete investigation and study of canal problems. The increase of capacity and operational improvement of the less expensive and functionally superior high-level lake-lock canal to meet the basic requirements mentioned in the statute cannot be overlooked in any inquiry that purports to be "full and complete." Moreover, it should be independent.

The high-level lake-lock type of modernization, when considered from all angles, offers the best solution. Besides it could pay its way while the necessary improvements are made. In contrast, a "sea-level" tidal lock canal must be completed to full dimensions at once and its enormous construction cost would be a substantial addition to the national debt for a very long time, to which

must be added the diplomatic costs for a new treaty.

Indeed, meeting the canal problem by the major improvement of the existing lock-type canal would inure to the very great advantage of Panama by keeping the canal on the Isthmus, preventing the destruction of Panamanian economy, and insuring the continued independence of Panama itself.

My uncle and his top level associates in building the Panama Canal were not men moved by sentiment in making crucial decisions but tough-minded realists. They, like those who follow the sea, had a great respect for the powerful forces of nature, so often exhibited at Panama in the form of massive slides. Were they here today, they would not be influenced by any sentimental feeling evoked by saving their own work but only by the intrinsic realities of the situation that they so well understood. I have every reason to believe from many conversations with him that they would favor the lake-lock plan that I have discussed as the proper solution and would oppose the resurrected idea of a so-called "sea-level" canal, which would require an unprecedented expenditure of the taxpayer's money and open a veritable box of Pandora of difficulties of every character. I, therefore, believe that the wisest and best solution is to keep the present canal and enlarge its capacity and improve its operations to meet future needs of shipping by means of the indicated high-level lake-lock design.

FEDERAL FUNDS, PROJECTS, AND PROGRAMS FOR SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF IOWA

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and pleasure of representing the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa in Congress for the past 2 years. As this historic session draws to a close, I believe that it is only fitting and proper that I express my appreciation to my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate and in the many Government agencies in Washington, who have cooperated with me in obtaining unprecedented benefits for the people of my district.

It has been a great satisfaction for me to have been responsible for securing a full measure of Federal funds, projects, and programs for the benefit and advancement of southwest and western Iowa. With your assistance, and that of others here in our Nation's Capital, our Seventh Congressional District of Iowa has experienced progress and economic growth that has not been achieved for years.

For the sake of the record, and as an expression of my appreciation, I desire at this point to set forth both the projects and the funds that have been allocated to our district:

ADAIR COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Adair—New post office: pending.
Orient—New sewer system: $69,000 grant, $87,000 loan.
Fontanelle—New post office: pending.
Greenfield—Urban planning: $7,738.
County—Library grant: $200.
County—3-mile creek watershed: $1,364,490.
County—12-mile creek watershed: pending.
County—Agricultural research: $28,663.
County—Extension service: $20,000.
County—SCS: $44,764.
County—Consumer service: $69,841.
County—ASCS: $604,319.
County—C.C.C.: $4,763,991.
County—F.C.I.C.: $3,715.
County—FHA: $1,480,410.
County—Medicare: $106,000.
County—Added social security: $134,000.

ADAMS COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Corning—Neighborhood center: $35,893.
Nodaway—New water system: $10,000 grant, $55,000 loan.
County—Library grant: $400.
County—W. Douglas watershed: $243,170.
County—Walters Creek watershed: $1,074,920.
County—Agricultural research: $14,332.
County—Extension service: $27,300.
County—SCS: $59,866.
County—Consumer service: $37,990.
County—ASCS: $375,819.
County—C.C.C.: $2,977,569.
County—F.C.I.C.: $7,588.
County—FHA: $778,323.
County—Medicare: $72,000.
County—Added social security: $100,000.

AUDUBON COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Exira—New post office: $47,018.
Exira—Davids Creek Dam: Pending.
County—Blue Grass Reservoir: Planning stage.
County—Library grant: $900.
County—Blue Grass Creek watershed: Under study.
County—Agricultural research: $28,663.
County—Extension service: $20,000.
County—SCS: $196,545.
County—Consumer service: $118,301.
County—ASCS: $517,219.
County—CCC: $4,616,745.
County—FCIC: $4,920.
County—FHA: $1,021,130.
County—Medicare: $95,000.
County—Added social security: $147,000.

CARROLL COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Arcadia—REA telephone: $165,000.
Templeton—New sewer system: $88,000.
Carroll—Urban renewal: $89,500.
Carroll—Civil defense radio: $11,305.
Carroll—Civil defense center: $6,500.
Carroll—New post office: Pending.
Carroll—Greenspan progress: $4,682.
County—Library grant: $6,300.
County—Agricultural research: $33,440.
County—Extension service: $48,650.
County—SCS: $46,207.
County—Consumer service: $354,784.
County—ASCS: $511,175.
County—CCC: $6,948,032.
County—FCIC: $1,862.
County—REA: $165,000.
County—FHA: $285,740.
County—Medicare: $180,000.
County—Added social security: $297,000.

CASS COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Anita—New post office: $23,892.
Atlantic—Remodel post office: $38,000.
Cumberland senior citizen housing: $50,000.
Massena—REA telephone: $165,000.
Massena—Senior citizen: $36,000.
Atlantic—Remodel hospital: $610,000.
County—Library grant: $950.
County—Agricultural research: $23,885.
County—Extension service: $54,350.
County—SCS: $89,169.
County—Consumer service: $171,735.
County—ASCS: $571,397.
County—C.C.C.: $4,896,752.
County—F.C.I.C.: $36,618.
County—REA: $165,000.
County—FHA: $1,114,700.
County—Medicare: $174,000.
County—Added social security: $293,000.

CRAWFORD COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Deloit—New sewer system: $42,000 grant, $88,000 loan.
Denison—Midwestern College library: $5,000.
Denison—Midwestern work study progress: $30,000.
Denison—Hospital expansion: $106,000.
Denison—Sewer system: $7,500.
Denison—Urban planning: $6,894.
Denison—Eventide expansion HHFA loan.
Dow City—Dane Ridge watershed: $900,000.
Dow City—Sewage treatment: $14,742.
Manilla—Sewage treatment: $17,070.
County—Urban planning: $39,000.
County—Agricultural research: $33,440.
County—Extension service: $53,000.
County—SCS: $146,191.
County—Consumer service: $527,526.
County—ASCS: $557,241.
County—C.C.C.: $9,151,001.
County—F.C.I.C.: $4,931.
County—FHA: $1,609,461.
County—Medicare: $155,000.
County—Added social security: $239,000.

DALLAS COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Adel—Flood control: $50,000.
Granger—Remodel post office: $5,000.
Van Meter—Urban planning: $1,034.
County—Saylorville Reservoir planning stage.
County—Urban planning: $12,000.
County—Library grant: $2,800.
County—Agricultural research: $33,540.
County—Extension service: $20,000.
County—SCS: $45,308.
County—Consumer service: $473,205.
County—ASCS: $641,191.
County—C.C.C.: $10,067,080.
County—F.C.I.C.: $4,857.
County—FHA: $516,090.
County—Medicare: $230,000.
County—Added social security: $410,000.

FREMONT COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Hamburg—Senior citizen housing: $405,000.
Hamburg—River barge lock: $25,000.
Hamburg—Remodel Federal building: $283,000.
Hamburg—New hospital: $435,000.
Hamburg vicinity—River bank: $781,364.
Sidney—Low rent housing: $345,000.
Bartlett—Farm levee: $967,517.
Bartlett vicinity—River bank: $862,991.
Thurman—Levee repairs: $130,000.
Farragut: Housing development: $4,000.
County—Library grant: $700.
County—Ledgewood Creek watershed: Pending.
County—Agricultural research: $14,332.
County—Extension service: $15,100.
County—SCS: $94,333.
County—Consumer service: $147,848.
County—ASCS: $590,292.
County—C.C.C.: $10,728,211.
County—F.C.I.C.: $5,023.
County—FHA: $290,370.
County—Medicare: $100,000.
County—Social security added: $155,000.

GREENE COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Jefferson—Semen barn and laboratory: $37,411.
Jefferson—REC loan: $442,000.
Jefferson—Urban planning: $6,656.
Jefferson—Adult education: $5,960.
Jefferson—Public library: $187,880.
Rippey—New post office: Pending.
County—Jefferson dam: Under review.
County—Agricultural research: $40,701.
County—Extension service: $26,050.
County—SCS: $37,123.
County—Consumer service: $173,395.
County—ASCS: $406,165.
County—C.C.C.: $11,249,130.
County—F.C.I.C.: $466.
County—REA: $422,000.
County—FHA: $406,367.
County—Library grant: $6,800.
County—Medicare: $134,000.
County—Social security added: $217,000.

GUTHRIE COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Casey—New sewer system: $10,500.
Casey—Remodel post office: $8,500.
Bayard—Senior citizens housing: $48,000.
Guthrie center—New post office: Approved, funds pending.
Panora—New post office: Funds pending.
County—Library grant: $7,900.
County—Bear Creek watershed: Pending.
County—Agricultural research: $72,980.
County—Extension service: $18,500.
County—SCS: $93,707.
County—Consumer service: $199,208.
County—ASCS: $785,110.
County—C.C.C.: $6,660,812.
County—F.C.I.C.: $2,335.
County—FHA: $743,511.
County—Medicare: $142,000.
County—Social security added: $228,000.

HARRISON COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Logan-Magnolia—Headstart project: $4,527.
Missouri Valley—Youth Corps: $21,740.
River Sioux—River bank work: $665,469.
Missouri Valley—River bank work: $481,959.
Missouri Valley—Sewage treatment: $81,600.
Mondamin—New post office: Pending.
Woodbine—Sewage treatment: $25,590.
Dunlap—Sewage treatment: $33,900.
County—Erosion control: $101,625.
County—DeSoto recreation: $45,144.
County—DeSoto wildlife: $85,000.
County—DeSoto roads: $54,629.
County—Home mortgage loans: $74,000.
County—Urban planning: $15,000.
County—Library grant: $1,500.
County—Agricultural research: $30,885.
County—Extension service: $27,500.
County—SCS: $245,587.
County—Consumer service: $221,286.
County—ASCS: $897,585.
County—C.C.C.: $13,250,945.
County—REA: $360,000.
County—FHA: $1,137,890.
County—Medicare: $164,000.
County—Social security added: $262,000.

MADISON COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECTS, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Truro—Senior citizen housing: $36,000.
Earlham—Senior citizen housing: $36,000.
Earlham—Nursing home: $108,600.
Earlham—Manpower training: $83,086.
Winterset—Neighborhood center: $18,648.
County—Home mortgage loans: $115,000.
County—Library grant, $400.
County—Agricultural research: $33,440.
County—Extension service: $20,250.
County—SCS: $205,090.
County—Consumer service: $144,184.
County—ASCS: $547,448.
County—C.C.C.: $5,205,154.
County—F.I.C.A.: $18,649.
County—FHA: $415,720.
County—Medicare: $127,000.
County—Added social security: $194,000.

MILLS COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Glenwood—New post office: pending.
Glenwood—Headstart program: $2.490.
Glenwood—Hospital work program: $18,155.
Glenwood—Manpower training: $242,679.
Glenwood—School training grant: $25,000.
Malvern—Headstart program: $3,656.
Malvern—Senior citizen housing: $4,000.
County—Adult education: $11,500.
County—Community planning: $16,452.
County—Home mortgage loan: $536,000.
County—Library grant: $1,000.
County—Agricultural research: $14,332.
County—Extension service: $30,650.
County—SCS: $251,893.
County—Consumer service: $126,170.
County—ASCS: $406,863.
County—C.C.C.: $7,407,708.
County—F.C.I.C.: $4,876
County—FHA: $373,630.
County—Medicare: $99,000.
County—Social security added: $172,000.

MONONA COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Blencoe—Sewer treatment plant: $13,000.
Blencoe—New water and sewer system: $35,000 grant, $72,000 loan.
Onawa—River erosion repairs: $67,810.
Onawa—REC loan: $254,000.
Mapleton—Senior citizen housing: $186,000.
Mapleton—Airport development: $105,808.
Onawa—Industrial railroad spur: $75,000.
County—Nagel drainage improvements: $15,000.
County—Home mortgage: $153,000.
County—Library grant: $650.
County—Agricultural research: $33,440.
County—Extension service: $30,440.
County—SCS: $4,869,994.
County—Consumer service: $194,197.
County—ASCS: $765,681.
County—C.C.C.: $10,293,195.
County—REA: $254,000.
County—FHA: $293,310.
County—Medicare: $126,000.
County—Added social security: $189,000.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Red Oak—Airport development: $64,065.
Red Oak—SBIC license: $153,000.
Red Oak—Learning resource center: $258,000.
Stanton—Community planning: $3,300.
Stanton—Senior citizen housing: $310,324.
Villisca—Headstart program: $2,610.
Elliot—New sewer system: $20,100.
County—Home mortgage loans: $295,000.
County—Urban planning: $43,000.
County—Library grant: $400.
County—Agricultural research: $16,719.
County—Extension service: $27,950.
County—SCS: $106,144.
County—Consumer service: $90,665.
County—ASCS: $414,509.
County—C.C.C.: $4,614,846.
County—F.C.I.C.: $7,658.
County—FHA: $430,820.
County—Medicare: $156,000.
County—Added social security: $237,000.

PAGE COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Braddyville—Water sewer system: $23,000 grant, $55,000 loan.
Braddyville—Post office improvements: Pending.
Clarinda—College library grants: $62,876.
Clarinda—College work study program: $28,160.
Clarinda—Mental health training: $25,000.
Clarinda—New post office: Pending.
Clarinda—Headstart program: $2,791.
Shenandoah—Headstart program: $3,656.
County—Home mortgage loans: $621,000.
County—Library grant: $1,200.
County—Mill and Longbranch Creek watershed: Pending.
County—Agricultural research: $14,332.
County—Extension service: $37,950.
County—SCS: $117,112.
County—Consumer service: $127,178.
County—ASCS: $505,523.
County—C.C.C.: $5,103,615.
County—F.C.I.C.: $6,997.
County—FHA: $736,596.
County—Medicare: $229,000.
County—Added social security: $351,000.

POTTAWATTAMIE COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Council Bluffs—Storm sewers: $948,000.
Council Bluffs—Urban renewal: $93,058.
Council Bluffs—School grant for military children: $52,876.
Council Bluffs—Urban plan: $70,746.
Council Bluffs—Nursing student loans: $4,180.
Council Bluffs—Levee repairs: $56,960.
Council Bluffs—River bank work: $811,223.
Council Bluffs—Federal building expansion: Estimated $58,000, pending.
Council Bluffs—Youth Corps programs: $72,510.
Council Bluffs—Urban renewal: $4,910,000.
Council Bluffs—Swimming pool grant: $45,000.
Carter Lake—School grant for military children: $14,350.
Carter Lake—Postal branch established.
Walnut—Post office expansion: $11,800.
Oakland—New post office expansion: $11,800.
Neola—Headstart program: $2,304.
Macedonia—Remodel post office: $5,805.
Treynor—Treynor recreation area.
County—Adult education: $8,270.
County—Other Headstart programs: $70,465.
County—Training unemployed: $201,111.
County—North Pidgeon watershed: Pending.
County—Home mortgage loans: $5,617,000.
County—Indian Creek project: $300,000.
County—Library grant: $850.
County—Simon Run watershed: Pending.
County—Agricultural research: $19,112.
County—Extension service: $67,900.
County—SCS: $462,818.
County—Consumer service: $657,113.
County—ASCS: $709,409.
County—C.C.C.: $13,000,258.
County—F.C.I.C.: $19,218.
County—FHA: $852,760.
County—Medicare: $540,000.
County—Added social security: $895,000.

SHELBY COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Harlan—New post office: Pending.
Harlan—Medicare alert: $12,732.
Irwin—Youth Corps: $4,400.
Defiance—Water sewer: $13,000 grant, system: $100,000 loan.
Earling—New post office: Pending.
Elk Horn—Remodel post office: $80,000.
Elk Horn—Greenspan project: $700.
County—Home mortgage loans: $123,000.
County—Agricultural research: $28,885.
County—Extension service: $33,950.
County—SCS: $83,773.
County—Consumer service: $263,993.
County—ASCS: $545,312.
County—C.C.C.: $8,588,413.
County—F.C.I.C.: $4,922.
County—FHA: $1,179,387.

County—Medicare: $132,000.
County—Added social security: $207,000.

TAYLOR COUNTY

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Bedford—Flood control: $264,500.
Clearfield—New water system: $15,000 grant, $160,000 loan.
Gravity—Water system: $11,000 grant, $65,000 loan.
Gravity—Remodel post office: $500.
Lenox—Greenspan program: Pending.
County—Library grant: $1,000.
County—Agricultural research: $14,332.
County—Extension service: $23,450.
County—SCS: $226,860.
County—Consumer service: $91,698.
County—ASCS: $560,134.
County—C.C.C.: $3,841,377.
County—FHA: $445,400.
County—Medicare: $125,000.
County—Added social security: $181,000.

MULTICOUNTY PROJECTS

LOCATION, PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Page, Montgomery, Cass, Mills, Fremont—Program development: $26,869.
Crawford, Harrison, Monona, Shelby—Farm training program: $60,642.
Harrison, Shelby—Mosquito Creek levee repairs: $1,117,900.
Audubon, Dallas, Guthrie—Study grant: $25,624.
Madison, Adair, Taylor, Union, Ringgold, Adams—Study grant: $40,994.
Carroll, Greene, Calhoun, Sac—Development project improve economic level: $36,516.
Harrison, Shelby—Mosquito watershed: Approval.
Fremont, Harrison—Headstart program: $13,191.
Pottawattamie, Harrison, Mills, Page—Headstart program: $79,583.
Audubon, Cass, Adair, Guthrie—Turkey Creek watershed: $2,632,120.
Crawford, Delaware, Des Moines, Polk, Washington—Assoc. Retarded Children: $35,570.
Adair, Adams, Guthrie—5 x 80 recreation.
Mills, Fremont—Urban planning: $45,000.
Greene, Madison—Urban planning: $11,000.
Harrison, Pottawattamie—Allen Steer watershed: Pending.
Guthrie, Audubon, Cass—Troublesome Creek watershed: Pending.
Mills, Freemont—Waubonsie Creek watershed: Pending.
Pottawattamie, Mills—Ponies watershed: Pending.
Page, Fremont, Montgomery—West Tarkio Creek watershed: Pending.
Crawford, Harrison, Monona, Shelby—Visitation service shut-ins: $64,856.
Crawford, Harrison, Monona, Shelby—Headstart project: $29,032.
Calhoun, Carroll, Sac, Greene—Headstart project: $3,106.
Boone, Dallas, Guthrie, Madison—Work experience and training: $229,040.
Harrison, Monona—Ox-Bow Lakes Recreation: $2,500,000.
Harrison, Adair and 28 other counties—Emergency flood repair: $500,000.
Dallas, Madison—Ext. Badger Creek: $213,000.
Greene, Crawford—Scranton, Schleswig Jefferson Plan assistance: $25,000.

DISTRICTWIDE PROJECTS

PROJECT, FUNDS, OR STATUS

Rehabilitation of blind: $110,000.
Allocation disaster relief: $5,000,000.
Outdoor recreational area: $1,283,894.
Rehabilitation flood property: $2,000,000.
Aid elementary and secondary schools: $2,800,000.

A REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE—89TH CONGRESS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment of this, the 89th Congress, I want to provide you and the Members of the House with a brief report of the work and activities carried out by the Select Committee on Small Business during these past 2 years.

As you will recall, shortly after the opening of the 89th Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives voted again to reestablish the Small Business Committee. This time, however, the House directed that the membership of the committee should be increased from 13 to 15 members.

During the 89th Congress you, Mr. Speaker, appointed me as chairman to serve along with the following Members:

WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York.

TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma.

James Roosevelt, Democrat, of California.

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois.

JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.

NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa.

CHARLES L. WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia.

ARCH A. MOORE, JR., Republican, of West Virginia, ranking minority member.

H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California.

RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana.

SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.

JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican, of North Carolina.

FRANK J. HORTON, Republican, of New York.

During September 1965, Representative James Roosevelt resigned from the committee. Representative JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat, of California, was selected to take his place. During October 1966, Representative CHARLES L. WELTNER resigned and he was replaced by Representative DONALD J. IRWIN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

These Members, Mr. Speaker, which you appointed, are Members of unusual ability and are steadfast in their devotion and dedication to the principles proclaimed clearly and forcefully by the Congress that the security and well-being of our Nation can be realized only if the small business sector of our economy remains viable and vigorous—that small business must be protected and encouraged in order to preserve our free-enterprise system.

Prior to January 1966 the committee had never been privileged to have a home of its own. The committee staff was housed in rooms scattered throughout the Cannon House Office Building. Our hearings were held in committee rooms provided by other committees. Mr. Speaker, with your assigning a hearing room and staff quarters in the Rayburn House Office Building, as a permanent home for the House Small Business Committee, our physical facilities became greatly improved. Our thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, and let me say also that this expression of thanks is likewise voiced by the Nation's small business community.

Our committee is also grateful to the Architect of the Capitol, the Honorable J. George Stewart, and to his dedicated Assistant, Mr. Mario B. Campioli.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE ECONOMY

The economy of our country is enjoying the sixth straight year of growth and prosperity. Small business has shared in these good times, but even so, all of us recognize that these good times have brought with them important and far-reaching changes in the structure of our economy. All of these changes, it seems, have brought new and special problems for small business. In the opening days of the 89th Congress, therefore, the committee was required to deal with a variety of challenges in order to carry out the duties and responsibilities assigned to the committee by the House of Representatives. It is a pleasure to be able to report, Mr. Speaker, that the committee moved firmly and resolutely to face up to these problems—serious problems with which small business is compelled to contend.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE

In carrying out the work of the committee, these subcommittees were established:

Subcommittee No. 1, Foundations: Their Impact on Small Business, under the chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas inquired into the operation of tax-exempt foundations and their impact upon small business. Other Members appointed to this subcommittee were Representatives Roosevelt, Democrat, of California, WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana, and H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California. Due to the resignation of Representative Roosevelt in September 1965, Representative CORMAN, Democrat, of California was assigned to the subcommittee.

Subcommittee No. 2, Small Business and Government Procurement, was placed under the chairmanship of Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York. The other Members appointed to this subcommittee were Representatives STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, Roosevelt, Democrat, of California, H. ALLEN SMITH, Republican, of California, and CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts. Due to the resignation of Representative Roosevelt in Septem-

ber 1965, Representative CORMAN, Democrat, of California was named in his place on the subcommittee.

Subcommittee No. 3 on Taxation was headed by Representative TOM STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma. Other Members named were Representatives MULTER, Democrat, of New York, NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa, JAMES BROYHILL, Republican, of North Carolina, and CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts.

Subcommittee No. 4 on Distribution Problems Affecting Small Business was established under the chairmanship of Representative James Roosevelt, Democrat, of California. Other Members assigned to this subcommittee included Representatives KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois, DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, MOORE, Republican, of West Virginia, and HORTON, Republican, of New York. Following the resignation of Representative Roosevelt in September 1965, the unfinished work of this subcommittee was carried forward to completion by the Subcommittee on Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies.

Subcommittee No. 5 on Small Business Problems in Urban Areas was placed under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Democrat, of Illinois. Other Members assigned to the subcommittee were Representatives MULTER, Democrat, of New York, WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, RALPH HARVEY, Republican, of Indiana, and HORTON, Republican, of New York.

Subcommittee No. 6 on the Activities of Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies Relating to Small Business was created and placed under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan. Other members of this subcommittee are Representatives NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa, WELTNER, Democrat, of Georgia, CONTE, Republican, of Massachusetts, and JAMES BROYHILL, Republican, of North Carolina.

Subcommittee No. 7—the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems—operated under the chairmanship of Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa. Other members of this subcommittee are Representatives STEED, Democrat, of Oklahoma, DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, HORTON, Republican, of New York, and JAMES BROYHILL, Republican, of North Carolina.

HELP FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Throughout the 89th Congress—as in preceding Congresses—the House Small Business Committee operated as a service committee for all Members of the House. The committee staff is expert in handling small business problems and in dealing with the Government agencies involved. Many Members of the House called upon our committee for such assistance, and the number of personal services provided the Members has continued to increase. In all instances these matters received immediate attention.

Many of the requests for assistance involved the financial assistance program of the Small Business Administration. Some Members wanted their constituents helped with procurement problems. Antitrust matters also were handled, as were numerous other situations covering a wide variety of problems faced by a wide variety of businesses which the constituents owned and operated.

The committee's staff is available at all times to serve all Members of the House. This will be equally true following adjournment for the committee's office will continue to be open each day of the week when the House is not in session.

HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

As provided in the Small Business Act, the House Small Business Committee has a special duty and obligation to keep itself informed regarding all of the operations of the Small Business Administration. Accordingly, during the 89th Congress the committee held two series of hearings covering the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration.

The first set of hearing were held during April of 1965. Later sessions were held during the entire week of July 18, 1966.

Mr. Bernard L. Boutin became SBA Administrator 2 months before the July hearings. Administrator Boutin testified in some detail regarding the various programs offered by the agency in aid of small business.

Testimony was also received from representatives of small business associations, small businessmen, and officials of small business investment companies. The Director of the Budget Bureau appeared before the committee to discuss budget policies of the administration as they relate to small business programs. A reply to questions concerning business loans under the Economic Opportunity Act was received from the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity for the record of the hearings.

Although a complete review of SBA's operations was conducted, special emphasis was placed on three specific areas of responsibility charged to the agency—first, the recent loan curtailments, policies, and funding of the agency; second the small business lending program under title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act which is under the joint administration of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Small Business Administration; and third, the operations of small business investment companies under the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended. The full scope of these programs were reviewed. Similarly, attention was given to the reorganization of the agency and the resulting changes in personnel assignments.

A field investigation into the operation of title IV of the Economic Opportunity Act was conducted in Detroit. The information thereby adduced together with the evidence developed during the course of the hearings indicated to some members of the committee that the small business lending program of the Office of Economic Opportunity should be transferred to the Small Business Administration. During the debate on this bill in September 1966, the chairman and other members of the committee supported an amendment offered by Representative DINGELL to carry out this transfer, which amendment was adopted by the House.

Much criticism had been received concerning the investment program. The committee devoted a good portion of the hearing to this problem. As a result of these hearings and hearings by other committees pertaining to the small business investment program, legislation was introduced and is presently being considered which will enable the Small Business Administration to more properly supervise these companies and enhance the effectiveness of the program.

Complete reports on the scope of the work of the several subcommittees is being prepared, with recommendations, for submission to the House.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

One of the subcommittees, under the chairmanship of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, has continued to gather facts regarding the impact of privately-controlled, tax-exempt foundations on the Nation's economy—dealing, in part, with foundation-controlled enterprises in competition with taxpaying small businessmen.

The object of the study is to determine whether legislation is needed in order to provide effective supervisory controls over such organizations. Information has been gathered from approximately 600 foundations and charitable trusts. The subcommittee's study has brought to light many instances in which the tax-exempt privilege has been abused; instances in which unfair practices were applied in a manner prejudicial to small business and to other businesses not enjoying tax exemption.

The work of the subcommittee has been noted by the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service. Indeed, President Johnson recognizes the problem of foundation-controlled enterprises in competition with taxpaying businessmen, and has called upon the Congress "to deal with abuses of tax-exempt private foundation." See the President's Economic Report to Congress, January 27, 1966, page 18.

One measure of the subcommittee's accomplishments is that the Treasury has transmitted a number of recommendations to the Ways and Means Committee with respect to the problem areas among tax-exempt private foundations. These problems cannot be resolved under present law and, therefore, a number of legislative measures have been recommended by Treasury.

Another measure of the subcommittee's accomplishments is the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has assessed large amounts of taxes resulting, in part, from the data published by the subcommittee. Five of the foundations which have been under study by the subcommittee were assessed $28 million by the Internal Revenue Service.

PROCUREMENT

The Subcommittee on Small Business and Government Procurement, under the

chairmanship of Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, has been quite active and effective during the 89th Congress. This subcommittee possesses a high degree of expertise regarding small business problems associated with the procurement practices and programs of the various agencies of the Federal Government.

The subcommittee held public hearings in the 89th Congress relating primarily to small business subcontracting and set-aside programs. These are the major programs to which small business looks for a fair proportion of the procurement dollar.

The subcommittee's hearings were held in the wake of a change made by the then Administrator of the Small Business Administration in transferring the responsibility for set-asides from SBA to the procurement agencies and eliminating SBA's procurement center representatives. Testimony was taken from representatives of Department of Defense, the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, Defense Supply Agency, Bureau of the Budget, and SBA. Representatives of small business firms and their associations testified in the subcommittee's hearings in protest against SBA's change. The subcommittee also developed a great deal of information through staff conferences, correspondence, and other informal procedures.

In connection with the subcontracting aspect of the hearings, the subcommittee took testimony from representatives of major prime contractors regarding their small business subcontracting programs established under Public Law 87-305 and their participation in the voluntary small business subcontracting program.

Additional testimony regarding the set-aside change was taken from SBA following the appointment of Bernard L. Boutin as the new Administrator. He requested an opportunity to study his predecessor's change in the set-aside program and to return to the committee with recommendations at the beginning of the 90th Congress. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget also testified that the change would be reconsidered and reported to the committee at the same time.

TAXATION

The Subcommittee on Taxation under the chairmanship of Representative TOM STEED has conducted, through its staff, a continuing study of the various aspects of the Federal tax structure and its impact upon small business.

Chairman STEED has requested the Internal Revenue Service to investigate the activities of nonprofit tax-exempt organizations in conjunction with the sale of air transportation. In response to Chairman STEED's request, the Internal Revenue Service has instructed its Manhattan field office to conduct a thorough study of this matter.

DISTRIBUTION SUBCOMMITTEE
AIR TRANSPORTATION

The Distribution Subcommittee held hearings on the role of small business in the air transportation industry. These hearings were primarily concerned with the problems of small business travel agents, particularly with respect to the sale of air passenger transportation, and the problems confronting small business airfreight forwarders. Evidence was also received concerning the need for small businessmen to receive continuing scheduled helicopter service in Metropolitan Los Angeles.

Seven hearings were held, including sessions in Los Angeles, Chicago, and Washington. Over 100 witnesses testified or filed statements.

At the opening session of the hearings, the vice president of the Air Traffic Conference, during cross-examination by Subcommittee Chairman Roosevelt, informed the subcommittee of the air carriers' willingness to join with the travel agents in forming a joint committee to study ticketing costs. This project, which had long been sought by travel agents, has since become a reality and is well on the road to completion.

The carriers, shortly after the announcement of the hearings, also withdrew a new proposed schedule for commissions which had been vigorously opposed by the travel agents because it reduced by 40 percent the commissions they would receive on the largest single category of tickets. Another byproduct of the hearings has been the granting, on a regular basis, of reduced-rate air transportation to travel agents for the purpose of allowing them to become familiar with tourist and vacation areas and facilities.

Shortly after Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI became acting chairman of the subcommittee, due to the resignation of Representative Roosevelt, it was called to his attention that the new standards committee working with the Secretary of Commerce on the proposed new plywood standard was composed exclusively of members of the American Plywood Association. Congressman KLUCZYNSKI wrote the Secretary of Commerce calling this to his attention and requested that representatives of the independent sector of the industry be appointed to the committee. Shortly after the letter was sent, the committee was enlarged to include independent representation.

URBAN SMALL BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Urban Small Business Problems under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI in Chicago, Rochester, New York, Atlanta, and Washington. Testimony was received from over 200 witnesses, the bulk of whom were small businessmen. The witnesses also included such notables as the mayors of New York, Chicago, Rochester, and Atlanta, and the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Hearings were held in small business shopping centers, small business retail outlets in areas scheduled to be demolished, and shopping plazas, as well as the more usual formal hearing rooms. A wealth of new information concerning the problems actually confronting the Nation's urban small businessmen was compiled. Round table discussions by members of the academic community, the planning profession, city managers and consultants were also held, during which these problems were subjected to intense analysis and scrutiny.

As a result of the hearings, the new Administrator of the Small Business Administration issued directives to all field offices that they are to establish at once close liaison with the field offices of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and those units of local government in charge of urban renewal. The purpose of this liaison will be to see that every small businessman who is displaced by urban renewal is personally informed of the programs available to him in conjunction with urban renewal.

The subcommittee has also received assurances from the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration that several programs which have been enacted by the Congress but have not been implemented by these agencies will, in the immediate future, be fully operative.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACTIVITIES OF REGULATORY AND ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Throughout the 89th Congress, Representative JOHN D. DINGELL has been chairman of the Subcommittee on Activities of Regulatory and Enforcement Agencies Relating to Small Business. During the first session of the Congress, testimony was developed by the subcommittee from representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and appropriate divisions of the Department of Agriculture.

During the second session of the Congress, hearings were held on the activities of the Federal Communications Commission relating to small business. Testimony was received from spokesmen for small business florists concerning the entry of Western Union into the direct sale of flowers in intercity markets. They were fearful this would deprive them of a large portion of their market because of Western Union's access to the contents of messages sent for congratulatory purposes and other factors. The Commission, subsequent to inquiry lodged by the subcommittee, has instructed Western Union to prohibit its employees from using the contents of messages for the purpose of soliciting orders for flowers.

Testimony was also received concerning the allegedly discriminatory rate structure of the television networks for advertising purposes. During testimony before the subcommittee, ABC and NBC announced the abandonment of their former rate structure and the issuance of a new rate card which eliminated the alleged discriminatory practices.

Testimony was also received from spokesmen from small businessmen desiring the designation of additional radio spectrum so that they might make fuller usage of land mobile radio. Subsequent to an inquiry lodged by the subcommittee with the Commission, field studies of the feasibility of assigning additional spectrum for this purpose, which had

long been sought by land mobile users, were commenced.

Testimony was also received from the proprietor of a proposed common carrier microwave system and spokesmen for small businessmen shared time computer center regarding the necessity of additional facilities, at reasonable cost, for the transmission of data. Subsequent to the receipt of this testimony by the subcommittees, the Commission has ruled that microwave may now be used for common carrier purposes and that a number of smaller firms may share the same facilities.

Testimony was also received from the telephone answering industry, independent producers of television programs, independent marketers of telephone equipment, radio and television station representatives, the National Association of Broadcasters, the community antenna television industry, and other small business communication interests.

Chairman DINGELL appeared before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, presenting the small business problems inherent in programs of industrial standardization. Subsequent to his testimony, he was asked by members of the science committee for specific views on additional points which were also presented.

Chairman DINGELL has engaged in conferences with both General Motors and the Ford Motor Co. seeking to have those firms eliminate certain allegedly discriminatory practices with regard to the distribution of so-called captive parts. Further conferences are scheduled on this matter and it is expected that a resolution to the controversy will be obtained.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS

THE EFFECT OF CORN MARKETING BY THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION UPON SMALL BUSINESS

During June 1966 the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems, under the chairmanship of Representative NEAL SMITH, Democrat, of Iowa, conducted 5 days of hearings concerning the effect of corn marketing by the Commodity Credit Corporation upon small business.

The subcommittee had received numerous complaints concerning price discrimination and other marketing factors which alleged that country elevators and other small businessmen had not been allowed to equitably participate in the purchase of Commodity Credit Corporation corn. The complaints dealt specifically with an extremely heavy sale of corn by CCC during the first several months of the 1965 corn marketing year which began on October 1, 1965.

Following a rather comprehensive field investigation, public hearings were held at which testimony was received from cooperative associations and independently owned elevator and warehouse operators from the Iowa and Minnesota grain marketing areas. Witnesses from the Department of Agriculture also testified.

Based upon the subcommittee investigations and hearings, the subcommittee adopted a unanimous report, House Report No. 2082, which contains the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee. This report has been filed with the House. Indicative of the interest in this report is the fact that the committee's supply of the printed record of the hearings has been depleted and the report has been widely accepted.

PROBLEMS OF THE TOOL, DIE, AND MACHINE TOOL INDUSTRIES

The Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems conducted hearings on July 26 and 27, 1966, concerning problems of the tool and die industry and associated problems of manufacturers and distributors of machine tools.

For some time the committee had received information from these industries that they were faced with important problems involving the inability to expand and modernize because of a lack of capital and the inability to meet production requirements because of a lack of skilled manpower. This matter was referred to the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems and hearings were conducted.

At these hearings representatives of tool and die manufacturers, machine tool producers and machine tool distributors appeared before the subcommittee. Testimony was also received from officials of the Small Business Administration, the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor. Special emphasis was placed on the tool, die, and precision machine industries because all of the problems affecting these industries specifically affected the tool and die manufacturers. This entire industry is comprised of small businessmen.

A report based on these hearings is also being drafted and will be submitted to the House.

SMALL BUSINESS DAIRIES

During the 89th Congress numerous communications were received from small independent dairies in various parts of the country complaining about price wars which threatened their continued existence.

A preponderance of these complaints came from independent dairies in the State of Iowa, particularly in the Des Moines and Waterloo trading areas.

A comprehensive field investigation was conducted in the State of Iowa. Interviews by committee investigators were held with officials of many of the dairies—both small and large—doing business in the markets involved. This action by the subcommittee brought about the termination of most, if not all, of the objectionable pricing practices that had been applied in that area.

The work of the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of Small Business Problems has been effective and productive in solving a variety of problems confronting small business. Some interim reports have been filed, but reports covering the work of the full Committee of the House Small Business Committee will be submitted to the House within the next few weeks.

THE COMMITTEE STAFF

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like also to pay tribute to Mr. Bryan Haskell Jacques, the committee's hard-working staff director; to Mr. Richard L. Mitchell, the able and skillful general counsel; and to all other members of the staff. The committee is fortunate in having an excellent staff composed of efficient, loyal, and dedicated individuals, and I wish to give recognition and thanks to them for the capable manner in which they have helped the members carry out the work of the committee.

THE COMMITTEE'S RECORD OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

Mr. Speaker, over the years the House Small Business Committee, time and again, has proven its usefulness to the Members of Congress and to the small business community.

The committee has established a long and distinguished record of service and accomplishment.

Among the distinguished Members who have served on this committee over the years—who have been appointed by Speaker Rayburn, Speaker MCCORMACK, and Speaker MARTIN—include our colleagues, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, of Indiana, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York, and Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio; our former colleague, Representative Leonard W. Hall, Republican, of New York; the present majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD; the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON; the late, beloved Senator from Tennessee, Estes Kefauver; and several other Members who also served with distinction.

COLUMBUS DAY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, the Italian-American communities of the United States deserve the Nation's congratulations for taking the lead in making the annual observance of Columbus Day an occasion for taking stock of our heritage.

Columbus Day, celebrated on the anniversary of the great explorer's first Western Hemisphere landing, is by the very nature of the holiday a reminder that the New World, and particularly the United States, seemed intended by the Creator as the crucible in which the best in mankind would be welded into a viable society.

The very fact that it has traditionally been Americans of Italian descent who

are in the forefront of this symbolic commemoration of the New World's discovery emphasizes the one-worldness of our Nation.

Christopher Columbus was a native of Italy. His voyages of discovery were sponsored by the monarchs of Spain. His epoch-making journey was in search of a route to India. His landing on October 12, 1492, was in what are now the Bahamas. He also discovered the island of Hispaniola, shared today by Haiti and the Dominican Republic. He discovered America.

His birthday and the dates of his discoveries are celebrated in many lands of our hemisphere. Several countries claim to contain his burial site.

All in all, his life, his voyages and the commemorations of these are considered today among the traditions of many nations, and this is in itself a tribute to the great Italian navigator and his supreme accomplishment.

We owe to our citizens of Italian descent a vote of thanks for their annual reminder of the origins of our culture and society, and I congratulate them for taking the lead in making Columbus Day a holiday of importance and deep meaning to us all.

EFFORT TO PREVENT MISTAKE BEING MADE IN OUR FOREIGN TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, since August I have been engaged in a strenuous effort to prevent a grave mistake from being made in our foreign trade negotiations.

Our highly valuable and significant synthetic organic chemical industry and particularly its benzenoid chemical segment is currently threatened by a proposal to remove the American selling price system of valuation of imported chemicals, in return for concessions at the forthcoming Kennedy round trade negotiations.

On September 20 I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission on this subject and made a strong appeal against this proposal. I should like to request unanimous consent to have my remarks of September 20 inserted in the RECORD. Yesterday, I am happy to report, I was joined by nine of my colleagues of both parties from our great State of Ohio in a letter to the President setting forth our views on this vital matter. Several other members of the Ohio delegation had expressed interest in joining in this effort but regrettably, due to previous commitments were out of town.

Mr. Speaker, I also respectfully request your permission to insert a copy of this letter in the RECORD at this point.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WALTER H. MOELLER, OF OHIO, BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON PROBABLE IMPACT OF CONCESSIONS ON CERTAIN PRODUCTS NOW SUBJECT TO DUTY ON THE AMERICAN SELLING PRICE BASIS OF VALUATION, SEPTEMBER 20, 1966

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear this morning before you gentlemen on a matter of great concern to my 11-County Congressional District in Southeastern Ohio. This District, I just might add, is within Appalachia and has within recent years made great strides in industrial expansion and economic growth. Gentlemen, in a District like mine, new industry and jobs thus generated are valuable and critical to the economic survival of the area. It is on this note that I appear before you today.

Washington County and the City of Marietta in my District are in the forefront of this activity in our once depressed and neglected area of the State of Ohio. The extremely valuable American Cyanamid Plant at Marietta has contributed substantially to this progress. This activity employs well over 180 workers and has a payroll exceeding one million dollars a year. In addition, the Cyanamid operation at Marietta produces over 1.5 million dollars in taxes and collateral purchases. Cyanamid also operates an even larger plant in Willow Island, West Virginia where it employs approximately 825 people, with a payroll in excess of 5.5 million a year. This type of industrial activity in Appalachia must be encouraged and, if necessary, protected. Any threat to the continued operations and future expansions of these important economic generators in our once depressed area is totally unthinkable.

The other point I would like to just briefly touch on for the benefit of the Commission is that it is important to the security of the United States as a whole to maintain a viable and strong Benzenoid Chemical Industry within our shores. These chemicals, as I am sure you know, are used largely in the production of sulfonamides, dyes, pigments and many other important products. If the current system of valuation at the American selling price is removed, production of these important chemicals in the United States will no longer be profitable enough for our domestic industry to manufacture these chemicals in the United States. The low labor rates abroad and the monopolistic business practices conducted abroad will force the plants in this country to close down. The companies, although they will be hurt, will survive and in all probability take the necessary steps to establish similar facilities in foreign lands, employing foreign labor to continue production. The major harm from such a consequence will be to those American workers displaced and to the communities adversely affected from the loss of this type of valuable business activity. In addition, we shall see a further drop in our balance of payments and gold position.

In other words, gentleman, the companies will survive but the individuals and the communities who are dependent upon such industry will suffer. It seems to me at a time when our nation faces many crises at home and abroad that it is somewhat ridiculous that we would contemplate casting from our shores an essential job-producing, domestic industry for the slight prospect of an illusory benefit of a concession at some future trade conference.

I urge you, in the strongest possible terms at my command, not to take action to upset our current system of valuation, at the American selling price, of benzenoid chemicals imported into the United States.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 11, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned members of the Ohio Congressional Delegation, feel compelled to call to your personal attention our grave concern regarding the possible elimination of the American Selling Price System of customs valuation for benzenoid chemicals which, if allowed, could result in severe economic injury to the substantial synthetic organic chemical industry in our State.

The U.S. Tariff Commission will shortly complete its investigation of the economic impact of a change in the current system of valuation and provide you with its findings and recommendations. While we are confident that these findings will fully support our position we feel it necessary to underscore for you the importance of this industry to the economy of our State.

There are over 14,000 workers in the synthetic organic chemical industry in Ohio, at 19 plants throughout the State. Almost 5,000 of these workers are directly engaged in the production of benzenoid chemicals. Nationally, the industry enploys 116,000 workers and has an annual payroll in excess of $900,000,000. Any threat to this continued operation and expansion of these important industrial facilities in our state is unthinkable.

It is clear from the record before the Tariff Commission, as well as from the data made available by the industry, that its sales will be reduced by virtue of the massive increases in imports which will result from the abandonment of the American Selling Price System. The profitability of the domestic benzenoid industry is well below the national average and we do not believe it can absorb the price reductions that will flow from the importation of low-cost foreign benzenoids.

If the American Selling Price System of valuation is removed we could expect severe economic dislocation to take place in the State of Ohio. We cannot agree that Ohio's benzenoid chemical industry should be sacrificed to foreign manufacturers with labor rates that are but a fraction of those prevailing in our State. To do so would be to jeopardize the livelihoods of 5,000 Ohio families.

We understand that a number of Members of Congress have recently written to you on this subject. We wish to identify strongly with our other colleagues and respectfully urge that no commitment on American Selling Price be made by the United States at the forthcoming international negotiations at Geneva.

Sincerely yours,

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER.
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA.
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY.
HON. ROBERT T. SECREST.
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS.
HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK.
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS.
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES.
HON. DONALD D. CLANCY.
HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER.
HON. WILLIAM H. MCCULLOCH.

MAINE SUGAR REFINERY

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Special Committee on Economic Development which I include in the RECORD at this point.

Hon. ED EDMONDSON,
Chairman, Special Committee on Economic Development, Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Thursday, October 6, 1966, my good friend Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., raised some questions relative to the worth and feasibility of a sugar refinery that is nearing completion in Maine. The questions were good ones and deserve answers. I would like to do so at this time.

1. Did the applicants for the initial ARA loan submit data on the marketing potential for refined sugar in nearby New England states? If so, did these data indicate that Boston and environs, the locations of two established cane refineries—constituted the chief marketing potential?

Answer: Technical Assistance Project No. 677 of EDA shows that a market potential analysis for refined sugar was conducted before any money was loaned by ARA–EDA for a sugar refining plant in Maine. The market analysis showed the area from Boston North offered the best marketing potential.

2. In granting the initial ARA loan, did that agency give consideration to the possible impact on employment in the established refineries in Boston? If so, what were ARA's findings and conclusions?

Answer: Project No. 677 of EDA states the following: "Boston and New England are currently supplied with sugar from two large cane refineries—No other major sugar market area in the United States has a comparable lack of competition.

"Historically, the price of sugar for the wholesale and retail markets of New England is the highest in the country."

The 48¢ to 68¢ CWT cost differential between New England and Chicago has been the normal situation for the last five years. Large wholesale users in New England who distribute their products in the national market are at a continuing disadvantage to their Chicago competitors. This price disadvantage has caused an exodus of large sugar users from New England.

The Koffsky Special Study on Sugar to the United States Department of Agriculture projects the theory that New England will decline in sugar consumption until at least 1975. Since industrial use of sugar constitutes 58.4% of sugar usage and since New England is losing industrial sugar users because of high prices, it seems logical that something should be done to correct this situation. ARA–EDA by loaning money to a new sugar plant in Maine will make the New England sugar more competitive thus preserving jobs in the New England confectionary industry and existing cane refineries.

The following list of firms and associations have written letters to indicate their concern over the sugar situation in New England. These firms are:

New England Bakers Association, Needham, Massachusetts.

New England Manufacturing Confectioners Association, Boston, Massachusetts.

New England Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Worcester, Massachusetts.

New England Confectionary Company (NECCO), Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Deran Confectionary Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

James O. Welch Company, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

H. W. Powers Company, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts.

Maple Grove, St. Johnsbury, Vermont.

School House Candy Company, Pawtucket, Rhode Island.

Edgar P. Lewis and Son, Malden, Massachusetts.

H. P. Hood and Son, Malden, Massachusetts.

The Berwick Cake Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

James H. McManus, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Dorchester Ice Cream Corporation, Boston, Massachusetts.

S. C. Clayton Company, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts.

In conclusion—the addition of another sugar source will contribute towards the effort to bring New England sugar prices in line with the rest of the United States. This in turn will keep the confectionary industry from moving out of New England. A new sugar source such as the plant in Maine will actually preserve New England jobs rather than destroy any.

3. In the application by Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., for the EDA loan of $2,250,300, recently granted, how much additional employment did the applicants claim would be generated—over and above that claimed in the initial application for the ARA loan?

Answer: The chief difference in the number of jobs claimed for the original ARA loan and the number claimed in the EDA loan is in year-round permanent jobs. There are approximately 250 more year-round jobs as opposed to part-time employment.

4. Was any consideration given by EDA in approving a loan for the purchase of cane sugar refining machinery, of the impact on marketings of the two Boston refineries and hence on their employment? If so, what were the findings of fact by EDA and its conclusions?

Answer: The answer to question 4 is basically the same as the answer to question 2. EDA Technical Assistance Project No. 677 points out that without the introduction of another source of sugar then sugar use in New England would continue to decline with the continued exodus of large sugar users. A sugar refinery in Maine should bring New England sugar prices more in line with the rest of the United States.

5. Is Maine Sugar Industries, Inc., applying for still a third loan? If so, for what purpose and for what amount?

Answer: Easton, Maine was redesignated by EDA on June 30, 1966, because of the improving economy in Central Aroostook County, thus making Maine Sugar Industries ineligible for any more loans.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
U.S. Congressman.

"KEEP A BOY IN SPORTS AND KEEP HIM OUT OF THE COURTS"

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, having served for many years on the municipal bench of the city of Jersey City, N.J., I know full well the truth in the old adage "Keep a boy in sports and you keep him out of the courts." Thus, I was very shocked this morning when I read the Potomac Watch column in the Washington Post by Mr. William Raspberry. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I will have Mr. Raspberry's column inserted at this point in the RECORD so that all Members may read of the outrage which is going on very literally under our noses.

Mr. Raspberry's column follows:

U.S.-OWNED VACANT LOT BARRED AS PLAYING FIELD

(By William Raspberry)

St. Peter's Angels haven't exactly been told where to go, but they've been ordered to get the devil out of their former football paradise at 1st and C Streets se.

The Angels (top weight: 130 pounds) and a second St. Peter's team of 100-pounders had used the two-block lot for about five weeks. Police evicted them last Thursday.

The lot is the property of the U.S. Capitol, and there is a law against playing on the Capitol grounds. So now the lot—almost a park, really—just sits there, protected by battered signs that say "U.S. Property: No Trespassing."

"I don't know what we're going to do now," said the Rev. Patrick Durkin, pastor of St. Peter's Church. "We're sort of hung. We're trying to find out if maybe we can provide transportation for the kids to Turkey Thicket Park, at 10th Street and Michigan Avenue ne. The next closest vacant lot is in Anacostia."

The Capitol Hill lot once contained some of the area's most attractive row houses. They were torn down three years ago when the Government acquired the site for the proposed Madison Memorial Library, an annex to the Library of Congress.

Indications are that it will be at least a year or two before construction begins. In the meantime, the huge lot, a rarity in this crowded city, apparently will just sit there.

Philip Roof, executive assistant to Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, said there has been no particular problem with youngsters damaging the grounds. There is nothing, really, to damage.

"There's a law against using the Capitol grounds as a playground," he said. "The minute we acquired the lot for the library, it became a part of the Capitol grounds."

Principal objection to use of the lot as a play area, he said, is legal. "For example," he said, "if a child is hurt there while he's playing, the Government could be sued under the Federal Torts Claim Act."

Roof also noted that the Government "has spent a lot of money to seed that ground."

The lot is fairly attractive, even if the grass has only a slight ascendancy over the weeds. The shrubbery that once graced the rowhouse lawns gives it the appearance of a park.

But it is a park that no one uses, nor is there any encouragement to those who would. There are no benches, fountains, walkways or other enticements. And, too, there are those "No Trespassing" signs.

According to Father Durkin, the lot's major use is as a two-block restroom for dogs. "Nearly everybody on Capitol Hill walks his dog there," he said.

Young adults of the area have occasional pick-up softball games there on weekend afternoons, although that, too, is forbidden and presumably will be enforced now.

Father Durkin said police indicated there have been complaints from residents about youngsters playing there. But he has been unable to find any of the complainants.

"In fact, residents of the Coronet Apartment House and others are circulating a petition trying to get permission to use the lot for recreation," he said.

Others are seeking help from high places, including Members of Congress and the Vice President's office.

According to Father Durkin, St. Peter's two teams—some 40 youngsters aged 11 to 15—are the only tackle football teams for that age group between 1st and 15th Streets se., from East Capitol Street to the Anacostia River.

"It is because of this that the Catholic Youth Organization permitted us to take in non-Catholic boys," he noted.

Capitol Architect Stewart said someone was in his office last week to ask permission to use the lot as a play area. He hinted that he was miffed because "they had been using the lot already and only came to ask permission after they were chased off by police."

But he said he couldn't have granted permission anyway. "I haven't any authority to bypass the law," he said. "The only way permission could be given is through an act of Congress."

Waiting for an act of Congress, particularly where District problems are concerned, is not the city's most rewarding pastime.

Mr. Speaker, my office in the Cannon House Office Building is on the eastern side of the building and I have, in common with many other Members of the House, noted the presence of the future Bobby Mitchells and Sonny Jurgensens playing football on the empty lot which lies between First and Second Streets Southeast. Thus, to find our Government treating the young footballers from St. Peter's Church as trespassers, is a very serious situation.

I have introduced legislation today which would correct this situation and allow this conveniently located tract to be used as a recreation area until the new Library Annex is built on the site.

Mr. Speaker, I think this corrective legislation should be promptly passed by the Congress.

"HOW BRIGHT LIGHTS REDUCE CRIME"

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by Don Murray entitled "How Bright Lights Reduce Crime" that appeared in Coronet magazine in February of 1960:

HOW BRIGHT LIGHTS REDUCE CRIME

CITIES ACROSS THE UNITED STATES FIND BRIGHT STREET LIGHTS THE "MOST EFFECTIVE—AND INEXPENSIVE COP ON THE BEAT"

(By Don Murray)

A gang of young punks shuffled through the velvet thick shadows of the Manhattan playground last August to where five teenage boys and a girl were sitting in the muggy heat.

"You seen Frenchy?" the leader snarled.

The teenage boys hadn't, and the punks moved away. The teenagers thought the gang had left but, when they decided to go home, they were met at the park gate by the punks, hidden by the shadows. One of the teenagers suddenly felt pain, grasped his abdomen and ran, bent over, across the street. Minutes later he died of knife wounds in the stomach and groin. Gagging with pain and blood, one of his buddies ducked into a hallway, where he died holding a girl's hand. Their three companions were beaten and injured. None had a chance; they hadn't even seen a warning flash of steel in the darkness.

This crime, like many others, needed the cover of night. Across the U.S., shadowed streets breed murder, assault, rape, holdups, burglaries and gang fights as prolifically as uncovered garbage breeds disease.

A national survey shows that there are 12 times as many crimes of violence at night as in the daytime. Another study reveals that all the murders in Canton, Ohio, Binghamton, New York, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, and Hempstead, New York, were committed at night during the period studied. Nearly all the rapes in Baltimore occurred after dark, as did 90 percent of the robberies in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

In Salt Lake City, 96.5 percent of all aggravated assaults took place at night; in Minneapolis, 92 percent of the burglaries happened after dark; in Pittsburgh, 85 percent of stolen cars were taken under cover of darkness.

For centuries decent people didn't go out at night because thugs controlled the streets. Today, with modern electric lights, our streets can be made bright, shadowless—and *safe*. Too often, however, we won't spend the money—until it is too late.

After World War II Cleveland citizens were told by experts that they should spend a minimum of $1,000,000 a year for ten years to make their expanding city safe after dark. They voted only $100,000. Cleveland, for years a leader in street lighting, allowed many of its streets to become jungles of dark shadows. When her citizens went out at night they were targets for muggers, purse snatchers, holdup men and perverts who attacked from the shadows and escaped under cover of darkness.

A 27-year-old laboratory technician was raped in Cleveland one dark night by two men while a third used a gun to make her boy friend watch. From the description of the car and license number police picked up three men. But when these were brought before the victim she couldn't identify them—it had been too dark for her to get a good look at their faces.

In the same city, at 7:50 on New Year's night, 1948, eight-year-old Sheila Ann Tuley was sent to the corner drugstore. She had to walk only 375 feet. But her street was poorly lighted; Sheila never made it. Her body, mutilated by a fiend's knife, was found crumpled on a porch three hours later. No one had seen the attack, yet there was evidence she had fought her assailant on the sidewalk, across a lawn, up the steps and on the porch.

Horrified by Sheila's death and fearing for their own children, a group of Cleveland mothers stormed the mayor's office. They started such a fuss that a bond issue was passed in 1949, and Cleveland began to spend millions of dollars to light its streets properly. When only one-third of the lights were installed, assaults dropped a third. There were 17 percent fewer night crimes; purse-snatching was cut an astonishing 78 percent. Cleveland Police Chief Frank W. Storey is backed by solid experience when he says, "Light always works on the side of the law."

In Vancouver, Washington, tiny Jo Ann Dewey was dragged off the street into a car just after sundown. A number of people heard her terrified screams and rushed to help her. They were too late. It was so dark no one could tell the make of car or read the license number. A long time later, her nude, ravaged body was found outside of town.

On dark streets victims can't see their attackers or describe them afterward. When the police spot a crime they often lose the criminal in a maze of dim streets and black alleys.

But if darkness is the criminal's ally, light is his enemy. For example, New York City had tried every trick to eliminate crime—adding men on the beat, infiltrating areas with plain-clothes men, organizing squads of specially trained officers—with partial success. Then the police pinpointed 111 square blocks in the city where criminals were rampant. The lighting department bathed those 111 blocks in light.

Street lights, which had been 175 feet apart, were placed every 125 feet. They had been 24 feet high. They were raised four-and-a-half feet so the light poured down into the shadowed store fronts and the dark areaways and alleys. Incandescent lights were replaced with brilliant mercury vapor lamps giving 125 percent more light.

The results were spectacular. In one precinct juvenile delinquency was cut a third; in the whole 111 blocks all crime dropped, and crimes of personal violence—murder, rape, assault—were cut a fantastic 49 percent.

It cost $500,000 to buy and install the new equipment. But the new lamps use $9 *less* electricity apiece in each year to give more than twice as much light. "There's no way of comparing the cost of the lights or the savings on electricity and the cost of crime," said one official. "Who can put a cold cash price on a human life or a girl's innocence? We consider the money well spent."

New York is currently spending another $100,000 to light up 20 playgrounds, such as the one where the five teenagers were stabbed, which have had a high incidence of juvenile delinquency.

Results of relighting all over the country are just as impressive as in New York. Chattanooga, Tennessee, had a 12-block area with a fantastic homicide rate. The city flooded the area with light, and crimes of violence were cut 70 to 90 percent.

Denver cut assault complaints a third by relighting some streets; Brookings, South Dakota, and Marion, Indiana, virtually eliminated vandalism in certain areas by expanding lighting; in Austin, Texas, new lighting cut some categories of crime 90 percent.

In Winston-Salem, North Carolina, at least one telephone operator a week had been assaulted—and many weeks two or three—after they left work on late night shifts. New mercury vapor lights were installed. Police Chief Jim Waller reports. "This used to be a major problem. Now it is no problem."

A street lighting program in Flint, Michigan, cut felonies 60 percent in the downtown area. "The new street lighting helped decrease crime beyond our expectations," says Police Chief George Paul. The suburban city of Highland Park, Michigan, plagued by holdups was crisscrossed with dark alleys. Highland Park lit up the alleys. Chief Dewey Schultz said, "Since then we have not had one alley holdup."

McPherson, Kansas, has installed one of the most extensive street lighting programs in the U.S. Brightness was increased six times and enough street lights added so that there is now one for every two-and-a-half homes. There have been no burglaries since then, says Chief Paul Smith, "Our lights have just about illuminated residential crime out of existence."

Albuquerque, New Mexico, cut both auto thefts and thefts from autos by new street lighting. Detroit is attacking crime in its toughest neighborhoods with light. Police officials in Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., Kansas City, Missouri, Houston and Chicago

report that street relighting programs have been a major weapon against crime in their cities.

Most police officials feel that bright streets not only make the police job easier but inhibit crime.

The *total* of crime in any town actually drops when adequate lighting is installed.

Still, many cities refuse to face the facts. Among the U.S. cities with the darkest, most dangerous streets are: Richmond, Virginia; Savannah, Georgia; Rochester, New York; Cincinnati; San Francisco; and Des Moines, Close behind are Boston, Memphis, and Charlotte, North Carolina. These cities lack minimum safe street lighting. The major reason they cite is cost, yet with modern fluorescent and mercury vapor lamps proper street lighting is 20 percent cheaper per unit of light than it was before World War II. It costs each citizen annually less than the price of a restaurant meal to bring the lighting on his street up to standard.

An engineer who specializes in street lighting, W. E. Schwanhausser of General Electric, has five questions you can use to judge the effectiveness of lights in your town:

1. Are the fixtures hanging at least 20 feet above the roadway?
2. Are the lights spaced no more than 150 feet apart?
3. Does the fixture direct the light *downward?*
4. Does the light illumine just the street and sidewalks or is light sprayed all around the pole, into house windows?
5. Is the lighting on the road and sidewalks fairly even and uniform, not a "puddle of light" under each pole with long stretches of darkness between fixtures?

If the answers are yes, then your streets are safe. If most of the answers are no, then you'd better start educating your neighbors so you can work together to make your street safe at night.

Good street lighting is your cheapest weapon against crime. Look at the case of Gary, Indiana, which started installing mercury vapor lights in 1952, half of them in dimly lit areas. Between 1953 and 1955, when the program was fulfilled, Gary's population *increased* 27 percent, yet assaults *decreased* 75 *percent* and robberies went down 65 percent. Police Chief John Foley explained why: "A good street light is as valuable as a good policeman—and a lot cheaper too."

MOTOR ACCIDENTS HAPPEN AT NIGHT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is an established fact that 60 percent of all fatal motor vehicle accidents occur at night when vehicle and pedestrian traffic is lowest. In the cities the after-dark rate is twice that of the day experience. In the country or on rural routes the fatal accidents at night are three times as high as the day rate. It is indisputable that the reduced visibility at night contributes heavily to the alarming difference in day and night traffic fatalities.

Another significant disclosure is that the rural night accident rate—where little or no lighting exists—is appreciably higher than that in the city where some form of illumination exists on a majority of the streets. Of course, higher speeds in the country is also a contributing factor but records reveal that the greatest decrease of accidents in both the urban and rural areas have occurred at the intersections where adequate illumination has been installed.

URBAN PLANNING

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FARNSLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress recently prepared a revised bibliography of books and articles on urban planning. Because of the great importance of this subject I would like to include this list in the RECORD so it will be available to all Members of Congress:

URBAN PLANNING: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS AND ARTICLES, 1955–1966

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Bentley, H. B. City planning and urban renewal; a guide to available reference tools. Library Journal, April 15, 1963: 1621–1624.

Beston, George C. City planning, a basic bibliography of sources and trends. Sacramento, Calif., California Council of Civil Engineers and Land Surveyors, 1962. 195 p.

Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. Selected references on urban planning methods and techniques. Chapel Hill, Dept. of City and Regional Planning, University of North Carolina, 1966. 68 p.

Rickert, John E. and Jerome P. Pickard. Open space land, planning and taxation; a selected bibliography. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965. 58 p.

Shillaber, Caroline. References on city and regional planning. Cambridge, Mass., Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1959. 41 p.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Urbanization and changing land uses; a bibliography of selected references, 1950–58. Washington, 1960. 212 p.

U.S. Dept. of Housing & Urban Development. Housing and planning references. Washington, Office of the Secretary Library, HUD. (Bi-monthly)

II. BOOKS

Altshuler, Alan A. The city planning process; a political analysis. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1965. 466 p.

American Chamber of Commerce Executives. Urban development and planning: challenge to the Chamber of Commerce. Washington, 1958. 44 p.

Bartholomew, Harland. Land uses in American cities. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1955. 196 p.

Blijstra, R. Town planning in the Netherlands since 1900. Amsterdam, P. N. Van Kampen and Zoon, 1965. 74 p.

Campbell, Robert D. and Hugh L. LeBlanc. An information system for urban planning. Washington, D.C., George Washington University, Urban Planning Data System Project, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965. 96 p.

Chapin, Francis Stuart. Urban land use planning, 2d edition. Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1965. 498 p.

Churchill, Henry. The city is the people. New York, Norton, 1962. 204 p.

Committee for Economic Development. Guiding metropolitan growth; a statement of national policy. New York, 1960. 47 p.

Crosby, Theodore. Architecture: city sense. New York, Reinhold, 1965. 96 p.

Cullingworth. J. B. Town and country planning in England and Wales, an introduction. Toronto, University of Toronto Press 1964. 301 p.

Downs, John F. Geography and planning in the urban community; a brief reconnaissance. College Park, Maryland, University of Maryland, 1961. 40 p.

Duggar, George S. Renewal of town and village, a world-wide survey. The Hague, M. Nijhoff, 1965. 243 p.

Duncan, Otis Dudley. Metropolis and region. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1960. 587 p.

Eskew, Garnett Laidlaw. Of land and men; the birth and growth of an idea. Washington, Urban Land Institute, 1959. 206 p.

Futterman, Robert A. The future of our cities. Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1961. 360 p.

Goodman, William I. and Jerome L. Kaufman. City planning in the sixties: a restatement of principles and techniques. Urbana, Illinois University, Bureau of Community Planning, 1965. 74 p.

Grimm, Sergei N. Physical urban planning. Syracuse, New York, School of Architecture, Syracuse University, 1961. 87 p.

Haar, Charles Monroe. Land-use planning: a casebook on the use, misuse, and reuse of urban land. Boston, Little, Brown, 1959. 790 p.

Haar, Charles Monroe. Law and land; Anglo-American planning practice. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1964. 290 p.

Hall, Peter. London 2000. London, Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1963. 220 p.

Haworth, Lawrence. The good city. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1963. 160 p.

Higbee, Edward Counselman. The squeeze; cities without space. New York, Morrow, 1960. 348 p.

Hilberseimer, L. The nature of cities; origin growth and decline, pattern and form, planning problems. Chicago, Theobald, 1955. 286 p.

Hutchison, Theodore M. Metropolitan area problems: the role of the Federal government. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Law School, 1961. 65 p.

Jacobs, Jane. The death and life of great American cities. New York, Random House, 1961. 458 p.

Keeble, Lewis. Principles and practice of town and country planning, 3d edition. London Estates Gazette, Ltd., 1964. 382 p.

Kent, T. J., Jr. The urban general plan. San Francisco, Chandler, 1964. 213 p.

Keyes, Scott, ed. Urban and regional studies at U.S. universities. Washington, D.C., Committee on Urban Economics of Resources for the Future, Inc., 1964. 127 p.

Logan, J. A. Environmental engineering and metropolitan planning. Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University Press, 1962. 265 p.

Lynch, Kevin. The image of the city. Cambridge, Mass., Technological Press, 1960. 194 p.

Marx, Herbert L. Community planning. New York, H. W. Wilson Co., 1956. 207 p.

Metropolis in ferment. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1957. 231 p

Meyerson, Martin. Housing, people, and cities. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962. 386 p.

Mitchell, Robert Buchanan. Metropolitan planning for land use and transportation, a study, 1960. Washington. 47 p.

Mooris, Robert. Feasible planning for social change. New York, Columbia University Press, 1966. 169 p.

Mumford, Lewis. The city in history, its origins, its transformations, and its prospects. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961. 657 p.

Munzer, Martha E. Planning our town. New York, Knopf, 1964. 179 p.

Nelson, Richard Lawrence. Real estate and city planning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, 1957. 507 p.

Norton, Perry L., ed. Urban problems and techniques, number 1. West Trenton, New Jersey, Chandler-Davis Publishing Co., 1959. 249 p.

Perloff, Harvey S., ed. Planning and the urban community. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961. 235 p.

Reiner, Thomas A. The place of the ideal community in urban planning. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1963. 194 p.

Reps, John W. The making of Urban America: a history of city planning in the United States. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1965. 574 p.

Robson, William A., ed. Great cities of the world: their government, politics and planning. New York, Macmillan, 1957. 810 p.

Rodwin, Lloyd, ed. The future metropolis. New York, George Braziller, 1961. 253 p.

Schnider, Wolf. Babylon is everywhere; the city as man's fate. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1963. 400 p.

Sears, Roebuck and Co. Community Planning Division. The ABC's of community planning. Chicago, Barton Aschman Associates, 1962. 32 p.

Smith, Herbert H. The citizen's guide to planning. West Trenton, New Jersey, Chandler-Davis, 1961. 106 p.

Stein, Clarence S. Toward new towns for America. New York, Reinhold Pub. Corp., 1957. 263 p.

Tetlow, John and Anthony Goss. Homes, towns and traffic. London, Faber and Faber, 1965. 224 p.

Tunnard, Christopher. American skyline. New York, New American Library of World Literature, 1956. 224 p.

———. Man-made America: chaos or control? New Haven, Yale University Press, 1963. 479 p.

U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Governmental structure, organization, and planning in metropolitan areas. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 83 p.

———. Performance of urban functions: local and areawide; an information report. Washington, 1963. 281 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Impact of Federal urban development programs on local government organization and planning. Committee print, 88th Congress, 2d session. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. 198 p.

———. 1964 survey of metropolitan planning. Committee print, 89th Congress, 1st session. Washington, 1965. 121 p.

———. The effectiveness of metropolitan planning. Committee print, 88th Congress, 2d session. Washington, 1964. 209 p.

———. Metropolitan planning. Hearings, 88th Congress, 1st session, May 21, 22, and 23, 1963. Washington, 1963. 178 p.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Economic factors in urban planning studies. Urban Renewal Service Technical Guide 20. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966. 40 p.

U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency. Urban expansion—problems and needs. Papers presented at the Administration's Spring Conference. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. 174 p.

Vernon, Raymond. The myth and reality of our urban problems. Cambridge, Mass., Joint Center for Urban Studies, 1962. 84 p.

Warner, Sam Bass, ed. Planning for a nation of cities. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1966. 310 p.

Weaver, Robert C. The urban complex. Garden City, New York, Doubleday, 1964. 297 p.

Weaver, Robert C. Dilemmas of Urban America. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1965. 138 p.

Webber, Melvin M., et. al. Explorations into urban structure. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1964. 256 p.

Webster, Donald Hopkins. Urban planning and municipal public policy. New York, Harper, 1958. 572 p.

Weiss, Shirley F. The central business district in transition; methodological approaches to CBD analysis and forecasting future space requirements. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1957. 44 p.

Wingo, Lowden, Jr., ed. Cities and space; the future use of urban land. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1963. 261 p.

Wirth, Louis. On cities and social life. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964. 350 p.

Wissink, Gerardus Antonius. American cities in perspective. New York, Humanities Press, 1963. 320 p.

Wood, Robert C. Suburbia; its people and their policies. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1959. 340 p.

Wright, Frank Lloyd. The living city. New York, New American Library of World Literature, 1963. 255 p.

III. ARTICLES

Abrams, Charles. Criteria for urban renewal. Architectural record, May 1962: 155–158.

Alonso, William. Cities and city planners. Daedalus, Fall 1963: 824–839.

Blake, Peter. Paolo Soleri's visionary city. Architectural forum, March 1961: 111–118.

———. Ugly America. Horizon, May 1961: 4–19.

Bollens, John C. Urban fringe areas—a persistent problem. Public management, October 1960: 218–221.

Boyce, Ronald R. Myth versus reality in urban planning. Land economics, August 1963: 241–251.

Brown, Robert M. Urban planning for environmental health. Public health reports, March 1964: 201–204.

Carlson, D. B. Can transportation put our cities back together again? Architectural forum, October 1963: 62–67.

———. Urban renewal: a new face on the American city. Architectural forum, August 1963: 80–85.

Changing suburbs. Architectural forum, January 1961: 47–104.

Chase, Edward T. Future of the city. Commonweal, October 11, 1957: 39–42.

Chase, S. Confessions of a town planner. Readers digest, July 1963: 133–137.

Chavooshian, B. Budd. Aspects of land use planning. American journal of public health, March 1961: 434–440.

Clark, R. A. New techniques for city planning. Public management, November 1962: 249–253.

Clawson, Marion. Suburban development districts. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, May 1960: 69–83.

Downtown snarl: a case for sorting, stacking and storing. Architectural forum, October 1963: 78–83.

Dutton, W. C., Jr. Federal and state aid as related to planning. American Institute of Architects. Journal, March 1961: 100–103.

Dyckman, John W. Social planning, social planners, and planned societies. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, March 1966: 66–75.

Eckbo, Garrett. Design and criticism. American Institute of Architects. Journal, June 1964: 23–26.

Garvan, A. N. B. Culture, change and the planner. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1964: 33–38.

Gladstone, Robert *and* Harold F. Wise. New towns solve problems of urban growth. Public managment, v. 48, May 1966: 128–138.

Godschalk, David R. *and* William E. Mills. A collaborative approach to urban activities. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, March 1966: 86–94.

Goodman, William I. Urban planning and the role of the state. State government, Summer 1962: 149–154.

Gruen, Victor. And after the sixties—cluster communities for tomorrow? Journal of homebuilding, December 1959: 34–36.

———. Who is to save our cities? Harvard business review, May 1963: 107–115.

Gulick, Luther N. Design for the future. National municipal review (now National civic review), January 1957: 6–13.

Hamilton, L. S. Ecological perspective on urban sprawl. American forests, June 1963: 38–40.

Heckscher, A. Descending spiral of ugliness. Recreation, September 1963: 315–316.

Hoyt, Homer. Growth and structure of twenty-one great world cities. Land economics, v. 42, February 1966: 53–64.

Huxtable, A. L. "Clusters" instead of "slurbs," New York Times magazine, February 9, 1964: 36–37.

Jacobs, Jane. Planning for living cities; three important changes. Vogue, January 1, 1962: 73.

Kaufman, Jerome L. Changes sweep local planning commission. Public management, August 1966: 221–227.

Levin, Earl A. The planning team. Community planning review, v. 14, no. 1, 1964: 22–28.

Lloyd, G. D. Cluster zoning: one step toward a better suburbia. American home, June 1964: 46–47.

Logue, E. J. and E. T. Chase. American cities: dead or alive? two views. Architectural forum, March 1962: 89–91.

Massell, Richard. New revisions seen in master planning concept. Public management, v. 47, June 1965: 134–139.

Mayer, Albert. Architecture as total community: the challenge ahead. Architectural record, March 1964: 137–144; April 1964: 167–178; May 1964: 145–152; June 1964: 141–146; August 1964: 129–138.

———. New towns: and fresh in-city communities. Architectural record, August 1964: 129–138.

Meier, Richard L. Systems and principles for metropolitan planning. The centennial review of arts and sciences, Winter 1959: 79–94.

Miller, R. A. Turning small towns into new ones. Architectural forum, February 1962: 92–95.

Montgomery, Roger. Improving the design process in urban renewal. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, February 1965: 7–19.

Moses, R. Are cities dead? Atlantic, January 1962: 55–58.

Mosine, Corwin R. Urban physical planning and the "new planning." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, July 1966: 234–237.

Mumford, Lewis. Future of the city. Architectural record, October 1962: 121–128; November 1962: 139–144.

———. Future of the city. (contd) Architectural record, January 1963: 119–126; February 1963: 119–126.

Newcomb, Robinson. Tomorrow's metropolitan America. Business horizons, Winter 1959: 61–67.

Orton, L. M. Bankrupt principles of urban growth. American city, October 1961: 101–103.

Perlman, Robert. Social welfare planning and physical planning. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, July 1966: 237–248.

Perloff, Harvey S. New towns intown. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, May 1966: 155–161.

Planning the city's center. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, February 1961: 1–73.

Prokop, John. Big squeeze in your back yard. American forests, April 1963: 6–7.

Reynolds, H. W., Jr. Local government structure in urban planning, renewal, and relocation. Public administration review, March 1964: 14–20.

Schmertz, M. F. Planning the downtown center; symposium. Architectural record, March 1964: 177–200.

Shaffer, Helen B. City beautiful. Editorial research reports, March 4, 1964: 163–180.

Spagna, J. Recreation and the city planning process. Recreation, September 1961: 365–366.

Sprawling strip cities, they're all over the U.S. U.S. news and world report, September 18, 1961: 73–75.

Sweet, M. L. and F. B. Jensen. Planned community. National civic review, May 1962: 251–256.

Thabit, Walter. Renewal—a planning challenge. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, May 1960: 84–88.

Von Eckhardt, Wolf. Beauty and the planners. New republic, October 5, 1963: 21–24.

Wingfield, C. J. Power structure and decision making in city planning. Public administration review, June 1963: 74–80.

A SALUTE TO CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, late in the 15th century, a Genoese sailor embarked on a historic and unprecedented voyage, hoisting his anchors in the familiar coastal waters of Portugal and landing 71 days later on the uncharted shores of San Salvador Island in the Caribbean Sea.

The sailor was Christopher Columbus, of course, and the story of that historic voyage is familiar to schoolchildren in every corner of the earth.

We can only try to imagine the kind of vision, the kind of courage, the kind of faith that stiffened the man's will and drove him to triumph over maddening setbacks and adversities. We can only wonder at the strength of this enlightened man whose conviction in what was then only a scientific theory, in his scorn for the superstitions that had guided men's lives since the dawn of civilization, led him to the discoveries and explorations that once and forever bridged the gulf between the Old World and the New.

One of the more curious and striking aspects of our history, to me, has always been the similarity in the character of Christopher Columbus and what we like to think of as the typically American character. It is curiously fitting that the similarities should exist between the national character of America and the man who brought civilization to these shores.

Columbus was a man of courage, and yet his courage was always tempered with wisdom and prudence, and with a careful appraisal of his chances so far as he could count them. He was a leader of almost mystical powers, compelling the several score crewmen of his three tiny ships to continue working westward into unknown waters and unknown perils, in spite of discomfort and hunger, in spite of their chilling dread of the unknown.

He was a man of science, as well; a navigator of consumate skill and ability. And he had sufficient faith and courage in his mathematics to follow their lessons around a circular globe instead of across a flat terrestrial plateau.

And as we search for the inevitable parallel between Christopher Columbus and modern man, we find him personified in each of the courageous astronauts who are carrying man and his knowledge across uncharted space to the very stars that guided Columbus almost 500 years ago.

How similar are our tiny cone-shaped space capsules to those tiny vessels of Columbus. How similar must the tough fiber of the astronaut be to the stiff spine that bore Columbus across the uncharted sea. And while we may have conquered the superstitions of the ages, there remains a great unknown void into which, sooner or later, a modern-day Columbus must venture in search of new worlds.

It is appropriate and fitting that each year on the anniversary of that October day when the longboats from the *Niña, Pinta,* and *Santa Maria* ground ashore at San Salvador, we pause to salute the memory of the captain who brought them. In so doing, we salute the sum total of man's knowledge and enlightenment that were focused so sharply in Christopher Columbus and in which we, as Americans, rightly take so much pride today. Columbus was a man for all men, symbolizing man himself, rather than a single nationality. He himself was Italian. His benefactors were Portuguese and Spanish. His crew included men of all European flags, including, legend has it, seafaring men from the British Isles.

And the land he discovered may truly be said to continue that focus, for we are truly a nation of all nations and of all nationalities.

In a sense, our salute of Columbus is a salute to mankind and a salute to the America that has sprung from the heritage of Christopher Columbus.

A LIVABLE REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK AND SEASHORE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, over the Pacific coast range where it slopes down to the ocean lives a breed of giants. As far as the persistent Pacific fog rolls into the river canyons and up the mountainsides, the tall coast redwoods push skyward like giant, green-tipped lances.

Here, along some 500 miles of the rugged northern California coast, is the only place in the world where Sequoia sempervirens—the tall coast redwoods—grow. Here, in the canyon flats, feeding on centuries-old silt washed down from the mountains by torrential rains and drinking the persistent fog and mist, are the tallest living things in the world. Here is something unique and breathtakingly beautiful that we received as a heritage. We must bequeath an adequate preserve of these superlative groves to our grandchildren and their grandchildren.

I believe that if a referendum were held throughout the Nation today, at least 75 percent of the people would be in favor of designating selected virgin redwood groves as a Redwood National Park. If the Congress were to put this issue to a vote today, I believe the dissenters could be numbered on one hand.

Earlier this year, after the issue had been discussed for nearly 3 years, I sent out more than 200,000 questionnaires to my constituents on national issues. The first question was:

Should a Redwood National Park be established in our area?

While I did not pretend it was a scientific poll, still some 20,000 of my constituents answered it and 60 percent answered "yes" on a national park, 31 percent answered "no," and 9 percent answered "no opinion."

Since this is the district in which a Redwood National Park would be located, there is naturally a great deal of fear and doubt regarding such a proposal. Many people are critical that the State of California has not developed the recreational potential of the more than 100,000 acres of cathedral like redwood forests it has held in State parks for many years. Because the timber products industry represents more than 70 percent of the local economy, others fear for their jobs. And still others, who pay property taxes, fear that the tax base will be seriously eroded by Federal acquisition of private lands, thereby increasing their own tax load. These are reasonable concerns that I, as their representative, also have voiced.

Later, when the administration proposed a bill to stop all timber cutting in the Mill Creek watershed of Del Norte County, one of the areas being considered for national park status, national wire services reported that 6,000 persons turned out in this small county for a protest rally. When one-third of a county's total population is disturbed to the point of public protest, this is a matter of local impact in the highest order.

I have stated my own position time and time again. When the administration made its own Redwood National Park proposal last February 23, I joined with Senator KUCHEL of California in introducing this proposal to the Congress. I did this for a number of reasons as I clearly stated:

It has become clear that one of the rarest resources in the world, the tall coast redwoods, should be recognized as one of our great national assets and that suitable redwood forests be set aside under the care of the National Park Service. By my words and action today, I fully endorse this concept.

Further, I said that I introduced this bill with reservations. While I felt it was a step in the right direction in creating such a park and in making an effort to solve the loss of tax base by an in-lieu payment and had some job adjustment features, I spelled out these reservations. Regardless of my own thoughts, my position of responsibility is different

from that of any other Member of Congress. Again, may I quote from my original statement when I introduced the administration's park bill:

> More than 400 Members of this honorable body may find it hard to question the protection of beautiful redwood forests, and that is understandable. But there is only one—the Congressman from the First District of California—who has the direct responsibility to protect also the legitimate interests of all the people who live there.

For everyone to see, I spelled out my major reservation the following day. On February 24, I introduced a second Redwood National Park bill which was similar to the administration's bill in every way except in the area covered by the park. The administration bill included Jedediah Smith Redwood State Park and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park plus 18,000 acres of the Miller-Rellim Redwood Co. lands in the Mill Creek watershed between the two State parks. In addition, it took in some small tracts to round out the park at the north end and added a separate unit extending from the town of Orick, Calif., upstream along Redwood Creek to the grove of tall trees discovered and documented by the National Geographic Society. Here was found the tallest tree in the world, reaching upward 367.8 feet. Since then, the discovery of two other tallest trees has been announced in other areas, and I presume that still more will be found. In all, the administration's proposal covered some 45,000 acres.

My own second bill covers the same areas as the administration proposal except that it eliminates the Mill Creek watershed, leaving only a narrow corridor to connect Jedediah Smith and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Parks. The reason for this was that only one-third of the Mill Creek watershed contains virgin redwoods. In addition, this proposal would leave the Miller-Rellim Co.—the backbone of Del Norte County's economy with 250 employees now expecting to scale up to 600—still in business.

I explained this concept again to the Senate National Parks Subcommittee in its field hearing June 17 at Crescent City, Calif. I pointed out to the committee that both the administration bill, taking in the Mill Creek watershed, and the so-called Sierra Club bill, calling for a park of some 90,000 acres, mainly in the Redwood Creek watershed to the south, were based upon the doctrine of preserving a so-called ecological unit to protect the virgin redwoods downstream. I told the Senate committee:

> So it seems to me that one of the major issues before the Congress is this doctrine of federal acquisition of a ecological unit. I simply ask the academic question: Are there other ways to guarantee the protection of these cathedral-like forests other than authorizing the federal government to buy the entire watershed? It seems to me that the answer to this question reaches to the very heart of the crucial economic question before the Congress, not only from the standpoint of the federal cost in the time of extremely tight money, but also from a standpoint of economic damage to the local community.

From a recreation standpoint, the north coast of California is an oddity. This, in itself, may someday make it a major tourist and recreational attraction. In this general area the fog rolls in from the Pacific on the average of more than 175 days a year, feeding the giant trees. Up on the slopes where the fog reaches only seldom, the redwoods are smaller and mingle about 50–50 with Douglas-fir and other species. Still further up toward the mountain ridges, the redwoods are smaller still and make up only 25 percent of the forests covered. Foresters will tell you that the superlative groves grow down on the alluvial flats and the commercial type redwoods grow on the slopes. These are vital factors that must be considered in evaluating the various Redwood Park proposals. This is why I question costly Government acquisition—costly from the standpoint of the Government's ability to pay and the local government's ability to survive with a reduced tax base. The mountainsides and ridges are definitely not of park quality and their place in a national park should rightfully be questioned. Further, of the 18,000 acres of nonpark quality lands in the Mill Creek watershed considered for acquisition, nearly two-thirds of this acreage already has had selective logging on it by the owner. On Redwood Creek—the Sierra Club plan—nearly half the watershed has been logged off.

It is my sincere belief that neither the administration plan, espoused by the Save-the-Redwoods League, nor the Sierra Club plan are fully park quality, for the reasons just mentioned. Both are very costly—$50 to $100 million for the 45,000-acre administration proposal and $150 to $400 million for the Sierra Club plan. With the administration having suggested a figure of $50 million for the park, the land and water conservation fund, accumulating less than anticipated, and the large number of authorized yet unfunded conservation projects elsewhere in the Nation, we must all take a realistic look at the Redwood Park question. However, both proposals have great merit in some of their features.

Quite frankly, it has been my feeling for some time now that the finest park proposal we could offer would contain the best features of both the Save-the-Redwoods League and the Sierra Club plan. Everyone familiar with the entire situation agrees that a compromise must be worked out—everyone must give a little.

The industry must change from its original position of opposition to a Redwood National Park, and the conservation organizations must cooperate in determining the best combination of lands of park quality to be included in a Redwood National Park, worthy of its name.

Having lived in this area all my life, I feel somewhat qualified to offer a compromise plan—one that I have described as a livable park plan. It is so described because it fits the prescribed hope of the area's people—a Redwood National Park we can live with and further retains the integrity of the conservationists and the Congress, as they move toward the creation of a Redwood National Park of full park quality that they can live with and be proud of.

With this in mind, I wish to submit my recommendations for the consideration and acceptance of people interested.

Rather than confining my thoughts to the creation of a Redwood National Park, I have chosen to propose a Redwood National Park and Seashore plan that uniquely qualifies as a genuine redwoods to the sea conservation complex. The area selected is unique in that it is the only quantitative and qualitative strip of remaining virgin old growth redwoods that grow next to the Pacific Ocean. This, coupled with an extraordinary combination of seashore lands, provides us with an exciting and imaginative park proposal that should whet the appetite of all nature lovers. Parts of the included coastline are rugged and scenic, with an abundance of ocean spray as the blue Pacific pounds the rocky shoreline. However, these rocky bluffs and cliffs were only placed intermittently by the Creator along the seashore. The high percentage of this 46-mile coastal strip contains some of the finest beaches in northern California. Anyone with a sense of imagination, I am sure, can picture this beautiful and exceptional redwoods to the sea combination.

This combination will contain the best features of the Save-the-Redwoods League and the Sierra Club plans. It is of genuine park quality and will easily meet national park criteria. It will require the acquisition of lands from the State of California, the U.S. Forest Service, and the redwood industry, but, at the same time have a minimal adverse impact upon the local economy and will keep all the forest products companies, now threatened with extinction, in business. In fact, this plan is designed to make—not take—jobs.

Further, it should be carefully alined so as not to affect present homesites as long as they remain in the family and as long as their use is not changed. Also, it coincides with the comments made by former National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury, a highly respected leader of the Save-the-Redwoods League, when he said:

> Surely the coast Redwoods merit this designation (Redwood National Park). They are among the wonders of the world, but the fact is that the best and most representative of these forests are now in the California State Parks. They are being carefully and intelligently protected.

With the Save-the-Redwoods League just 2 years away from the 50th year since founding, I am hopeful we can have the Redwood National Park and Seashore established and adopted by the Congress. Would this not be a fitting tribute to a half century of effort by other dedicated conservationists like Robert Gordon Sproul, Walter Starr, the Merriams, Ralph Chaney, the Stouts, the Rockefellers, the hundreds of Save-the-Redwoods League donors, and the cooperating redwood industry? The area I have suggested would, I am sure, meet with their approval as to site selection.

I am announcing this plan now for a number of reasons.

First. The administration's proposal to stop all cutting in the park area created great fear in the local area. I feel that

people should not be forced to live their lives, month in and month out, under the fear of economic disaster at any moment.

Second. Both Houses of the Congress have indicated their intent to consider creation of a Redwood National Park as one of the first orders of business next year, so any compromise proposal should be revealed now in order to have an honest chance for full consideration. While this is the political season and I fear that a proposal at this time may become a political football, I am willing to stand on it now as a reasonable compromise that may be imperfect in its parts, but I welcome reasonable and honest amendments from any quarter, and I urge bipartisan support.

I propose that a Redwood National Park and Seashore of some 45,000 acres be created.

I propose that this park include Jedediah Smith Redwood State Park and its breathtaking Stout Memorial Grove—one of the two or three most beautiful virgin groves in the Redwood empire—and its frontage along the Smith River, the most beautiful wild river in my experience.

It would extend southward and take in Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Park and follow along the wild beaches and the rocky coast to take in the Prairie Creek Redwood State Park and its Roosevelt Elk Sanctuary, Fern Canyon, and Gold Bluff Wild Beach. It would extend further southward along the Redwood Highway and the coast, including three large lagoons for water skiing, swimming, fishing, and other water sports. It would continue further southward from there to include the rocky coast to Patricks Point State Park.

It would also take in the so-called tall trees unit, with a right-of-way extending upstream on Redwood Creek to the tall trees and an easement along the creek to its mouth for scenic boat and road trips to the tall trees.

I propose that the connecting link between the two northern State parks be along the mountain ridge for the location of observation chalets for people interested in watching storms and fog forming at sea and just plain ocean viewers along the crescent-shaped beach, south of Crescent City. Such observation chalets could be located all along the Redwood Highway where it overlooks nearly 50 miles of shoreline. I propose additional space be included in the compromise plan for parking and access to the many miles of usable beaches.

The Redwood Highway—U.S. 101—would follow along the park for 54 miles from the rugged coast near Patricks Point past the lagoons to Orick and the tall trees unit and thence northward through conservation corridors to Prairie Creek State Park to the famous salmon and steelhead fishing of the Klamath River. Still farther it would travel through more redwood forests and parks, then over the ridge to Stout Memorial Grove in the Jed Smith Park and the equally famous and breathtaking scenery along the Smith River. Serious study should be given toward designation of both the Smith and Klamath Rivers as national scenic rivers.

Besides covering about 23,000 acres of virgin redwood forests, the 46 miles of rocky, scenic coastline with its high bluffs along some areas and sandy beaches in others is ideally suited for location of observation chalets.

Further, I propose that the northern redwood purchase unit, containing nearly 15,000 acres, now under the management of the U.S. Forest Service, be designated a Redwood National Forest. Located as it is along the Redwood Highway about midway along the proposed park, it would provide tourists with an educational experience into modern, efficient practices under the guidance of the Forest Service.

Watershed protection, one of the major points in the present proposals, is now available through the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the amendments of 1966. Under this act, the State and Federal Governments cooperate on a matching basis, with the State classifying streams for water pollution control and under the California Forest Practices Act, the State has the power to control forest practices of lumber products companies. These laws can be enforced to protect watersheds and stream quality. If these laws are believed to be inadequate for protection of a Redwood National Park, I am sure that other arrangements, short of outright Government acquisition, can be found to solve the problem.

In addition to the Redwood National Park and Seashore, I would further include in my regional conservation package for our redwood empire two other specific recommendations.

First, as recommended by the administration, the State could exchange their park lands for the 31,500 acres of federally owned lands in the King Range area of southern Humboldt County. With this exchange, the State of California could combine these lands with the Humboldt State Redwood Park and develop a State redwood park, recreation, and seashore complex. This concept was considered and proposed as a National Redwood Park by AFA and conservation associates. With the number of other State parks in this immediate vicinity, it appears to be a natural to expand the State recreation complex through this recommended exchange. I know this meets with the approval of the people of the area because many of the cattle and sheep ranchers are determined to retain the predatory animal control program under State jurisdiction.

If this proposed transfer is found to be unacceptable by the local residents, the county government or the State, the United States could continue to develop the Kings Range area for multiple-use conservation as it is now. Both my predecessor and I have introduced bills designating this the Kings Range conservation area, and the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors has endorsed the plan. This arrangement would be satisfactory to me and simply establish a State-Federal compact in the heart of the redwood empire.

Also, with the contemplated flood control and water conservation developments on the middle and upper Eel River complex, we can anticipate additional recreational facilities as the reservoirs are built.

Instead of suggesting the Redwood Park should be specifically located in Del Norte, northern Humboldt or southern Humboldt, my recommendation includes all three areas as important parts of the regional comprehensive conservation package that I outlined to the Senate Interior Committee when I testified in Crescent City in June, 1966.

I believe we should logically include all four major redwood parks in our State-Federal combination package. Certainly, the combined facilities will be available, under this plan, to all recreation-minded and outdoor-loving people.

Once finally adopted, I would hope that we can consider the State and Federal land acquisition in block—have them accepted by the Congress and the State legislature. This would then permit the forest products industry to move forward with its forest and land management programs with a minimal amount of harassment in the future. Certainly they too are deserving of this consideration because their plans for continuity and expansion demand the holding of adequate timber-growing acreage to successfully operate on a perpetual yield basis.

My final major conservation recommendation for our district comes as a reminder to everyone that we still must complete the land acquisition and development of the Point Reyes National Seashore. This will remain my first priority conservation project for the district until completed.

With the 53,000-acre seashore, the 2,404-acre Tamalpais State Park, the State beaches, and the beautiful John Muir Woods Redwood National Monument, we again have a unique opportunity to bring into focus a State-National Redwood Park and Seashore combination located conveniently to the major populated bay areas.

The Redwood National Park and Seashore in the north, the Redwood State Park and Seashore in the middle, and the combination State and National Redwood Park and Seashore, in the southern part of my district, plus the 24 other redwood State parks, all tied together by the Redwood Highway No. 101 and the State Scenic Road No. 1 up the coast, certainly provide the people of the Nation with an extraordinary array and selection of redwood park and recreation areas in the redwood empire of northern California.

This regional conservation and recreation package in itself would be the dream of conservationists anywhere. But, added to all this, are the 22 established redwood industry recreation areas. A variety of outdoor recreation opportunities are available for picnicking, swimming, hunting, fishing, hiking, water skiing, rock collecting, berry picking, photography, nature studies, and skin diving. All told, the redwood industry has opened up some 360,000 acres to the public for the purposes expressed above. The demonstration forests and the tree farms will provide added educational values to the redwood empire visitors. This exciting experience in the woods

should serve as an excellent change of pace for the city dweller and his family looking for a refresher in the great outdoors.

Finally, in addition to the State and Federal preservation package of 200,000 acres, the redwood industry recreation and tree farm areas of 360,000 acres, we have on the north coast of California, immediately contiguous to these vast areas, the U.S. Forest Service multiple land-use—preservation, wild areas, timber harvesting, fishing, hunting, hiking, et cetera—areas of some 5.7 million acres.

All told this coordinated conservation and recreation complex contains over 6 million acres, all committed to the future enjoyment of American citizens and international visitors.

It is our purpose to retain this land use commitment through the adoption of this plan of redwoods forever, combining preservation, conservation in public ownership of an adequate reserve of magnificent, superlative, park-quality redwoods with proper forest management and reforestation practices of multiple-use conservation in the private and public sectors.

The overall acreage commitment should strike a responsive chord with preservation conservationists and multiple-use conservationists alike.

A few facts not recognized by many people are:

First. The existing State redwood park system acreage and the acreage pledge for acquisition and preservation by industry is now 123,000 acres.

Second. Managed forests provide the best food and habitat for most wild animals and birds. Dense, dark, overmature forests are veritable deserts of many animals and birds.

Third. Forests can be manipulated and harvested so as to increase water storage and yields, while protecting the watershed.

Fourth. Recreation is readily harmonized with tree farming, which has resulted in thousands of miles of forest roads opening up millions of acres to recreationists. Just this year the Congress doubled its commitment for forest access roads to an annual level of $170 million.

Fifth. Redwoods are not going to disappear from American forests.

Sixth. In the redwood region alone there are about 815,000 acres now certified in the American tree-farm system.

Seventh. By 1985, redwood growth will be about the same as it is being harvested. Some redwood companies are already on a perpetual yield basis.

Eighth. Redwood is just about the fastest growing tree in the United States, capable of attaining 240 feet of height in 100 years—commercial size in 60 to 80 years.

While good coastal weather should attract great numbers of tourists during the few months of favorable weather conditions each year, some others will visit the coast for brief periods for a quick look at the redwoods as they feed on the fog, watch the shoreline being lashed by storm and veiled by fog, during bad weather months. But the real attraction during these foggy weather months will be just a few miles inland where the sun still shines most of the year. While the giant redwoods feed on the heavy fog, the 8,000 square miles of national forests ranging from 10 to 40 miles inland from the coast will be clear and open for camping, fishing, and hunting, as well as pack trips and nature hikes.

Included in this gigantic area stretching in a giant ribbon from Lake County up into Oregon are the Mendocino National Forest, Trinity National Forest, Shasta National Forest, Whiskeytown-Shasta Recreation Area, Salmon-Trinity Alps Primitive Area, Klamath National Forest, Marble Mountain Primitive Area, the Middle Eel-Yolla Bolly Primitive Area, in the Six Rivers National Forest.

Three years ago, when I first came to the Congress, I projected a vision of the redwood empire as America's family playground. I also said that this could be done by helping the local economy rather than damaging it. I think this livable Redwood National Park and Seashore, combined into the Redwood Empire Park, Recreation, Conservation, and Seashore plan, as I have described it, is the road leading to this goal.

From the "island in time," as Point Reyes National Seashore is called, to the timeless redwood giants, 350 miles to the north, is the heritage many of us know well. Millions more should know this emotional experience, and I am convinced we can develop it into one of the great natural and recreational attractions of the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH IN BALTIMORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply honored today to be invited to accompany the President on his helicopter trip to Baltimore, and to be present when he addressed the Social Security Administration there on the subject of social security reforms.

I was especially pleased that, in his remarks, the President gave full recognition to the work and recommendations of the Republican Coordinating Committee's Task Force on the Aging, on which I served. This task force, chaired by Mr. John B. Martin, of Michigan, submitted a report in June which in many respects anticipated some of the suggestions made by the President today. Because the task force's study deserves wide attention, I would like to include it in the RECORD today, as follows:

A REPUBLICAN APPROACH TO THE NEEDS OF THE AGING

(By the Task Force on Problems of Aging, prepared under the direction of the Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C., June, 1966)

REPUBLICAN COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Presiding Officer: Chairman, Republican National Committee.

Former President: Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Former Presidential Nominees: Barry Goldwater (1964), Richard M. Nixon (1960), Thomas E. Dewey (1944 & 1948), Alf M. Landon (1936).

Senate Leadership: EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Minority Leader; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Minority Whip; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Chairman, Republican Conference; THRUSTON B. MORTON, Chairman, National Republican Senatorial Committee.

House Leadership: GERALD R. FORD, Minority Leader; LESLIE C. ARENDS, Minority Whip; MELVIN R. LAIRD, Chairman, Republican Conference; JOHN J. RHODES, Chairman, Republican Policy Committee; H. ALLEN SMITH, Ranking Member of Rules Committee; BOB WILSON, Chairman, National Republican Congressional Committee; CHARLES E. GOODELL, Chairman, Planning and Research Committee.

Representatives of Republican Governors Association: John A. Love, Governor of the State of Colorado; Robert E. Smylie, Governor of the State of Idaho; George W. Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York; William W. Scranton, Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Republican National Committee: Ray C. Bliss, Chairman; Mrs. C. Wayland Brooks, Assistant Chairman; Mrs. Collis P. Moore, Vice Chairman; Donald R. Ross, Vice Chairman; Mrs. J. Willard Marriott, Vice Chairman; J. Drake Edens, Jr., Vice Chairman.

Republican State Legislators Association: F. F. (Monte) Montgomery.

Robert L. L. McCormick, Staff Coordinator.

TASK FORCE ON PROBLEMS OF AGING

Chairman: John B. Martin, Republican National Committeman for Michigan.

Vice Chairman: Garson Meyer, President of the National Council on Aging.

Members

Arlin M. Adams, Attorney, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

William H. Avery, Governor of the State of Kansas.

J. CALEB BOGGS, United States Senator from Delaware.

Mrs. Elsa Carrow, Administrative Assistant to the Mayor of Los Angeles.

Miles L. Colean, Economic Consultant, Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Member of Congress from Florida.

DURWARD G. HALL, Member of Congress from Missouri.

Charles O. Hendricks, Chairman of the Indiana Republican State Central Committee.

FRANK HORTON, Member of Congress from New York.

Mrs. D. Eldredge Jackson, Jr., Republican National Committeewoman for Rhode Island.

Alfred E. Leland, Member of the Washington State Legislature.

Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, Director, Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, 1953–60.

CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Member of Congress from Maryland.

Donald E. McKay, Vice Chairman, California Senior Citizens Committee.

JACK R. MILLER, United States Senator from Iowa.

John H. Powell, Jr., Member, Board of Trustees for the Great Neck Senior Citizens Association, New York City.

WINSTON L. PROUTY, United States Senator from Vermont.

Miss Ollie A. Randall, Member, Board of Directors of the National Council on Aging, New York City.

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, Member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

John M. Stuckey, Secretary to the Task Force.

The Republican Coordinating Committee is fully aware of the size of the task which it has undertaken and does not pretend to offer in this short paper solutions to all of the difficulties confronting the elderly citizen

in 20th Century America. What is attempted here is a beginning. We have addressed ourselves to those problems in need of immediate solution, but promise continued study and attention to the whole of the problems of aging.

The recommendations contained in this paper are based on the traditional Republican philosophy which holds that the proper function of government is to do for the people only those things that need to be done, but cannot be done by individuals for themselves. We do not hold to the current view that "age-equals-indigence." The great majority of our senior citizens constitute a strong and independent segment of our society. They are people who desire only the opportunity to exercise their own individual initiative and abilities. Addressing ourselves to this segment of our aged population, we have sought to offer policies which will protect these people against circumstances that would destroy independence, dignity and a sense of purpose—policies that offer opportunity—opportunity for continued usefulness and meaningful activity, opportunity to participate in the life of family and community as fully as ability and desire dictate, opportunity to exercise a reasonable measure of individual choice in the way these needs are to be satisfied.

Conversely, we recognize the existence of a minority of our elderly citizens, who through no fault of their own, are in real and dire need of positive assistance. The old natural cushions and protections for the aged have largely disappeared in our modern society. Families are mobile and more loosely knit. People no longer are born, live, and die in one community, with their relatives and neighbors to act as buffers against the crises of life. Although the needs of the elderly are essentially the same as those of every adult, there is a difference in the older person's capacity to meet them independently because of the changes in biological, psychological and social functioning inherent in the aging process. Addressing itself to this segment of our aged population, the Republican Coordinating Committee has sought to offer policies that will not only protect, but support and reinforce the ability of the elderly to care for themselves while retaining the fullest measure possible of independence and dignity.

INFLATION

Inflation steals from everyone, young and old alike, but hurts especially those elderly Americans who live on pensions or other fixed incomes. Inflation has swept in upon us because of policies of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and its controlled Congress. The Republican Coordinating Committee urges that steps be taken immediately at both the legislative and executive levels to stop multi-billion dollar Federal deficit spending which lays the foundation for inflation.

Inflation takes away purchasing power by increasing the cost of living and other goods and services, which means that the purchasing power of the dollar goes down. In 1939, our dollar had a purchasing power of 100 cents. By 1960 the purchasing power of the dollar had fallen to 46.9 cents. By 1965 it had fallen to 44 cents. As of April 1966, it was down to 43.2 cents and continuing to drop.

It is noteworthy that of the drop of 57 cents in the purchasing power of the dollar, 53.1 cents occurred during those years when the Democrats were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years; and only 3.9 cents occurred while Republicans had control. Also, in the only 2 years (1949 and 1955) in which the purchasing power of the dollar increased, Republicans were in control of the Congress for the budgeting which ended during those years.

The foundation for inflation is laid when a majority of the Members of Congress vote to spend billions of dollars more than our Federal Government takes in, year after year. Such actions contribute to an excessive increase in the quantity of money and bank credit—beyond our production of goods and services. (See Table No. 1.)

In 1965, Congress increased Social Security pensions by 7 percent. But even with this increase, inflation has diminished the purchasing power of the pensioner's dollar below what it was in 1954 and 1958. The following table shows the increases in Social Security pensions legislated by Congress in order to enable pensioners to maintain their purchasing power in relation to the decline in the value of the dollar.

Year	Annual pension	Purchasing power of dollar compared to 1939 dollar worth 100 cents (in cents)	Real value of pension
1940	$499.20	99.2	$495.20
1950	870.00	57.8	502.86
1952	930.00	52.3	486.39
1954	1,062.00	51.7	549.05
1958	1,140.00	48.1	548.34
1965	1,220.00	44.0	537.00

(NOTE.—The example is a worker having a $3,000 annual income base, single at retirement and "fully covered." The 1940 year figure is for a worker retired under the 1935 act. Other figures are for a worker retired under successive acts for years indicated.)

Perhaps the most graphic way to illustrate what inflation costs the American consumer is to use a sales tax equivalent. A sales tax operates the same as inflation, because it strikes at everyone and because it bears most heavily on the low income, large family groups and those living on fixed incomes. Since 1961, there has been an average annual inflation of over $10 billion. With the exception of the Federal income tax, inflation has taken more purchasing power away from the American people than any other item. It has been the equivalent of a three to five percent sales tax on the citizens of most of our States. (Table No. 2)

The problem has been growing more serious. Inflation amounted to $16 billion for 1965, with a sales tax equivalent of from four to eight percent on the citizens of most of the States. (Table No. 3) During the first three months of 1966, inflation amounted to $7.5 billion so it is obvious that the trend is still worse.

TABLE 1.—*Purchasing power of dollar in relation to budget deficits*

Year	Purchasing power (in cents)	Budget deficits (millions of dollars)
1939	100.0	3,967
1940	99.2	3,823
1941	94.4	11,762
1942	85.3	41,461
1943	80.3	55,691
1944	79.0	53,650
1945	77.2	43,595
1946	71.2	2,512
1947	62.2	+(2,434)
1948	[1] 57.8	+(5,241)
1949	[1] 58.3	3,592
1950	57.8	422
1951	53.5	3,358
1952	52.3	5,842
1953	51.9	9,157
1954	[1] 51.7	3,683
1955	[1] 51.9	2,771
1956	51.1	+(3,779)
1957	49.4	(592)
1958	48.1	7,088
1959	47.7	7,040
1960	46.9	+(1,953)
1961	46.4	6,306
1962	45.9	7,199
1963	45.3	6,672
1964	44.7	8,248
1965	44.0	4,699
1966	43.2	

[1] Years in which fiscal years ended which were under control of a Republican Congress.

TABLE 2

State	Average yearly loss from inflation, 1961–65	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	$125,300,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.
Alaska	16,200,000	5.7 percent retail sales.[1]
Arizona	70,400,000	2.5 percent general sales and use.
Arkansas	66,100,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.
California	1,126,700,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.
Colorado	100,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Connecticut	181,900,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.
Delaware	31,900,000	4.5 percent retail sales.[1]
Florida	266,100,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	178,000,000	2.9 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	38,200,000	1.9 percent gross receipts and use.
Idaho	30,700,000	3.2 percent retail sales.[1]
Illinois	654,500,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.
Indiana	261,700,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	135,700,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	113,900,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	123,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.
Louisiana	138,000,000	2.6 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	42,200,000	4.1 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	201,000,000	5.8 percent retail sales and use.
Massachusetts	306,300,000	4.1 percent retail sales.[1]
Michigan	468,600,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	176,800,000	3.9 percent retail sales.[1]
Mississippi	68,900,000	2.7 percent gross receipts and use.
Missouri	223,900,000	3.9 percent retail sales and use.
Montana	$32,200,000	3.3 percent retail sales.[1]
Nebraska	72,000,000	3.4 percent retail sales.[1]
Nevada	27,400,000	2.2 percent retail sales and use.
New Hampshire	32,600,000	3.7 percent retail sales.[1]
New Jersey	416,100,000	4.6 percent retail sales.[1]
New Mexico	43,400,000	2.2 percent gross receipts and use.
New York	1,110,000,000	4.6 percent retail sales.[1]
North Carolina	188,800,000	3.6 percent retail sales and use.
North Dakota	28,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
Ohio	546,600,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
Oklahoma	105,200,000	3.2 percent retail sales and use.
Oregon	100,600,000	3.8 percent retail sales.[1]
Pennsylvania	595,500,000	5.9 percent selective sales and use.
Rhode Island	47,500,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.
South Carolina	88,500,000	3.1 percent retail sales and use.
South Dakota	27,400,000	3 percent retail sales and use.
Tennessee	145,200,000	3 percent retail sales and use.
Texas	468,900,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Utah	43,900,000	2.7 percent retail sales and use.
Vermont	17,600,000	3.3 percent retail sales.[1]
Virginia	201,900,000	4.2 percent retail sales.[1]
Washington	162,200,000	2.1 percent retail sales and use.
West Virginia	68,900,000	1.3 percent retail sales and use.
Wisconsin	210,500,000	7.9 percent selective gross receipts, use.
Wyoming	16,000,000	2.5 percent retail sales and use.

[1] Percentages for the 13 States having no sales taxes as of Sept. 1, 1964, were based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware, farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; food stores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations; apparel accessory stores; furniture, homefurnishings equipment stores; eating, drinking places; drugstores, proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers.

TABLE 3

State	1965 loss from inflation	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent	State	1965 loss from inflation	Loss of purchasing power measured in sales tax equivalent
Alabama	$195,468,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.	Montana	$50,232,000	5.2 percent retail sales.[1]
Alaska	25,272,000	8.9 percent retail sales.[1]	Nebraska	112,320,000	5.4 percent retail sales.[1]
Arizona	109,824,000	3.9 percent general sales and use.	Nevada	42,744,000	3.4 percent retail sales and use.
Arkansas	103,116,000	4.2 percent retail sales and use.	New Hampshire	50,856,000	5.8 percent retail sales.[1]
California	1,757,652,000	6 percent retail sales and use.	New Jersey	649,116,000	7.2 percent retail sales.[1]
Colorado	157,404,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.	New Mexico	67,704,000	3.5 percent gross receipts and use.
Connecticut	283,764,000	9 percent retail sales and use.	New York	1,731,600,000	7.2 percent retail sales.[1]
Delaware	49,764,000	7 percent retail sales.[1]	North Carolina	294,528,000	5.6 percent retail sales and use.
Florida	415,116,000	5.5 percent retail sales and use.	North Dakota	44,460,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Georgia	277,680,000	4.5 percent retail sales and use.	Ohio	852,696,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
Hawaii	59,592,000	2.9 percent gross receipts and use.	Oklahoma	164,112,000	5 percent retail sales and use.
Idaho	47,892,000	5.1 percent retail sales.[1]	Oregon	156,936,000	5.9 percent retail sales.[1]
Illinois	1,021,020,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.	Pennsylvania	928,980,000	9.1 percent selective sales and use.
Indiana	408,252,000	3.5 percent retail sales and use.	Rhode Island	74,100,000	8.6 percent retail sales and use.
Iowa	211,692,000	4.8 percent retail sales and use.	South Carolina	138,060,000	4.9 percent retail sales and use.
Kansas	177,684,000	5.2 percent retail sales and use.	South Dakota	42,744,000	4.7 percent retail sales and use.
Kentucky	191,880,000	5.3 percent retail sales and use.	Tennessee	226,512,000	4.6 percent retail sales and use.
Louisiana	215,280,000	41.4 percent retail sales and use.	Texas	731,484,000	7.1 percent retail sales and use.
Maine	65,832,000	6.4 percent retail sales and use.	Utah	68,484,000	4.3 percent retail sales and use.
Maryland	313,560,000	9 percent retail sales and use.	Vermont	27,456,000	5.1 percent retail sales.[1]
Massachusetts	477,828,000	6.4 percent retail sales.	Virginia	314,964,000	6.6 percent retail sales.[1]
Michigan	731,016,000	5.4 percent retail sales and use.	Washington	253,032,000	3.3 percent retail sales and use.
Minnesota	275,808,000	6.1 percent retail sales.[1]	West Virginia	107,484,000	2 percent retail sales and use.
Mississippi	107,484,000	4.2 percent gross receipts and use.	Wisconsin	328,380,000	12.3 percent gross receipts and use.
Missouri	349,284,000	6 percent retail sales and use.	Wyoming	24,960,000	3.8 percent retail sales and use.

[1] Percentages for the 13 States having no sales taxes as of Sept. 1, 1964, were based on assumption of a simple retail sales tax on lumber, building materials, hardware, farm equipment dealers; general merchandise group stores; food stores; automotive dealers; gasoline service stations; apparel accessory stores; furniture, home furnishings equipment stores; eating, drinking places; drugstores, proprietary stores; other retail stores; and nonstore retailers.

COST OF LIVING INCREASES IN SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT

The Republican Coordinating Committee recommends that the Social Security Act and the Railroad Retirement Act be amended to provide an automatic cost of living increase in the insurance benefits payable thereunder.

Congress has not been entirely unmindful of the impact of cost of living increases on Social Security pensions and has periodically increased them. Provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act raise benefits under that program to correspond with Social Security increases. But between these sporadic increases there has usually been a time lag of several years during which the pensioners have suffered from a drop in their purchasing power. For example, from 1958 through 1964, just before the 7 percent increase in pensions was legislated, inflation cost Social Security pensioners approximately $1.4 billion in loss of purchasing power.

There is a precedent for such a provision as here recommended. Congress, in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, Sec. 1102, provides for an automatic increase in Civil Service retirement pensions when there has been an increase of 3 percent or more in the consumer retail price index.

An automatic increase in Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits correlated to increases in the consumer price index involves no increase in costs as a level percentage of payroll. Wage increases usually precede increases in the other components comprising the consumer price index. Increases in the wage level bring more covered workers nearer the maximum Social Security wage base and thus result in increased tax revenues. Additionally, the benefits paid represent a smaller proportion of an individual's wages as his wages approach the maximum wage limit ($6,600). Because of these factors, there is no increase in the level cost of payroll (although there is an increased flow of dollars) involved in enacting an automatic benefit increase provision.

There is an urgent need for such a change in the law. Why should aged pensioners continue to suffer while run-away inflation further destroys the purchasing power of the pension dollar? Congress should provide for an automatic offset against the hardship inflation and its resulting rise in prices visit upon our senior citizens.

RETIREMENT TEST

The Social Security Retirement Test could more accurately be called an earnings test. It restricts the amount a person may earn without forfeiting a part or all of his Social Security benefits. The most recent amendments to the Social Security Act raised the exempted earnings to $1,500. The Republican Coordinating Committee believes this ceiling on earnings to be too low. A worker who has contributed to Social Security during his most productive years is entitled to his benefits without being unduly penalized because of his willingness and ability to earn.

It seems probable that a sizable number of senior citizens are forced to limit their earnings because the retirement test would make the losses in Social Security benefits excessive. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in 1960 about 300,000 people getting full Social Security retirement benefits were earning just under the $1,200 exemption then in effect. HEW estimated that "a sizable proportion of these can be assumed to be deliberately holding their earnings to $1,200 or just under that amount in order to get full benefits."

In 1962, employment was the largest single source of income for the aged population. There is ample evidence to indicate that, in 1966, gainful employment is even more important as a source of income for the older worker.

OLD AGE ASSISTANCE

Many older persons receiving minimum or no benefits under Social Security are forced to rely heavily upon the old-age assistance programs of the States created with the help of Federal grants-in-aid. It is readily apparent that most States are failing to meet the minimum subsistence standards which they, themselves, set up as necessary for older people. The Republican Coordinating Committee is deeply concerned about these old-age assistance programs and urges action to assure their adequacy. We recommend that immediate action be taken by the States, and if necessary by the Federal Government, to see that the basic needs of our elderly citizens are met.

It is estimated that some 2 million persons 65 and over actually receive—from all sources—less money than any minimum decency budget would require. The reason for this is that many States have arbitrary ceilings for the payment of old-age assistance funds either in a dollar amount or in allowing only a percentage of a budget figure to be paid to the recipient. This, in effect, says to the old person: "It will cost you a certain amount for food, clothing, shelter and other absolutely necessary expenditures but we are only giving you this much, we are only giving you 60 percent or 70 percent of what you actually need."

It is shocking that such practices exist today when we are committed as a Nation to the alleviation of poverty. We believe that the States have a responsibility and an obligation to provide for their aged citizens a minimum decency standard of living. If the States do not take steps to fulfill their responsibilities and obligations, the situation will unquestionably provoke continuing demands that the Federal Government do the job. We are of the opinion that it is far better that the States handle their own problems.

PRIVATE PENSIONS

Private pensions are potentially one of the most important sources of retirement income. They are currently paying nearly $2,750,000,000 annually to almost 2,500,000 beneficiaries. They cover about 25 million Americans who have not yet retired constituting an estimated half of the employees in private nonfarm employment.

It is estimated that by 1980 the number of employees covered by retirement plans will have increased to 42 million, or three out of five employees then in private nonfarm employment. Projections for 1980 have 6,500,000 Americans receiving private pension benefits totaling approximately $9 billion annually.

Most of the persons currently in receipt of private pensions are also receiving OASDI benefits. They constitute about 23 percent of retired beneficiaries under Social Security. These persons are the economic elite among the retired OASDI beneficiaries. Their median total income of $3,400 was only one-sixth less than that of beneficiary couples with at least one member working at a full-time job. And for nonmarried beneficiaries, a private pension did as much as full-time employment to raise the average level of money income.

The improverished condition of many of our senior citizens today clearly indicates that unless adequate private retirement plans are extended to more people there will be increasing demands for other ways of help-

ing the aged in retirement. The current financial structure of Social Security is not geared to provide a full retirement program.

The Republican Coordinating Committee recommends that the continued improvement, flexibility, and coverage of private pension plans be encouraged. Private programs should be viewed as one of the essential and interrelated elements of retirement security and emphasis should be placed on including more workers under their protection rather than trying to adapt governmental programs to provide a complete retirement income.

We urge prompt consideration of ways to amend present laws to further encourage the self-employed to establish pension programs both for themselves and their employees.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Considerable study has been devoted to the problems of age discrimination in the field of employment. The specter of an able-bodied man being refused employment solely on the basis of age is extremely disturbing. Idle older workers constitute a waste of productivity that our country can ill afford. (See Table No. 4)

Although it is not strictly within the purview of this report, the employment problems of workers between the ages of 45 and 65 are of great importance. A worker who is forced out of the labor market at age 45 is extremely hard pressed to prepare adequately for old age, and may later become a social and economic problem.

To the extent that enforced early retirement is a result of a fixed arbitrary retirement age and does not rest on actual job requirements, there is a need for a program to reduce age discrimination in employment. The Republican Coordinating Committee urges that the Administration on Aging, established under the Older Americans Act of 1965, undertake to initiate an educational and informational program to reduce resistance to employment because of age. The Department of Labor should intensify its efforts to provide specialized placement services for older workers through Employment Security Offices in each of the States. A dynamic America should be able to find a use for the experience and talents of its older people who are able and willing to work.

The importance of gainful employment to the older American can not be understated. Employment was the largest single source of income for the aged population in 1962—despite the fact that 3 out of every 4 persons 65 and over did not work during the year.

For many of the elderly, employment is part-time and earnings are primarily a supplement to retirement benefits. But for the 2.3 million who worked during 1962 at jobs that were usually full-time, earnings made up about two-thirds of total income.

With some effort and imagination, business, labor and other groups should be able to open up new fields for employment of the older worker. A great many of our senior citizens are willing and able to contribute to their own support and should be encouraged to do so if at all possible.

TABLE 4.—*Percentage of population, not in labor force, by age and sex, 1960*

[In percent]

Age	Female	Male
45 to 49	53	6
50 to 54	54	8
55 to 59	60	12
60 to 64	71	22
65 to 69	83	56
70 to 74	90	71
75 to 79	94	80
80 to 84	97	88
85 and over	98	93

HOUSING

The Republican Coordinating Committee recommends a reappraisal of governmental housing programs for the elderly to assure that they are serving the people they were intended to serve and doing the things they were intended to accomplish.

We have found that there is substantial overlapping in the markets served by these programs and that they are competing with each other and with private enterprise to the detriment of the entire effort to provide adequate housing for older people.

The ability to obtain, or retain, safe and sanitary housing in an acceptable environment is essential to a dignified and rewarding life for our senior citizens. Having established the President's Council on Aging under President Eisenhower, supported programs of housing for the elderly, proposed and supported the reduction of interest rates to 3 percent for needy elderly, the Republican Party can and does point with pride to its contributions to the provision of adequate housing for the elderly. But Republicans are disturbed by the failure of Democratic Administrations either to collect enough data or review it objectively enough to make possible reasonable evaluations of the program operations or accomplished needed improvements.

The four major government programs of elderly housing—the Public Housing Administration, the Community Facilities Administration, the Federal Housing Administration (Sec. 231.), and the Farmers Home Administration—are all designed to serve a specific market. The PHA, CFA, and FHA, are intended to serve respectively the low, low middle, and middle income elderly. The Farmers Home Administration serves the elderly in rural areas.

Figures show beyond doubt that a large percentage of government subsidized CFA projects are in a rental range that competes with nonsubsidized FHA propects. (CFA states that it attempts to build for the income range of $2,000 to $4,800 per year.) Conversely, many of the FHA projects offer low enough rentals to make the need for certain CFA projects questionable (see chart below). To further point up the confusion, the Senate Special Committee on Aging reported in 1965 that the median rental for housekeeping apartments under CFA (Sec. 202.) was $88.00 per month, but pointed out that the great area of need was in the range of $50.00 to $70.00 per month. Some 8 percent of FHA projects have already gone into default and are the subject of a Congressional investigation.

In a 1963 report of the income of 6,450 elderly residents, FHA reported a median income of $2,580.00. They break this down as follows:

	Percent of total
Without income	9
Under $1,000	8
$1,000 to $1,999	16
$2,000 to $2,999	29
$3,000 to $4,999	25
$5,000 or over	13

These figures indicate that 87 percent of FHA's project residents have incomes under $5,000 which is essentially the income range CFA is attempting to serve. Thirty-three percent had incomes under $2,000 which is below CFA's target range.

Administration of government housing programs—particularly the FHA—has been such as to deter their use by church groups, fraternal orders, labor unions, and other organizations to provide housing for the elderly. The Republican Coordinating Committee, recognizing the interest and capability of these groups, recommends that administrative procedures be amended to maximize the possibilities for their participation.

Certain regulations included in our government programs tend to stifle the elderly housing program by imposing restrictions with which private groups find it impossible to comply. Processing is cumbersome and requirements so high that costs are driven up out of all proportion. Costs of units—and thus rentals—could be reduced by relaxing unreasonable standards and removing the frills from some projects. Standards of the government subsidized CFA are actually higher than the non-subsidized FHA, requiring such things as kitchens in every unit while permitting group dining facilities.

Other artificial limitations such as the ban on the use of founder's fees—a well established procedure in church sponsored homes—should be relaxed in order that more progress can be made toward involving the private sector. There is a definite need for attention to this problem if the full potential of private enterprise to serve the housing needs of the elderly is to be developed. Programs which serve the elderly only at the price of their conformance to the programmers' standards will not grant the dignity of a free choice and the reward of a full life.

MEDICARE CRISIS

In the new field of Medicare the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is guilty of gross negligence.

The law became effective nearly a year ago and the Administration has failed tragically to prepare for the start of the program. The hospitalization program begins on July 1. The program of nursing care goes into effect January 1, 1967.

Still, today, extended medical care facilities called for under the Act are largely nonexistent.

Hardly more than 20 percent of the nursing homes of the country are equipped to provide the nursing care services promised by Medicare. There is no likelihood that any large proportion of the nursing homes will be ready to provide these services by January 1.

The Administration is now in a frantic, eleventh hour scramble to meet a crisis which it should have anticipated long ago. But this crisis cannot be "consensused" away. Hospitals are not built in a day. Doctors, nurses, and health aides cannot be trained overnight.

The hard and inescapable fact is that the Nation is short thousands and thousands of nurses and other health personnel, as admitted by HEW Secretary Gardner in his May 23, 1966, report to the President. The Medicare promises of the Administration will simply not be kept for thousands of older people for many months and perhaps years to come. For such people it will be a fraud and a political hoax. The President's failure to move in adequate time to avert this crisis is tragic.

The Republican Coordinating Committee urges the immediate implementation of already existing programs to provide such personnel, services, and facilities as may be necessary to care adequately for the health of our elderly citizens.

The Health Professions Educational Assistance Act of 1965 and the Nurse Training Act of 1964 can be used to provide more professional manpower. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Older Americans Act can be used to correct the shortage of subprofessionals in the field of health. The President's 1967 budget request does not provide for full funding of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Only through Republican efforts in the Congress has full funding been provided for the next fiscal year.

Construction of new facilities can be supported by the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. Such additional funds as are needed to carry out programs under these laws should be requested and approved.

The Republican Coordinating Committee is shocked by the Administration's failure. Let the Nation hold fully accountable those responsible for the inaction of the Democratic Administration in the face of this crisis.

DATA COLLECTION

In the study of the problems of the aging, we were greatly handicapped by the lack of data relating to the effect of both public and private programs currently operating to help the elderly American. We strongly recommend that efforts be undertaken to provide for more frequent and improved quality of data collection on all programs directly or indirectly operating to alleviate the problems of our senior citizens.

Without the necessary information to evaluate current efforts, we are, in effect, flying blind in our attempt to improve our programs of assistance to the elderly. This situation is apt to lead us to overlook the shortcomings of some programs and ignore the potential of others. When we undertook to ascertain the needs of the elderly as they apply to cash income, it was found that the only complete figures relating to the problem were from 1960. The last official attempt to formulate a "modest but adequate" budget for an elderly couple was in 1959. Similarly, in the study of housing for the elderly, there are serious deficiencies of data. Every tenth year a census is taken in the United States. In between there are some samplings taken and projections are made from them but precise information comes only every ten years. The result is that accurate assessments of the success or failure of efforts to improve elderly housing are extremely difficult to make.

Through Medicare and Social Security, actual contact, or means of contact, with the elderly has been established. These channels should be utilized to provide an accurate picture of the problems of our older citizens.

STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON MINNESOTA SCHOOLS

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, I recently received a copy of a letter written by the Minnesota Commissioner of Education, Duane J. Mattheis, to U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe. The letter concerns the direct mailing to Minnesota school districts of two inventory forms for elementary and secondary schools in which statistical information about the race composition of the student body is requested. Commissioner Mattheis has strongly objected to this mailing for several important reasons. Let me read that portion of his letter which covers these:

1. I believe that all communications from the U.S. Office of Education should be directed to the Commissioner of Education in a state, and he in turn will communicate with the school administrators of the state and send to them any forms necessary for data gathering. I am disturbed by this plan to bypass legally constituted state authorities.

2. State Department of Education personnel have been working with the U.S. Office of Education to develop a Basic Educational Data System (B.E.D.S.) and in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education and the Council of Chief State School Officers Committee on Educational Data Systems (C.E.D.S.). Apparently no effort has been made to coordinate either of these projects with the collection of the information you now desire. It is inconceivable that someone in the U.S. Office of Education could not have known as late as June that such information was desired so that the states could have been asked to collect it at a time that would be most convenient for the states and the schools within the states.

3. The purpose of these forms is to collect data on school enrollment by race. We have a law in Minnesota which states in part, "No district (school) shall classify its pupils by race, color, social position, or nationality . . .". School districts do not keep records of the racial origins of either pupils or teachers, and it is not possible to accurately provide such information. Most school administrators would return such forms as OE–2247 and OE–2248 with a statement that it is illegal to provide such information. In Minnesota we do, however, have an Attorney General's Opinion that permits principals and teachers to make what has been interpreted to be a "sight count" of pupils of various races or colors so as to provide an estimate of racial groups. Schools are not permitted, however, to keep records indicating the race of either pupils or teachers. There is also the question of what constitutes a non-caucasian. The legal definition for various programs to aid Indians is that they must have 25 percent Indian lineage. Is there to be any such definition for this survey?

4. Minnesota school districts do not and have not maintained public schools for any racial or national origin group. School districts are established for all pupils residing in the district and attendance areas within districts are for all pupils residing in the attendance area. We have only a very small percentage of school attendance areas that have a substantial number of Negro pupils, and the "estimated" number of nonwhite students in attendance in these schools can readily be supplied without a statewide survey. It would not be necessary to conduct a statewide survey to supply the information that you are apparently going to request. I realize this varies greatly among the states and is only one more reason for turning to the states for assistance and guidance in matters such as the one you intend to propose.

5. We do not believe that there is any value of or need for collection of data on enrollments by race on a statewide basis. We see no urgent need for this type of information and we do not see how it will contribute toward compiling "a nationwide directory of public elementary and secondary schools". I think it would be proper at this time, prior to its collection, to enumerate in very specific terms the use that will be made of the data.

OE 2248 (9–66)—BUDGET BUREAU No. 51–R536—EXPIRATION DATE: 10–31–66—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

INVENTORY OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS: FALL 1966

Name of School:

Address of School: Number and Street or Rural Route, County, City, State, Zip Code:

Name of School System:

A. General information regarding type of school: 1. Is this school (type an "X" in one box).

(a) A regular day school? If "regular day school," do you conduct—

(b) A school for exceptional children? (physically, mentally, emotionally handicapped, mentally gifted, etc.): (1) Special classes for handicapped children? Yes—. No—. (2) A vocational educational program? ("X" one): Yes—. No—.

(c) Another special school? (vocational, technical, etc.). Specify.

B. Grade span, enrollment, and staff information.

1. What is the lowest and highest grade in this school? ("X" one box on each line)

(a) Lowest grade:

(b) Highest grade:

2. Pupil enrollment?

Number of pupils enrolled in this school: White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

3. Staff personnel (report each staff member only once):

Teachers: Full-time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

F.T.E.[2] of part time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

Principals: Full-time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

F.T.E.[2] of part time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

Other professional: Full time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

F.T.E.[2] of part time: Item—. White—. Negro—. Other[1]—. Total—.

Name and title of person furnishing information:

Telephone No. and extension:

Date prepared:

---

1. Complete form and return original to Office of Education promptly.

2. Send duplicate to chief State school officer.

3. Retain one copy for your files.

OE 2247 (9–66)—BUDGET BUREAU No. 51–R536—EXPIRATION DATE: 10–31–66—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

INVENTORY OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS: FALL 1966 UPDATE

(In the fall of 1965, the U.S. Office of Education received from your State department of education a complete listing of school systems in your State. This form has been designed to provide a rapid means of bringing our files up to date.)

Name of school system.

County, school system number, number of schools in system.

Address of school (number and street or rural route), city, State, zip code.

If name and address of system has changed since fall 1965, type an "X."

If you operate no schools, type an "X."

Name of chief administrative officer of this system.

A. Enrollment:

Pupils enrolled in this system: White —. Negro —. Other[1] —. Total —.

---

[1] Other: Should include any racial or national-origin group for which separate schools have in the past been maintained or which are recognized as significant "minority groups" in the community.

[2] F.T.E. (full-time equivalent) of part-time staff is intended to equate part-time staff with full-time positions. For example: If a teacher works two days a week and another works four days a week, together their services are the F.T.E. of 1.2 teachers (2 days=0.4 week; 4 days=0.8 week; sum=1.2 weeks). Report F.T.E. to one decimal point in all cases.

B. Staff personnel:

Number of full-time professional staff: White —. Negro —. Other[1] —. Total —.

Number of part-time professional staff: White —. Negro —. Other[1] —. Total —.

C. Total central office staff (not to be reported elsewhere): White —. Negro —. Other[1] —. Total —.

Name and title of person furnishing information.

Telephone No. and extension.

Date prepared.

Mr. Mattheis concludes his letter by offering several suggestions as to a more appropriate and feasible method of collecting the sought-after data on enrollments by race. I quote again:

We do not presently plan to authorize the direct mailing of the forms to school districts in Minnesota from the U.S. Office of Education. If the forms are to be completed by local administrators in accordance with state law and Attorney General's opinions, a detailed letter of instructions by this office should accompany the forms to each local school district and this procedure will be followed.

We further offer our full cooperation in working out a mutually acceptable plan for collecting data on enrollments by race if such information is necessary. We urge that the problem be submitted to C.E.D.S. for their study and recommendations and that nothing further be done about collecting such data until a more acceptable plan has been developed.

I further suggest that, if a plan for the collection of the information you desire cannot be designed that will work *through* and not *around* the Minnesota State Department of Education, I intend to encourage local school district officials in Minnesota to not comply with a request for such information from your office.

I trust that my letter indicates to you the strong concern I have for the maintenance of proper lines of communication between the U.S. Office of Education, State Department of Education and local school districts. Through the history of federal aid to public elementary and secondary education, and there are many programs, the proper federal, state and local relationships have been maintained, with the exception of Title III of Public Law 89–10 which I have discussed at length with you. I encourage you and all members of the U.S. Office of Education to work through the long and legally established channels of authority in any dealings with individual public school districts within the respective states.

In addition to the letter from State Commissioner Mattheis, I have here a copy of a letter also written to U.S. Commissioner Howe on the same subject by the executive secretary of the Minnesota School Boards Association, W. A. Wettergren, in which he points out that this incident is just another example of total disregard for the established methods of communication and the lack of understanding of education problems on the local level. Let me read the whole of his letter:

MINNESOTA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
St. Peter, Minn., October 10, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD HOWE II,
U.S. Commissioner of Education, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER HOWE: This office has received a copy of a letter sent to you dated October 5, 1966, by Minnesota's Commissioner of Education, Duane Mattheis. If it is your intention to have someone of the Office of the U.S. Office of Education go directly to the school districts of Minnesota to seek information, I must advise you that the Minnesota School Boards Association protests this action very strongly.

We have just completed twenty-four area meetings throughout the state of Minnesota for school board members and superintendents of schools and we continually heard through these meetings a complaint from the districts over the application of the various programs under Public Law 89–10. I think all of their complaints can be summed up in this thought. Federal legislation and the rules and regulations to implement this legislation simply incorporate corrective measures for problems that are not existent in Minnesota's public school districts and therefore makes the relationship of Minnesota's public school districts and the State Department of Education to the U.S. Office of Education and Federal legislation almost impossible.

May I suggest that as long as we will have greater and greater support from the Federal government to our great systems of education, that more consideration be given to the absolute fact that all problems are not the same in each state of the nation.

I must support Commissioner Mattheis' position and in doing so I suggest as I have done many times before, that there is a great gap between the U.S. Office of Education and the local school boards and superintendents in Minnesota. It would seem to me that education could be provided with a great service if more attempt was made on the part of the U.S. Office to find out more about the problems of public education as they exist on a local level. I also suggest that your office has made very little attempt to do this other than appoint a few committees for more or less "window dressing purposes". This is not the real thing.

Sincerely,

W. A. WETTERGREN,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and disturbed when I read these letters and saw a copy of the inventory forms published by the U.S. Office of Education. Outside of the standard information on identifying the particular school, the only other information sought on the form is the race composition of the student body, staff personnel, and total central office personnel. Furthermore, the breakdown in classifying the race affiliations is white, Negro, and other. For example, the school superintendent is only to identify the number of white children, the number of Negro children, and the number of other children, and no area is left to identify what the "other" category may consist of. For instance in some parts of the country there are large numbers of Indian children, in other parts the percentage is larger for Mexicans, Orientals, or Asians. In every case you will probably find quite a mixture. If the Office of Education is so interested in finding out the racial characteristics of all the school districts, why have they so obviously singled out the Negro category? It would seem to me that they would want to know more than just how many Negroes and how many whites. After looking at these forms, I think you can draw your own conclusions.

Aside from wondering why the Office of Education wants to know the breakdown between Negro and white in the schools, I am doubly concerned as to the method they chose to obtain this information; namely, mailing the questionnaires directly to the school systems and completely bypassing the State departments of education, the channel through which the Office of Education constantly says the decisions with regard to Federal programs of education are being made, and the channel for which Public Law 89–10 set aside substantial funds under a separate title to upgrade.

Today, I wrote to U.S. Commissioner Howe protesting this action and asking for a complete explanation as to why racial information of this nature is desired by the Office of Education and why a method bypassing the State education departments was chosen. I think it will be interesting to see how Mr. Howe replies.

NATO TRADE COUNCIL NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the slow pace of the tariff reduction negotiations points up the conclusions of Dr. Richard J. Goodman in a study of "Agricultural Trade Policy and the Atlantic Community."

The study was made for the House Republican Committee on NATO and the Atlantic Community, of which I am chairman, as part of its program of research on the future of the Atlantic Community.

Dr. Goodman, an economist for Great Plains Wheat, Inc., is an international trade specialist in agriculture and a GATT consultant on cereals. He is one of 26 foreign policy specialists cooperating with our committee. Here is his statement:

AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY AND THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

(By Richard J. Goodman)

An important initial economic objective of liberalized international trade is to increase world industry competition as a means of eventually rationalizing production more closely to the principle of efficient comparative advantage. This objective has significance as a national economic policy, in a peaceful world, as domestic industries become highly concentrated oligopolies within which the test of free competitive performance becomes abridged by monopolistic market behavior.

The result of tariff reductions, and the abrogation of non-tariff barriers of all kinds, is to broaden the competitive delineation of markets beyond national boundaries to include more firms competing within the same industry market structure. Liberal trade may also result in greater inter-industry competition, via market substitutes, as well as for scarce factors of production.

The application of the principle of liberal trade for competitive efficiency appears to be much easier to conceptualize for economic sectors that are not directly government supported or subsidized. Tariffs, quotas, licenses and import regulations are principally involved. Manufacturing industries have generally avoided domestic governmental subsidization by structural control and the resulting evolvement of market power—the

same characteristics that provide persuasion for increasing competition through more liberalized international trade.

As an industry, agriculture does not generally possess structural control and, therefore, cannot alone affectively exercise market power on its own behalf. Because of agriculture's inherently unstable, atomistically competitive character, governments have extended commodity price support and marketing programs to enhance farmers' relative market power. Government support of agriculture, in varying degrees, in one form or another, is commonplace throughout the world, and has achieved the highest levels of sophistication in developed industrial economies.

However, there are great differences in the efficiencies of agricultural production among industrial developed countries, particularly those of the Atlantic community. The greatest differences in efficiencies appear to exist in the production of grains and oil seeds and less differences in livestock, dairy and poultry production, when adjusted for differences in feed grain prices.

The economic argument for liberal trade with high price, highly protected agriculture, such as that of Western Europe, can best be made on the basis of precipitating more rapid structural change for the achievement of greater productive efficiency through broader competition. This argument, of course, has its greatest political disadvantage for governments of countries with proportionally high farm and rural populations, even though these countries may be in greatest need for structural change in agriculture.

For export oriented agriculture the principle of liberal trade for greater competitive efficiency is also less than popular, even though agricultural production in exporting countries is generally more efficient by any comparison with net importing countries. Domestic government commodity price stabilization and marketing programs are more widely used to support farm income in agricultural exporting countries, and are erroneously believed by farmers to be jeopardized by more liberalized imports. Nevertheless, just as it may be in the long run national interest to promote liberal trade for greater competitive efficiency of national industrial oligopolies and to restructure inefficient agriculture, so may liberal trade be similarly important to keep efficient export agriculture growingly efficient within government commodity support programs. While liberal trade should in no way threaten the existence of national agricultural income stabilization measures, the terms of support within specific commodity programs could be effected by broader international competition.

The principal obstruction to reciprocal liberalized agricultural trade within the Atlantic Community remains the unwillingness of governments to commit their farmers and rural communities to structural and production adjustments clearly foreseen by subjection to closer and broader market competition. This unwillingness persists among major Western European governments in spite of economic logic, because their farmers sound a louder political voice on food policy questions than do their consumers; and because European political parties, particularly opposition labor parties, have long courted the rural vote as a road to majority power.

Thus, while the U.S. government may be politically able to extend liberalized agricultural trade, direct reciprocity with Western Europe agriculture appears distant and unpromising. What the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association may be looking for in the Kennedy Round of GATT negotiations is to offer general industrial tariff concessions in exchange for a mix of industrial and agriculture tariff concessions from North America. This would be nearly opposite to the formally stated Kennedy Round objections of the U.S., which set out for Western European agricultural tariff concessions in partial exchange for more general U.S. industrial tariff reductions.

Because the EEC employs highly protective variable import levies against major agricultural commodities, rather than traditional fixed tariffs or ad valorem duties, overall agricultural trade negotiations in the Kennedy Round are further complicated by the necessity of the GATT to establish special negotiating units for grains, fats and oils, dairy products, and meats and poultry. The approach in these special negotiations is toward formal world commodity trade agreements, at least clearly so in grains.

With Western Europe increasing its agricultural output toward greater self-sufficiency under high protected farm price guarantees and the expansion of comparatively inefficient production to the detriment of agricultural imports from the Western Hemisphere, particularly North America; what might be an effective agricultural trade policy for the U.S. to follow that could contribute to drawing Europe toward liberal world agricultural trade and a strengthening to the Atlantic Community? Contrary to the belief of some international economists, international commodity agreements embodying artificially high administered world price levels is not a satisfactory or dependable answer.

Conversely, it is my firm belief that a greater degree of success lies in a policy of aggressive export pricing of U.S. farm commodities at the most competitive levels that the efficiency of our commercial agriculture can afford, and the extension of this export policy without restriction to all markets of the world, particularly including Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Likewise, the U.S. should grant equal tariff and nontariff treatment on imported agricultural products regardless of country of origin. With this trade policy established, the U.S. government should stand ready, with necessary authority, to participate in regular, and perhaps extended negotiations in the GATT toward liberalizing international agricultural trade with a willingness to exchange tariff concessions in one or a group of commodities for similar concessions in another commodity or group of commodities.

This approach would essentially reject artificially high administered world prices or price ranges within international commodity agreements. Although international commodity agreements can importantly contribute to world trade and price stabilization, the U.S. as a world political leader, cannot hope to benefit or realize equal advantage from commitments to manage or administer world commodity prices at noncompetitive levels. The International Wheat Agreement provides some example.

The International Wheat Agreement (IWA) has significance to the world price of wheat to the extent of setting a minimum-maximum trading price range in terms of the best quality wheat, basis the head of the Great Lakes between the United States and Canada. The minimum trading price in the present IWA is $1.62½ per bushel for No. 1 Manitoba wheat in store at Port Arthur-Fort William. This minimum trading price was raised from $1.50 when the agreement was renegotiated in early 1962.

The IWA minimum trading price has been maintained from the very beginning of the Agreement in 1949, by governmental administered export pricing exclusively by the Canadian Wheat Board and the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation. The U.S. and Canada have also been the only Agreement countries that have carried any significant surplus stocks of wheat in order to manage world wheat supplies in maintaining stable world wheat prices above the IWA price minimum.

Ignoring the unusual speculative demand conditions in the early part of the Korean War, and during the Suez Crisis, the world wheat price has generally averaged 10 to 15 cents per bushel higher under the present Agreement, until early 1965, than before 1962.

Of the four major exporting countries in the Agreement (U.S., Canada, Australia and Argentina), significant expansion of wheat acreage has taken place in all but the U.S. since the 1955–59 period. While wheat production has generally increased throughout the development world since 1955–59, outturn of wheat in Australia during the 1962–65 period was nearly doubled over that of the earlier period. Production also increased by one-third in Canada and France, by one-fourth in Argentina, by nearly one-half in Mexico between the two reference periods. Likewise, while wheat outturn increased in Western and Eastern Europe by about 18 percent, U.S. production climbed by only 11 percent, the smallest increase of the seven countries and regions mentioned.

Wheat production and acreage in specified countries and regions, 1955–59 and 1966–65

Country or region	Production			Acreage		
	1955–59 (millions of bushels)	1962–65 (millions of bushels)	Percent change	1955–59 (millions of acres)	1962–65 (millions of acres)	Percent change
Australia	168.3	328.7	+95.3	9.9	16.8	+70.0
Canada	465.6	627.3	+34.7	22.7	28.1	+23.8
Argentina	225.7	282.5	+25.2	11.6	12.6	+8.6
France	358.0	481.7	+34.6	10.4	10.7	+2.9
Mexico	44.6	65.8	+47.5	2.2	2.2	−.9
Western Europe	1,312.9	1,548.9	+18.0	46.6	46.0	−1.3
Eastern Europe	552.7	649.4	+17.5	25.3	24.9	−1.6
United States	1,095.4	1,221.0	+11.4	49.1	46.9	−4.5

Source: Wheat Situation, October 1965—USDA.

Of course a major reason for the much larger increases in wheat production in other parts of the world over that of the U.S. has been the domestic production control program in the U.S. and the absence of such acreage restraints elsewhere. Also, under the procedure of the U.S. and Canada bilaterally taking the responsibility of maintaining the world wheat price above the Agreement minimum, other exporting countries have commercially sold their entire wheat crops each year regardless of size. Canada has increased her sales by mass transactions and long term contracts with Mainland China and the Soviet bloc. The U.S. has for the most part looked toward

concessional sales under PL 480 for major export increases.

Taking full account of recent world wheat production and trade history, one must conclude, at least in part, that increased world wheat prices between 1962 and 1965 stimulated wheat production in those freely producing countries, with these increased supplies more closely filling increased commercial world wheat demand at the expense of U.S. commercial export opportunities, and U.S. wheat producers continuing to be ever more increasingly dependent on concessional export sales arrangements.

Including barter transactions, CCC Credit and PL 480 Title IV sales, annual average commercial exports of wheat from the United States during the five years from 1955–59 were only slightly over 36 percent of our exportable production during this period, as compared to an average of over 68 percent for the total of the five major exporting countries (United States, Canada, France, Australia and Argentina). Whereas, we averaged only about 183 million bushels of commercial wheat exports during that five year period, equitable shares calculated on equal percentages of exportable production indicate that we should have averaged 340 million bushels of commercial exports. During the five year period 1960–1964, the United States commercially exported only about 42 percent of her exportable production as compared with over 72 percent for the average of the five major exporting countries. While we averaged only 260 million bushels of commercial exports during this most recent five year period, equitable shares indicate that we should have exported an average of 448 million bushels in the commercial category.

Of course, our total exports have been favorably maintained relative to other exporting companies by transactions under Title I, II and III of PL 480, all of which have been concessional sales outside of any usually expected commercial returns. These concessional transactions would have to be considered a financial burden to the United States if they have been carried out at the expense of an equitable share of the world commercial export market, as the data seems to clearly indicate:

5-year average wheat [1] situation, 5 major exporting countries, 1955–64

[In millions of bushels]

	United States	Canada	France	Australia	Argentina	Total
Carryover	1,031.0	617.2	62.6	62.1	68.6	1,841.5
Production and imports	1,104.1	465.7	387.8	168.3	225.7	2,351.6
Domestic disappearance	598.2	159.3	328.9	72.3	139.6	1,298.3
Exportable production	505.9	306.4	58.9	96.0	86.1	1,053.3
Total exports	450.4	293.8	59.9	102.3	91.7	998.1
Commercial exports [2]	183.2	281.9	59.9	102.3	91.7	719.0
Commercial exports as percent of exportable production	36.2	92.0	101.7	106.5	106.5	68.3
Equitable shares of total commercial sales	345.4	209.2	40.2	65.5	58.7	719.0
1960–64 AVERAGE						
Carryover	1,228.5	509.2	85.6	30.7	42.5	1,896.5
Production and imports	1,225.3	538.3	450.8	309.2	233.0	2,756.6
Domestic disappearance [3]	604.3	149.1	344.2	76.9	123.2	1,297.7
Exportable production	621.0	389.2	106.6	232.3	109.8	1,458.9
Total exports [3]	713.7	408.4	83.0	223.0	82.8	1,510.9
Commercial exports [2 3]	260.0	403.9	83.0	223.0	82.8	1,052.7
Commercial exports as percent of exportable production	41.9	103.8	77.9	96.0	75.4	72.2
Equitable share of total commercial sales	448.0	281.0	77.0	167.5	79.2	1,052.7

[1] Includes flour in wheat equivalent.
[2] Includes barter and Public Law 480 title IV sales for United States, and East European insured credit and special China credit for Canada.
[3] 1960–63 for other than United States; 1964 partially projected for United States. All 1963 data preliminary.

Source: "Wheat Situation," October 1965, USDA.

The Atlantic Community cannot be strengthened by U.S. failure to fully compete with partner countries for commercial exports to other communities of nations, particularly for dollar sales of agricultural commodities. Such failure not only weakens the U.S. from a standpoint of balance of payments, but distorts the pattern and balance of economic and commercial relations of the Atlantic Community with the Soviet bloc and the rest of the world. Other major agricultural exporting countries of the Atlantic Community which freely trade with the East without competition from the U.S. may surely be expected to view their international political and security interests with less than full Atlantic Community spirit.

The Atlantic Community, in my view, can be strengthened by a U.S. agricutural trade policy that extends equal treatment to imports regardless of origin, and that fully extends export competition in farm commodities to all destinations.

A fully competitive world food trade policy on the part of the U.S. holds a far better chance of economically rationalizing world agricultural production and trade over time than does artificial administered commodity trade and pricing agreements.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *January 17, 1966.*

Mr. Speaker, our committee is indebted to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], one of its valued members, for an analysis of Dr. Goodman's study. He is also a member of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Education and Labor.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Goodman's excellent study of inter-Atlantic trade relations comes at a most appropriate time. Within recent months we have witnessed one dispute after another which concern the nature and the future of the Atlantic community and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If possible, the fabric of NATO is in greater disarray than ever. If steps are not taken in the near future to avert the weakening of NATO, the future of that organization is in severe question. I commend the excellent study now being conducted by the Republican task force on NATO and the Atlantic community, and I am indeed impressed by the high caliber of the participating specialists.

In his paper, Dr. Goodman diverges in one important respect from the stand I have long taken with respect to agricultural trade. To quote Dr. Goodman:

It is my firm belief that a greater degree of success lies in a policy of aggressive export pricing of U.S. farm commodities at the most competitive levels that the efficiency of our commercial agriculture can afford, and the extension of this export policy without restriction to all markets of the world, particularly including Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Likewise, the U.S. should grant equal tariff and non-tariff treatment on imported agricultural products regardless of country of origin (p. 6).

I do not believe that at the present time it is to the best interests of either the United States or NATO to engage in this kind of competitive trading with the Eastern European bloc and other Communist-controlled nations. I have often stated my support for the formation of a NATO Trade Council to supplant the present manner of dealing with these nations. I wish to reaffirm my support for this Council.

Much is to be gained from the formation of such a Council. All NATO nations would participate in an effort to arrive at a unified and well-directed trade policy. The present situation involves the governments of Communist countries dealing directly with private firms of Western nations. Often the resulting agreements work at cross-purposes to the broader free-world purpose. One result has been ill-will among various members of the EEC and the EFTA, and U.S. trade policy has been put in a foolish light by the flagrant disagreement that exists within the Atlantic Community regarding the expediency of such trade. American goods, or their equivalent, often end up in the very countries with whom we refuse to trade due to the zealous exploitation of every available market by our Western European allies. This puts U.S. trade policy in the role of "whipping boy" to the aspirations of other nations. A NATO Trade Council would avert this unfortunate situation, and would unite all trade policy behind an official trade medium.

I stand in full agreement with Dr. Goodman that the United States needs to compete more fully with partner nations for dollar sales of agricultural commodities. Our inability to compete in many instances has led to the deteriorating balance of payments problem as well as the unbalancing of our relations with and within the Atlantic community. But I limit my argument to non-Communist trade—if the NATO Trade Council is formed, the problem of unfavorable competition will be eliminated, and the best interests of NATO will be served. Only as a last resort should the United States join the competitive market-search in Eastern Europe. If this happens, the best interests of NATO are undermined, and the political interests of ourselves and our allies along with them. I might add that this is only one area in which there is a crying need for

greater unity among Atlantic community nations. Developments in Europe or in the United States that weaken Atlantic unity are undesirable on numerous counts. The best interests of the Atlantic Community in the long run are often not best served by courses that seem the best in the short run. The United States must explore with its European allies, the fields, forms and degrees of unity which would be mutually advantageous. If Atlantic Community nations can agree that their best interests lie in unified efforts to reduce the effectiveness of Communist hegemony, it is imperative that they also realize that a central Council is needed to formulate this kind of policy on a day-to-day basis.

The United States, says Dr. Goodman, cannot hope to benefit or realize equal advantage from commitments to manage or administer world commodity prices at noncompetitive levels. I would also insert that there is always the danger that price levels can be driven too low, and that this too must be avoided in considering an expanded U.S. role in agricultural trade. I believe this is an economic consideration which must be evaluated along with political considerations.

I should like to quote the National Foreign Trade Council—NFTC—declaration, which was prepared at their 1965 convention:

> The convention emphasizes that any expansion of our trade with the communist countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union should be based upon either genuine and mutual economic advantage or on demonstrable political benefits to the United States. Negotiations with each of these countries should involve realistic bargaining from which the United States should expect to receive satisfactory assurances regarding the removal of commercial obstacles arising from the differences in economic systems, reasonable settlement of outstanding financial claims, and procedures to avoid dumping and to protect property and contractual rights.

I believe that this is a very sensible approach to our trade policy with the Eastern European nations and the Soviet Union. I believe it emphasizes the need of political motivation in trading. I furthermore believe that it applies as well to the interests of all Atlantic Community nations as it does to the interests of the United States. "Demonstrable political benefits" provides a good starting point for the creation of a NATO Trade Council. The diverse trade policies now in effect have hurt the Atlantic Community in many ways. The fact that many NATO signatories have different—often widely diverging—political aims does not change the fact of a fairly common political purpose with regard to the Communist nations.

This brings me to another problem. The fact of political differences within the Atlantic Community is in itself not a bad thing—in fact, it is probably a very healthy thing. But the organization itself needs to have an effective medium to resolve political disputes that affect the organization as a whole. So far, the NATO Parliamentary Conference has not been effective in this role. It has been unable to cope with the many problems arising, for example, from the economic policies of EEC and EFTA. No doubt, many of these problems are reflective of growing pains which are to be expected in the radical changes that have occurred in the European economic picture in recent years. But if these growing pains are allowed to weaken the Atlantic Community more than they already have, the future is dim indeed. The action of France with regard to military participation in NATO is a prime example of this very problem. Misunderstandings and arguments arising from largely economic disputes have led to a potential withdrawal from the military alliance, a withdrawal that will drastically weaken the NATO structure when it happens.

Very often in the past the United States has been guilty of tactless and undiplomatic treatment of France and President de Gaulle. The present administration has largely overlooked the historic significance of France and De Gaulle's vision for rebuilding the French nation. In our robust zeal to achieve economic federalization—with the inevitable political federalization that follows—we have expected far too much submission and humility from a nation that has traditionally harbored great pride in its history of independence and achievement. It is small wonder that France has become as "ornery" as she has. And the problems now posed by France loom large and dark on the horizon of the Atlantic community.

Another failure has resulted from our inability to cope with the nuclear problem in the MLF. It is plain that within the presently constituted framework of NATO we will not see a real solution to this problem for some time. The implications of the problem are both military and political. A reappraisal of NATO goals and methods is urgently required in order to resolve this kind of dispute at the foundation level.

For this reason I have long advocated the formation of a "blue-ribbon" study panel to represent the United States in a major and significant convention of all NATO signatories. The Atlantic community deserves our very best diplomats and our very best diplomacy. The Republican Task Force on NATO Unity last year asked President Johnson to form such a panel, and further to appoint as cochairmen ex-Presidents Eisenhower and Truman. We met with Secretary Rusk about this proposal, and that was the last we heard of it.

This convention is needed to reevaluate the goals of the Atlantic community with an eye to the ultimate economic, political, military and even cultural implication of the community, and expressing specific intent with regard to each step visualized in the formation of a closer and more significant Atlantic community. A stronger unit to review and mediate political disputes is urgently needed. Better cooperation in economic differences needs to be promoted on all levels of trade.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, our committee is also indebted to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON] for an analysis of Dr. Goodman's study. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take the opportunity to comment on the thoughtful paper of Dr. Richard J. Goodman on "Agricultural Trade Policy and the Atlantic Community."

World economics and trade are so fluid in comparison with a generation or two ago, and they are so important to the health and well-being of every nation, that it is appropriate that we have a constant review of these important matters. Dr. Goodman has made a significant contribution to this goal. In this same context, the Republican Task Force on NATO and the Atlantic Community is to be commended, for by this activity they make a similar contribution to this searching reappraisal.

The paper presented by Dr. Goodman presents a concept of world trade based on comparative economic advantage, without any tariff protection or restriction as to the destination of our exports. Under the plan, countries the world over would trade and compete with each other for trade on the basis of pure economic advantage.

For the United States to adopt this plan would be to deny ourselves the use of our commercial and economic power in international affairs. The United States would embrace an agricultural trade policy that extends equal treatment to imports regardless of origin and fully extends export competition in farm commodities to all destinations. Dr. Goodman's proposal would abolish controls over exports and imports at the very time when we are trying to muster our strength and that of our allies, with our foreign aid program, for the conduct of our national security policy.

Under the Goodman plan, the United States would pull away from international commodity agreements such as the Wheat Agreement, and rely on across-the-board trade with all countries of the world in aggressive export pricing of U.S. farm commodities at the most competitive levels that the efficiency of our commercial agriculture can afford. It would also extend this export policy without restriction to all markets of the world, particularly including Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Likewise, the United States would grant equal tariff and nontariff treatment on imported agricultural products, regardless of country of origin, regardless of hostility of other countries toward us, and regardless of whether a foreign country is involved in aggression against another country.

The United States would have to abandon its restrictions on import and export trade with Communist and Communist satellite countries if this plan were adopted. But the Latta amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1961 stated that

it was the sense of Congress that there should be no trade of subsidized export commodities with Communist countries. Other Republican Congressman have held that no food under Public Law 480 should go to Nasser of Egypt, that no wheat should go to Yugoslavia, and that no soft currency agreements—under title I of Public Law 480—should be entered into with any Communist countries—hence, no soft currency deals with either Yugoslavia or Poland.

Various laws generally favored by Republicans, such as the Battle Act, would be repudiated by the Goodman plan. Republicans also have favored most-favored-nation treatment whereby non-Communist countries are given special tariff and quota considerations not extended to Communist countries under general tariff laws. Particularly pertinent at this time, with American men fighting in Vietnam, is the Trading With the Enemy Act, which prohibits any trading with countries such as Cuba, Red China and North Vietnam.

The 1964 Republican platform clearly states our position; this position would be seriously eroded by the Goodman plan. The platform declares:

We reject the notion that Communism has abandoned its goal of world domination, or that fat and well-fed Communists are less dangerous than lean and hungry ones. * * * Republican foreign policy starts with the assumption that Communism is the enemy of this nation in every sense until it can prove that its enmity has been abandoned. We hold that trade with Communist countries should not be directed toward the enhancement of their power and influence but could only be justified if it would serve to diminish their power.

To accept the Goodman plan, the United States would have to overlook the protectionist policies of the European Common Market, with the hope of breaking down these barriers by offering competition in world trade. Section 22 of the AAA of 1933 as reenacted and amended, which affords protection against imports of agricultural products that are part of stabilization programs in the United States, would have to be vacated. On this subject, the Republican view was given in the report of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture, September 13, 1965:

ADMINISTRATION'S POLICY FAILURE

These shortcomings in our agricultural trade policies result principally from (a) the failure of the Administration to adopt a sound, positive agricultural trade policy that would resist the protectionist policies of other trading countries, and better serve this nation's agriculture and economy, and (b) the Administration's failure to comply with the directive of Congress, as expressed in Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to coordinate U.S. agricultural import policies with our domestic farm programs.

To accept Goodman's worldwide free trade policy would be to abandon Public Law 480's concessional sales, which in effect are discriminatory trade programs favorable to the United States. It is the Republican view that Public Law 480, essentially an Eisenhower measure, was instituted to develop agricultural trade and remove agricultural surpluses. Republicans, generally, have supported this program for a number of years.

Republicans in Congress contend that this Nation's import duties are moderate, averaging out only 10 to 12 percent ad valorem, which is considerably lower than the European Common Market, which imposes variable import fees on American feed, flour, poultry, pork products, and dairy commodities. These fees have caused considerable concern to American agriculture in recent years.

In summary, I believe we should not at this time adopt Dr. Goodman's recommendations for six important reasons:

First. It would deprive us of an important tool of foreign policy, namely the use of quotas and import restrictions;

Second. It would greatly expand trade with Communist states and on balance, this helps their economies far more than it does ours;

Third. It would undermine our Trading With the Enemy Act and undercut previously adopted most-favored-nation clauses;

Fourth. It would directly repudiate important sections of the 1964 Republican Party platform;

Fifth. It would destroy the concessional sales philosophy of Public Law 480, which is a beneficial way of aiding friendly states;

Sixth. It would be based on the pretense that other nations do not have certain protectionist policies or the dubious hope this action would eliminate them. In my judgment, neither premise is valid.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the other members of our committee are Representatives ADAIR, DON H. CLAUSEN, CLEVELAND, CHAMBERLAIN, ELLSWORTH, KEITH, MARTIN, MORTON, PIRNIE, and REID.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DO YOU VALUE YOUR SIGHT?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following letter I received from a good friend of mine, J. M. Ulmer, secretary of the National Foundation for Eye Research, together with the enclosures he mentions:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION
FOR EYE RESEARCH,
Cleveland, Ohio, September 30, 1966.

Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Congressman from Rhode Island,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FOGARTY: Since last mid-December I have been laid up with a coronary and have not been able for that reason to spend the time I have for many years in doing what I always sought to do; namely, to help advance research and education in the blinding and other sensory diseases as well as in other disciplines. I have always tried to keep up with the reading of the volumes in which are spelled out the testimonies of the witnesses who appear before the Appropriations Committee of the House which was considering appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, of which Committee you have for a long time been chairman.

I marvel at the tremendous amount of effort that you and your Committee have patiently expended for long years, resulting in an outstanding record evidenced by appropriations made by the Congress to support education and research and expand manpower in seeking the cure and prevention of the multitude of diseases of which mankind is a victim. You have been praised many times for your outstanding efforts in this direction, and personally, on several occasions when I have had the pleasure of chatting with you, I have added my few words of praise for your efforts. Notwithstanding, I want you to know my sentiments on this subject, for in the past few months when I have been recovering from my own illness I have diligently read Parts 2 and 3 of the Record of the Appropriations Committee and have partially read Parts 4 and 5 of said Record covering the Second Session of the 89th Congress.

You merit my personal thanks, because I continue to understand and marvel at the excellence of your Committee's painstaking efforts so fully spelled out as I have read the testimonies of witnesses appearing before your Committee. May you continue in good health so that the nation will ever be proud of your exceptional devotion and your unceasing efforts to advise the Congress of the facts upon which the recommendations for appropriations are made.

With high regard and sincere thanks, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. M. ULMER.

DO YOU VALUE YOUR SIGHT?

(J. M. Ulmer's talk to a committee of the Congress)

For a period of 22 months I could not read a line. During my long period of incapacity and after my sight was restored as a result of cataract operations, I studied the matters set forth in this statement. I shall relate these facts, to advance a cause too long forgotten. It is high time that something constructive be done to bring about proper fundamental and clinical research to determine the causes, the prevention and the cure of blinding eye diseases.

I am not a paid advocate. I determined that I would indicate my appreciation in part for the restoration of my sight by bringing attention to the results of a protracted study made on what is, or rather, what is not being done with respect to research in the diseases of the eye leading to blindness.

I contacted many leaders in the field of ophthalmology—outstanding scientists, members of research foundations, members of the staffs of universities and various governmental agencies. In the light of these contacts, I ask Do you value your sight?

When blindness strikes, you turn to medical science. You ask:

What causes the impairment of sight?

What can be done to prevent the loss of sight?

What is fundamental research in the eye field?

Is there a lack of teamwork between clinician and scientist in basic research in blinding diseases?

Is there a need for fundamental research in the eye field?

How can fundamental research for the causes, the prevention and the cure of blinding eye diseases be secured?

In one's study, you find that thousands have impaired sight or are totally blind and

that thousands more become blind each year. There are only a very few outstanding eye research laboratories and, in this country, there are literally less than 20 men engaged full time in research studies designed to determine the causes of diseases leading to blindness and to provide new forms of therapy. You discover that in more than 75% of the blinding eye diseases, you are literally against a stone wall. Unless we act, thousands are faced with a future of darkness.

In studying the field of blinding eye diseases, time and again you find the phrase "unknown to science", "undetermined by physician" or "not specified." In the book on "The Causes of Blindness" by Ralph Hurlin, Sadie Saffian and Carl E. Rice, M.D., issued by the Federal Security Agency, it is stated:

"Little is definitely known of the underlying causes of diseases such as glaucoma, atrophy of the optic nerve, cataract, . . ."

"Since the underlying causes of many eye defects are still obscure, a large proportion of causes are indicated under the heading "Unknown to Science."

For lack of research, there is no answer to the question "What can you do to regain your sight, or to prevent the loss of it, or to cure the diseases that caused you to lose your sight?"

You find that there are meager dollars available to support the few outstanding eye research centers in this country. Without money they cannot function properly. These few splendid eye research laboratories such as Howe at Boston, Wilmer at Johns Hopkins, the Department of Ophthalmology of the University of Pennsylvania, and a few other similar laboratories, if properly supported and expanded, will help find the answer to the problem of what can be done to find the causes to cure and prevent blindness. In these laboratories you have the beginning of the pattern of fundamental research in the blinding eye diseases. Other avenues of research can be found and supported to conduct research in this neglected field. Generally, you find that the field of research to discover the causes, the cure and prevention of blinding diseases is unplowed. You are frustrated when you make the inquiry and find the answer to the question that you have asked to be, "I don't know" or "Unknown to Science." You are challenged by these facts—at least I was.

You are faced by the harsh fact that the subject of fundamental ophthalmological research except in a few places has been lost in the study of diseases. Why so little attention has been paid to so vital a function of life as one's eyes, passes understanding. We must change these conditions. In this country of ours, we find that scant dollars have been made available to find the answer to blinding eye diseases. I must repeat that where the few qualified research groups are found, *all* need money to expand their activities and enlarge fundamental research so that the causes, the cure and prevention of blindness may be found. This statement I make unreservedly, I have written evidence from all over this great land to prove that eye research has not been made for lack of money. About one-half of the departments of ophthalmology in approved medical schools and eye research institutions have no funds for research, but only a very few have meager funds. Everywhere throughout the country, there is reported a great need for funds for eye research. Other eye research laboratories will be established if we provide the funds and scientists and professional men will rally to the cause if supported.

As the human life is lengthened, more and more people find their sight impaired or destroyed. New classes of blindness have been developed in the birth of children prematurely born. A good authority states that there are probably 800,000 persons with unrecognized glaucoma, a dread disease leading many to blindness, if not detected. Yet, for lack of plan and lack of dollars, science has not been able to find what causes many of these conditions and what to do to correct the same. Competent authority says that there are not three or four full time men in the entire country devoting their search to answer the questions, "Why glaucoma?" "How can it be prevented?"

You find that governmental agencies alone spend more than $50,000,000 each year to help those who are already blind, yet only about $300,000 per year from public and private sources is spent in research to prevent blindness. Of this, we are advised that the Federal Government spent less than $80,0000 last year in grants for fundamental research in eye diseases.

It is not necessary to supply further statistics, statements and general information which will serve only to fill out and amplify the conclusions here stated. This information should prompt your earnest consideration of a situation which demands that the Congress should provide the machinery and supply some of the money required, so that through fundamental research the causes, the cure and the prevention of blindness may be brought about. (*See Note at the end of this statement.)

Too long has this field been neglected. The restoration of sight and the prevention of blindness through medical research by discovering its causes is so fundamental and simple a concept that one need not labor the point. The time has come when something should be done to remedy this deplorable and long neglected problem.

With assistance of the Federal Government and especially under legislation providing for support of research under the Public Health Service Act, the way can be found, a pattern set up and some of the money provided to meet this situation. When there has been dollar support and a general process of education, both of which should be supplied at least in part by the Federal Government, then perhaps the State Governments and the public and the many groups and foundations interested in the welfare of the people will see to it that additional financial support will be provided, not only to aid the blind after they are blinded, but to help through fundamental research to attack the problem at its very roots.

The question of fundamental research in the clinical specialties is one of absorbing interest.

Everyone interested should read the book "The Furtherance of Medical Research" written by Dr. Alan Gregg, Director of Medical Sciences, Rockefeller Foundation. The paper "Fundamental Research in the Clinical Specialties", Science, Vol. 105, No. 2728, April 11, 1947, prepared by Dr. V. Everett Kinsey of Howe Laboratory of Ophthalmology, Harvard Medical School and the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, is important and informative reading. In this way there will be spelled out the answers to the question, "What is fundamental research and what should be done to bring fundamental research about in the blinding eye diseases?"

These men are leaders in their fields and much is to be gained by reading what they have said so that you may understand the problem. We quote almost literally from the sources above referred to in order to tell in simple words some of the fundamentals which will assist you in your study of the problem before us.

It is difficult and perhaps not necessary to define what is medical research. A knowledge of physics and chemistry are of primary importance in their field. Nor is medical research limited at all to the study of diseases. By no means is research confined to the possessors of the M.D. degree. When Dr. V. Everett Kinsey made his survey of the studies of fundamental research in the clinical specialties at the large universities, he found the situation to be, in general unsatisfactory. Research programs were handicapped by inadequate funds and by the fact that neither the well qualified department heads nor the underpaid clinical staff members were in a position to devote full time to the research programs.

Dr. Kinsey calls attention to the fact that the number of investigators working in any given field is frequently pitifully small. And as heretofore stated, glaucoma, for example, is one of the principal causes of blindness in individuals past middle age. Yet, in the United States, there are not more than three investigators who are devoting half or more of their time to this problem. Dr. Kinsey says that as a result of halfway measures, the amount of fundamental research in the clinical fields is extremely small. He concludes that research is a full-time job if facilities and personnel are to be utilized efficiently and if the quality of the work is to compare favorably with that in other branches of science.

Dr. Gregg points out in his splendid work that research involves a critical examination of sources and ways of learning and what we describe as facts. "Research may lead to the discovery and proof of new principles, the breaking through the crust of already accepted doctrines and axioms. Scientific research involves and elaborates facts, relationships and interpretations. Mere recording of observations and reading dials of complicated instruments is not research. The compiler can be ignorant of his materials, but the researcher cannot."

Dr. Gregg says, "Confusion lies in mistaking the result for the cause. Research may lead to invention or invention may call for research, but invention is not research. Research in any field as a procedure consists of a sequence of activities, each of which contributes to, but cannot be substituted for, the whole process.

"Medical research is a part of medicine in the sense that it is one of the growing fringes of medicine. Medical research has left the medical profession itself somewhat behind, and at times clannishly resentful. Medical research, then, is in its youth, attentive, adaptable. It is only within recent times that universities and scientists have come to recognize that research is as important a part of the university as teaching, that the public does not understand or value medical research as much as it admires and praises it. The tragedy of every good cause is that it must accept praise in lieu of understanding and hospitality and words of welcome rather than sustenance."

Research, we must therefore agree, is the vital forerunner of all medical progress. And yet we are shocked to find that there is pitifully little research being conducted in the blinding eye diseases in the universities and independent research institutions of this country. There has been a steady improvement of medical research done in the laboratories of commercial companies. Instances will be found of part-time work in eye research sporadically done, but this should not come under the name of fundamental research in any scientific appraisal of the term, and is quite different from the research of a full-time scientist teamed with other scientists in a properly equipped laboratory such as is found at Howe Laboratory in Boston, Johns Hopkins at Baltimore, the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia, and a very few others throughout the country.

Dollars must be supplied to meet the challenge. Medical research in the diseases of the eye leading to blindness requires the efforts of well trained and zealous men who can devote their lives to the problem. These men must be trained in chemistry, physics, mathematics, anthropology, psychology, sociology, genetics, etc. We cannot ignore the importance of experienced, devoted and gifted men who can carry on this research until the problems are resolved and the answers found. These men must be supported in their life's work and others trained to fill the ranks of those brave men who are willing to follow the cause of research.

Dr. Kinsey in great detail and after thorough study and a countrywide investigation, states that there is and has been, save in a few quarters, a lack of fundamental research for the very simple reason that dollars have not been allocated to meet the situation. Dr. Kinsey has pointed out that by expanding the activities of research laboratories like Howe at Boston, at Baltimore, at Philadelphia, and by establishing other places like them, all of which can be done if the dollars are provided, you will have gone a long way to meet the problem.

Upon contacting various groups interested in the blind, institutions, ophthalmologists, scientists, clinicians and men in charge of our universities, all agree that the answer "I don't know" may be turned into "I do know" if money is supplied. Among the statements made to me are the following: "We have no information about what research may be going on." "We are in a position to carry on research in the various fields concerned with the blinding diseases provided funds are available to do so."

The head of one of the great universities says: "We have here a number of research problems which bear directly or indirectly on the causes of blindness and which are in need of funds to support them."

The Rockefeller Foundation has said that of course there are departments of ophthalmology associated with medical schools but relatively few of them have active programs of research. Ophthalmologists and scientists familiar with the field agree that literally no funds have been available for fundamental research.

The Federal Government has said, "Our work is entirely with persons who are already blind or nearly blind."

Competent authority has said, "It is needless to say that funds are inadequate to pursue studies like glaucoma in the intensive manner necessary."

A Federal Agency has said, "As is illustrated by the study in an unfortunately large proportion of cases of blindness, even when diagnosed by physicians skilled in diseases of the eye the cause of the eye defect cannot be defined either by inadequacy of information available to the physician at the time of the examination or because the cause of the condition is not yet known to medical science. Causes are generally recorded as unknown to science."

Inquiry has been made of the various states which indicates that help is given to the blinded but literally no dollars are devoted to fundamental research to find the causes of blindness.

The Federal Security Agency, as late as June 1, 1949, points out that during the Government fiscal year 1948–49 a total of $70,340.00 was all that was allocated to research in the field of ophthalmology. What more need one say to prove the point.

The Veterans' Administration has stated, "No studies at present are under way on the primary causes of blindness."

The New York Institute for the Education of the Blind says, "There is no single group interested in devoting its time and attention to raising funds to provide fundamental research required to find the causes to cure and prevent blindness."

Facts are here presented which should prompt action. It is needless to labor the point. If money is supplied to the few outstanding eye research laboratories in the country and these groups in time are expanded according to plan, and others interested in the eye research field are supported, past experience indicates that sooner or later the problem of blinding eye diseases in part at least, will be met. The discoveries in eye research will certainly be pooled and the findings will be for the common good. The support for medical research in the blinding eye diseases field by the Government, we trust, will increase, but up to the present time literally no dollars have been supplied for this purpose.

As late as November 4, 1948, the Institute of Ophthalmology, London, was opened. Dr. Alan C. Woods of Johns Hopkins Medical School, outstanding in the eye field, represented this country at the dedication of the Institute. After more than a century, the English set up an eye research laboratory in which is coordinated all that is best in England in eye research. With the help of the Parliament of England, there will be developed a research and teaching institute of the first magnitude which will permit Great Britain to continue as in the past in the grand part it has played in the development of ophthalmology and ophthalmological research. Notwithstanding great difficulty, much credit must be given for the enterprise and courage that prompted the establishment of a research institute of this type. The same is staffed by men able and willing to do research, supported by the Medical Research Council and coordinating general medicine and surgery as well as the fundamental and physical sciences, the experience and knowledge of hospitals and universities, which marks a new epoch in the advance of British Ophthalmology.

This challenge must be met in this country. The Government must take the lead in this cause. You can remedy the situation herein described by legislation of the kind that you are considering, if you include in it the much needed support for fundamental research in the blinding eye diseases. Then men trained in chemistry, physics, psychology, physiology, mathematics, anthropology, biochemistry, sociology, genetics, including pre-clinical sciences, clinical specialties and other sciences, may find the answer to the problem of blinding eye diseases and so provide resources of inestimable value to the research worker in medicine. "Medical research and its inseparable companion, medical education," says Dr. Gregg, "exist for the purpose of fighting diseases and ignorance." He further says, "From the study of diseases, medical research is moving forward to the study of health and the knowledge of what is essential to optimum performance and happiness."

The Government can direct certain kinds of medical research which otherwise will never be done. If the legislation pending before you, which provides for an amendment of the Public Health Service Acts, includes research into the causes of blinding eye diseases, is enacted, the general purpose of the Act, i.e., to improve the health of the people of the United States through the conducting of research, will be furthered. The States, the Universities, the Foundations and the People must be shown the way by the Federal Government. There must be a plan, a purpose and the money to meet the challenge now existing. If we do not do this, we shall deny sight to many yet unborn and refuse to cooperate in finding the causes for the cure and prevention of blinding eye diseases.

Only one who has lost his sight is conscious of that most precious gift. Only one who has seen the light and then is forced to give up the use of his eyes can appreciate what others take for granted. Any person could be stricken blind tomorrow only to find that "Unknown to Science" is the answer concerning the causes, the prevention and the cure. The shock of this discovery becomes greater when it is revealed that practically nothing is being done and very few are working to find the answers to the blinding eye diseases because of lack of funds, indifference or neglect. The process of education on this subject has been sadly neglected. The remedy is in our hands. The challenge must be met—if these facts help open the eyes of those who want *all* to see, then action will result and the purposes may even in our time be fulfilled.

NOTE

The foregoing statement was made by J. M. Ulmer to a Committee of the Eighty-first Congress on June 17, 1949, in an effort to secure necessary legislation which it was believed was required to stimulate fundamental research to find the causes, the prevention and the cure of blinding eye diseases. Others likewise interested made similar statements. The Congress enacted Senate Bill 2591 and Public Law 692 became effective August 15, 1960. Under this law, for the first time in the history of the blinding eye diseases field, there was established a national institute on blindness. This new member of the National Institutes of Health functions under the direction of Dr. Leonard Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States, as do the National Heart Institute, the National Cancer Institute, etc., and is known as National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Dr. Pearce Bailey is the Director of the new Institute. The Surgeon General selected a national Advisory Council of 12 to assist the new Institute in its work and appointed J. M. Ulmer as one of the members of the Council. The Congress will provide funds in part to further a cause which will, through research, make it possible that there be less blind people in the world. However, the development of research requires wide participation and support. Only by a process of education and by engaging public interest and that of individuals, organizations and foundations interested in the well-being of people, can an effort be made to bring the true story of the lack of research to the attention of all who value not only their sight, but have consideration for and an interest in hundreds of thousands whose sight is now—or may in the years to come—be impaired for the lack of fundamental research.

A non-profit organization, the National Foundation for Eye Research, was incorporated in the District of Columbia for the sole purpose of leading an organized drive for increased medical research for the purpose of preventing blindness. The Foundation has some of the most distinguished eye research men in the world on its Scientific Advisory Board. Funds for research will be allocated only with the approval of the Scientific Advisory Board, which is comprised of the following:

SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY BOARD

Chairman, V. Everett Kinsey, Ph. D., Professor of Ophthalmic Research, Wayne University College of Medicine; Kresge Eye Institute, Detroit, Michigan.

Frances Heed Adler, M.D., Professor of Ophthalmology, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine; Wills Eye Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Chief Editor, A.M.A. Archives of Ophthalmology.

Edwin B. Dunphy, M.D., Professor of Ophthalmology, Harvard Medical School; Chief of Staff, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Boston, Massachusetts.

Jonas S. Friedenwald, M.D., Professor of Ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins Medical School; Wilmer Eye Institute, Baltimore, Maryland.

Kenneth C. Swan, M.D., Professor of Ophthalmology, University of Oregon Medical School, Portland, Oregon.

Alan C. Woods, M.D., Ophthalmologist-in-Chief, The Johns Hopkins Hospital; Professor of Ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins Medical School, Baltimore, Maryland.

The Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the National Foundation for Eye Research is Albert S. Hirshberg, writer for the Boston Post, Saturday Evening Post, and other publications; the Treasurer of the Foundation is Horace W. Cole, Secretary of the Boston Safe Deposit and Trust Company, and the Secretary of the Foundation is J. M. Ulmer. The Foundation's address is 100 Franklin Street, Boston 6, Massachusetts. It also maintains Box 70, Boston 1, Massachusetts, where contributions are accepted.

A great public service and world-wide benefit to all mankind can be rendered by supporting a cause which has for its purpose the cure and prevention of blindness through fundamental research. As you value your sight—and who does not—will you cooperate in this cause so there may be less blind people in the world?

REMARKS BY SAM GAINES—DEAN ANDREWS OUTSTANDING ALUMNUS AWARD, MAY 25, 1966

To the proper administration of justice and its inestimable service to people he has contributed mightily of his abundant talents and his impressive capabilities. With consummate fidelity and with marked success he participated on the firing line of committee work at every court level, local, state and federal, from the Municipal Court of Cleveland to the Supreme Court of the United States.

To improve local, county and school board government he labored diligently and effectively in the survey and surveillance of public administration and public finance. By those engaged with him in such endeavors, his apt perceptivity and his keen acumen were eagerly sought and as readily furnished.

Widely recognized are his uncommon attributes as an advocate and as a counsellor in business affairs. He helped most materially, on a national scale, to formulate a Code of Conduct for Investment Bankers dealing in mortgage bonds, standards which laid the groundwork for the Code of Competition for Investment Bankers itself precursor of the Securities Exchange Commission Act.

That teacher teaches well, 'tis said, who gives his pupils eyes.

Equally so has he striven, in most practical fashion, literally to give people eyes. Even as in the roles he played in fostering and nurturing the abler administration of justice, the more efficient administration of government and the honorable administration of business, here, too, he was and is on the firing line of performance. For him it has never been enough to lend lip service or monetary aid to an idea. And for now just short of twenty years, totally oblivious to geographical boundaries, he has devoted a very substantial portion of his time, his means and his abilities in the fostering and the nurturing of research, education and teaching in medical disciplines, particularly in the realm of ophthalmology, to the end that occular disability and blindness be prevented—to give people eyes.

This he has done with a zeal one must experience at close range to believe possible. The magnitude and the nobility of his accomplishments constitute a monumental contribution to people.

For outstanding and pragmatic devotion to ideals and accomplishments, typical of Dean Andrews, the selection committee has chosen as the 1966 Fletcher Reed Andrews Outstanding Alumnus Awardee—graduate of the class of 1908—cultivated gentleman, lawyer of excellence and superb soldier in the service of society—Jacob M. Ulmer.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS TO THE ALUMNI, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, MAY 25, 1966

PROLOGUE

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Millis, Dean Toepfer, Acting Dean Schroeder, Mr. Gaines, Members of the Faculty, Members of our Alumni, Class of 1966, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As I left the table to come to this podium, my daughter Janet, whom I dearly love and who sees that I always do the right thing, asked me: "What are you going to talk about?"

I said: "I will talk about two hours."

She said: "Don't you know the hour is late and it's way past your bedtime and the audience will walk out on you?"

I said: "Janet, don't worry."

I will talk extemporaneously and, as always, read a long speech which I have reduced to writing. When I get to the one-and-a-half hour mark, Mr. Chairman, please give me the stop sign. My in-conclusion remarks I should be able to finish in the half hour still left to me, as I plan to talk to you "about two hours."

REMARKS TO THE ALUMNI, WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW, MAY 25, 1966

More than sixty years ago as a Freshman I walked through the portals of the old Law School on Adelbert Road. We are promised that this generation will build a new law school. All will welcome the great new building in which the tradition of the Law School earned in these long years will be continued. What a great opportunity for progress is in your hands!

My fifty-eight years as a lawyer have run by me very fast. Where the years have gone, I do not know. I have enjoyed all of the years. I was taught by my father to have reverence for education, for wisdom, for integrity, for humility, for justice, and early learned that one must be his brother's keeper. I trust I have deserved the many friendships I have found and cherish and the rewards that have come to me in my career at the law.

I have always respected my teachers and my elders. I well remember and owe much to our excellent faculty, among them Judge Alexander Hadden, Homer H. Johnson, and Dean Walter Dunmore, a great scholar who was for forty years a dedicated, devoted and outstanding teacher of lawyers. Always a fine gentleman, a good friend.

Without the understanding and help of my law partners and associates, I could not have carried on. For all through the years I have leaned on my partner, J. M. Berne, and on my other associates in the practice of law.

I have great regard for justice. I have tried always to help to further, advance and improve the cause of the administration of justice, which is the last great bulwark of our civilization. If there is no justice, there is no judge. I have tried to improve the administration of our government—city, state and nation.

In my recent years, by chance I have come to know of the diseases which lay men low, to understand that through furthering education and expanding research the causes of blindness and other crippling diseases may be found and eliminated. To aid as a layman and a lawyer to help find the causes of diseases and the cure of same through research has been a great and rewarding experience.

I have never asked for praise. I have tried to make this a bit better world. Emerson said: "Every true man is a cause, a country, and an age."

How can I best thank you for this honor you have so generously and graciously bestowed on me, save in the words of a great philosopher, Erich Fromm, who much better said what is in my heart tonight:

"Not of material things, but in the human realm, what does one person give to another? He gives of himself, of the most precious thing he has . . . he gives of his time, his joy, his interest, of his understanding, of his knowledge, of his humor, of his sadness—of all the expressions and manifestations of that which is alive in him . . . he does not give in order to receive—in truly giving, he cannot help receiving that which is given back to him." I think you for the honor that you have given me.

This I hope I deserve. I shall always cherish what you have done and will remember this night all of my life.

J. M. ULMER.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: J. M. Ulmer. Born in Shreve, Wayne County, Ohio, November 19, 1886.

Address: 1100 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio, 44115.

Residence: 13610 Shaker Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, 44120.

Law school: The Franklin Thomas Backus School of Law of Western Reserve University.

Graduated: 1908 with degree of L.L.B.

Present position: Senior member of the law firm of Ulmer, Berne, Laronge, Glickman & Curtis. Continuously engaged for 58 years in the practice of law, commencing in 1908 with the original firm of Ulmer and Berne.

Activities and affiliations with various court and other committees and organizations:

Member of the Cleveland Bar Association for more than 50 years.

Former member of its Executive Committee.

Former member of Committees of the following Courts: Supreme Court of the United States, Appellate Courts of the United States, District Courts of the United States, Supreme Court of Ohio, Courts of Appeals of Ohio, Probate Courts of Ohio, Common Pleas Courts of Ohio, Municipal Courts of Ohio, Juvenile Courts of Ohio.

Cooperating with the Courts and the public in seeking to improve the administration of justice.

Cooperating with various Ohio legislatures.

Working with various Ohio legislatures and their committees to obtain increased salaries for the Judges of the various Courts of Ohio.

Seeking to aid in the enactment of legislation to provide a Judicial Retirement Compensation System for the Judges of all the Ohio Courts.

To improve the government of the City of Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. For several years, as a member of the Common Pleas Court Public Relations Committee, aided in bringing about, through Griffenhagen & Associates, Consultants in Public Administration and Finance, a Survey and

Report of the activities of the government of the City of Cleveland, the School Board, and Cuyahoga County, directed toward improving same in cooperation with The Citizens League and related governmental groups.

Member of the Ohio State Bar Association. A member for more than 50 years of the Ohio State Bar Association.

The American Bar Association. A member for about 50 years of The American Bar Association. Cooperated with The American Bar Association in efforts directed toward securing increases in the salaries of the Judges of the Federal Courts and otherwise seeking to advance the administration of justice.

Member: Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, The City Club of Cleveland, The Mid-Day Club, Oakwood Club, Society of Benchers—The Franklin T. Backus School of Law of Western Reserve University, The Temple, Cleveland, Ohio.

1926–27

Member of a National Committee of the American Construction Council, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Chairman.

The Committee, organized by Franklin D. Roosevelt before he became President, to survey the general conditions of the First Mortgage Real Estate Bond business of the United States, worked out, with the aid of the National Association of Securities Commissioners, a "Code of Conduct" for the operation of Investment Bankers dealing in mortgage bonds throughout the country.

The month-long meetings of the Committee under the direction of Franklin D. Roosevelt laid the groundwork for the Code of Fair Competition for Investment Bankers as approved by the President of the United States on November 27, 1933.

These conferences and actions had much to do with the Congress, under the direction of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, bringing about the creation of the Securities Exchange Commission, commonly known as SEC, in 1933 and 1934.

Member of the Selective Service System of the United States During World War II. Appeal Agent of one of its Boards. Chairman and Co-Ordinator of the Selective Service Appeals Boards System.

1948–1966

Medical research and medical education activities

Expanding Medical Research and Aiding in Advancing Education as a Member of the United States Public Health Service.

Secretary of the National Foundation for Eye Research incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1948, to bring about the prevention of blindness through medical research and to discover the causes of ocular diseases and the means for their cure, to foster education in the medical disciplines, and seeking financial means and support for an expanded research program.

In 1950–3, a member of the National Advisory Neurological Diseases and Blindness Council of the Public Health Service.

Member of the Inter-Council Committee of all of the National Public Health Institutes under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1961–3, a member of the National Advisory Research Resources Council under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In 1962 appointed Honorary Member of the Association for Research in Ophthalmology, Inc.

International Cooperative Research to Advance Basic and Clinical Research and Medical Education. Travel and field studies throughout the world to help bring about international cooperation of various countries to advance the frontiers of medical knowledge and expand basic and clinical research for the purpose of the prevention of blindness and ocular and other diseases.

1949–66

Ohio—Institute for Research in Vision, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. In 1949, aided in the formation of the Institute for Research in Vision at Ohio State University, and acting as an Advisor of the Institute.

Department for Research in Ophthalmology at the Medical School of Ohio State University. Long years of effort, with the aid of the Governors of Ohio and various Legislatures of Ohio and their committees, to secure appropriations for the creation of eye research and the support of same at the Medical School of Ohio State University.

Cooperating with Medical Schools, Foundations, organizations, the Ohio Lions Clubs, and the Knights Templar Eye Foundation, Inc. of the Grand Encampment Knights Templar of the United States.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DYAL (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), from October 10 through October 15, 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. HALL) to address the House and revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LIPSCOMB, for 60 minutes, on October 17.

Mr. CONTE, for 10 minutes, today, October 12.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. MATHIAS, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FINDLEY, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, October 13.

Mr. QUIE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 30 minutes, on October 18.

Mr. FOGARTY (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIKES (at the request of Mr. MCFALL), for 60 minutes, on October 17; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. KUPFERMAN during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 12047 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of California during his remarks while in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 12047, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINSHALL.

Mr. KUPFERMAN.

Mr. TEAGUE of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCFALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. FARBSTEIN.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. CULVER.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in three instances.

Mr. GATHINGS.

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. 2444. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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. 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. 8678. An act to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 405. An act for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas;

S. 1275. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Elva L.*, owned by Harold Bunker, of Matinicus, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges;

S. 2457. An act for the relief of Jorge Ajbuszyc Volsky;

S. 2587. An act for the relief of Dr. Hilda W. Perez de Gonzalez;

S. 2640. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Rodriquez;

S. 2738. An act for the relief of Dr. Ezzat N. Asaad;

S. 2761. An act for the relief of Dr. Julio Sanguily, Jr.;

S. 3106. An act for the relief of Dr. Alberto L. Martinez; and

S. 1310. An act relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

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. 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; and

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 13, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2817. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal, pursuant to the provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434), and the act approved June 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 377); to the Committee on House Administration.

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. ZABLOCKI: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 3675. An act to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime; without amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11753. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Indiana University; without amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 11941. A bill to provide for the free entry of one Weissenberg rheogoniometer for use of Case Institute of Technology; without amendment (Rept. No. 2235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Committee of conference. H.R. 5963. Department of Transportation, establish (Rept. No. 2236). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4347. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12110. A bill to provide for the free entry of one ship model for the use of the Lutheran Church of the Covenant, Maple Heights, Ohio, without amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 12197. A bill to provide for the free entry of one rheogoniometer for the use of Tufts University, Boston, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13035. A bill to provide for the free entry of a triaxial apparatus and rheogoniometer for the use of Northwestern University; with amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13190. A bill to provide for the free entry of a four-octave carillon for the use of the Northfield and Mount Hermon Schools, East Northfield, Mass.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 13739. A bill to provide for the free entry of one broad-range multigap magnetic spectrograph for the use of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14388. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain articles for the use of Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KARSTEN: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14610. A bill to provide for the free entry of a double neutron diffractometer for the use of the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14893. A bill to provide for the free entry of an ionosonde for the use of the University of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 15888. A bill to provide for the free entry of a carillon for the use of the University of California at Riverside; without amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: Committee on Armed Services. S. 3887. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. S. 3391. An act to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to authorize exemption from the provisions of the act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 16958. A bill to authorize the establishment of a public community and vocational college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOWDY: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1319. An act to authorize a work release program for persons sentenced by the courts of the District of Columbia; to define the powers and duties in relation thereto, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1049. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. 390, an act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1050. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 13447, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wild-

life conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2252). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1051. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 18176, a bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration (Rept. No. 2253). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1052. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 18225, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEPPER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1053. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 18233, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. S. 3112. An act 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 percent of the total appropriation for any year; extend the duration of the programs authorized by the act; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2256). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report entitled "An Investigation of the U.S. Economic and Military Assistance Programs in Vietnam," 42d report (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 18312. 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. 18313. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon:

H.R. 18314. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 18315. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 18316. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 18317. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to prevent certain employees of community action agencies and Volunteers in Service to America from engaging in pernicious political activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 18318. A bill 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; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 18319. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 18320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 18321. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 18322. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 to strengthen the work-study program for vocational education students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 18323. A bill to provide for a White House Conference on Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 18324. 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. 18325. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 18326. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 18327. A bill to designate Columbus Day, the 12th day of October in each year, a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 18328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit States, under Federal-State agreements, to provide for coverage for hospital insurance benefits for the aged for certain State and local employees whose services are not otherwise covered by the insurance system established by such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 18329. A bill to permit the vacant land bounded by Independence Avenue, Second Street, C Street, and First Street SW., to be used temporarily for recreational purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 18330. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 18331. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to increase to $25,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance which may be carried by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Con. Res. 1035. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 18332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ana Augusta Lourenco Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 18333. A bill for the relief of Ibrahim Hassan Sadek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 18334. A bill for the relief of Mr. Victorino Severo Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18335. A bill for the relief of Mr. Janos Peter Mate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 18336. A bill for the relief of S & S Vending Machine Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 18337. A bill for the relief of Allessandro Carozza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18338. A bill for the relief of Jure Donlic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18339. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18340. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Villaraut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 18341. A bill for the relief of Constantine Athanasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 18342. A bill for the relief of Mr. Cherubin Langenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18343. A bill for the relief of Mr. Tah Wah Wong, also known as Tom Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1966

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Rev. Haskell R. Deal, D.D., minister, Eldbrooke Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our Father, Thou who hast blessed us with faculties of mind and reason and an abundance of all good things, we turn to Thee in praise and gratitude. We come to Thee for aid in