

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

His Excellency, the Most Reverend Harold R. Perry, D.D., auxiliary bishop of the Catholic archdiocese of New Orleans, La., offered the following prayer:

O God, the strength of those who hope in You, graciously be present with us as we invoke You; and since mortal weakness can do nothing without You, give us Your divine assistance.

Grant to our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress a clear vision of the place and function of Government in mobilizing the human resources and wealth of this great Nation to combat poverty and illiteracy.

Although the prosperity of our Nation, O God, has progressed to a level surpassing any achieved in the history of the world, we humbly acknowledge that poverty continues to be the lot of a substantial number of our people. Yet we know that our Nation can only achieve its full potential if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities.

May our mind and hearts be kindled with a greater zeal for eliminating the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty, by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training, the opportunity to work, and the opportunity to live in decency and dignity.

All these blessings we ask in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1966:

H.R. 432. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 and the Civil Service Retirement Act with regard to filing designation of beneficiary, and for other purposes.

On March 25, 1966:

H.R. 13546. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

On March 26, 1966:

H.R. 3584. An act to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines.

On March 28, 1966:

H.R. 8030. An act to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced

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

S. 2669. An act to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, 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. 6845) entitled "An act to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act."

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 (S. 1404) entitled "An act to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes."

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Please find enclosed herewith a telegram from Mr. John L. Hill, secretary of state, Texas, stating that according to returns as canvassed and certified by the Commissioners Court of Harris County, that Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS was elected to complete the unexpired term of the late Honorable Albert Thomas from the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

Respectfully yours,

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

AUSTIN, TEX., March 28, 1966.

RALPH ROBERTS,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Bill Elliott, county judge, Harris County certified to this office that the Commissioners Court of Harris County has canvassed the returns of the special election held on Saturday, March 26, in the congressional Eighth District to fill the unexpired term of Albert Thomas, deceased. According to returns as canvassed and certified by the Commissioners Court of Harris County, Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS received 6,120 votes and Louis Leman received 2,147 votes.

JOHN L. HILL,
Secretary of State.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas, Mrs. ALBERT THOMAS, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

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

There was no objection.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mrs. THOMAS appeared at the bar of the House, and took the oath of office.

TYPICAL DOUGHBOY OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. PRICE. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, March 11 to be exact, Mr. Walter Ellis Gaultney, Sr., of Collinsville, Ill., died at age 70. He was a constituent of mine, whom I was honored to serve, as well as a friend.

Walter Gaultney was more than that, however; he was a doughboy of World War I. Corporal Gaultney, 11th Infantry, 5th Division, American Expeditionary Forces, was selected by his commander as his example of the finest type of soldier. For that distinction Corporal Gaultney was one of the soldiers chosen for a series of paintings done by Joseph Cummings Chase, an artist commissioned by the War Department to do a pictorial record of World War I.

When Walter Gaultney visited me at my office in 1962, we went to the Smithsonian Institute to see his portrait, "The Typical Doughboy of World War I," on display in the Arts and Sciences Building. While the portrait has since been taken down because the building is being remodeled, I know the spirit the picture captured will continue to have a permanent place in our hearts.

All of us are deeply indebted to Walter Gaultney and his fellow World War I veterans.

FIRST ACT OF 1966 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before this body was unveiled the first act of the 1966 election campaign. As if on this one day a great catastrophe occurred; the other side of the aisle peddled their newspapers before the membership like hawkers with an old-time extra. It was one of the crudest attempts at fiscal quackery ever put to this body.

Inflation real and ominous suddenly erupted upon the scene.

As the profound remedy we were told we must cut the \$12 million rent supplement program. Taking \$12 million out of \$2½ billion—nit picking. No cuts in new programs will significantly affect the mounting curve of prices. Any high school economics student knows you cannot reverse the price curve of a gross national product approximating \$750 billion by sniping only at the \$72 billion of Federal purchasing—less than 10 percent of the total.

If meaningful steps are to be taken and if we are to control inflation, then distasteful as it may be, there must be consideration of controls set upon wages and prices.

Mr. Speaker, such a proposal was advanced by the newspaper *Newsday*, in an editorial I caused to be inserted in the *RECORD* on January 13, 1966. That editorial proposed a national agency, composed equally of representatives from labor, business, and from the ranks of citizens, with guaranteed independence from political pressures similar to the Federal Reserve Board. This body would recommend wages and prices on the basis of individual situations and the national interest. I would like once again to associate myself with this constructive suggestion by editor Harry Guggenheim of *Newsday*.

Our economy should not be made a political football. Rather, Members of this distinguished body should consider sound and prudent measures to anticipate and ease the inevitable strains that occur in our economic system.

Let my Republican colleagues not play politics with the fiscal integrity of the American dollar and mislead the American people with more election campaign promises of doom.

Let us all join in an effective bipartisan effort to control inflation by considering wage and price controls.

FAMINE IN INDIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this House look with great concern upon the threat of a vast famine which hovers over the lives of millions of our fellow human beings in the great country of India. As difficult as it may seem for us in this country to comprehend, the ancient peril of famine still stalks the earth.

All men of compassion must be moved by this horrible threat, for as Matthew Henry said:

They that die by famine die by inches.

This House knows of the efforts that our Government is making to alleviate this situation. Today I am proud to announce to my colleagues and to the country that the students at the University of Scranton have decided to do something about this. By Tuesday next it is their goal to raise contributions from each student which they

will then use to buy food for the people of India to drive off the Pale Horse of Death.

What a marvelous demonstration of basic human decency. In an age when thousands of our citizens are marching up and down the streets with signs about Vietnam, these young men have given their blood for our soldiers in Vietnam—and they were the first university in the United States to do so.

In an age when we read of famine or talk of famine, these young men are raising money to eliminate famine—and they are the first university in the country to do so.

We can all hope that their example will spread through all the colleges and universities of our great Nation. It would be the greatest message from the people of America that Mrs. Gandhi could take back to the people of India.

INCREASES IN INCOME TAXES NOT NECESSARY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the President has indicated he may soon be asking for increases in income taxes. This strains the credibility gap to the limit. Just a week ago, the same Mr. Johnson assured us that he could see no need for higher taxes. Now he blames high prices, and claims that higher taxes are a must. Why? The remedy is simple. The Federal Government can tailor its budget to fit outgo to income. This Government belongs to the people. We in Congress have the obligation to see that the Government serves the public and does not manipulate the public to serve the purposes of an overgrown, fat bloated Government.

There is no need for a tax increase. As long as the Federal Government is spending more than it takes in, a tax increase will not do a lick toward fighting inflation. The President is, in effect, telling the American people that they are smart enough to make the money, but only the Government is smart enough to spend it. He is overtaxing our credulity.

ROLLCALL VOTES REQUESTED ON MONDAY OR TUESDAY OF NEXT WEEK PUT OVER UNTIL WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes, except on rules, which may be requested on Monday or Tuesday of next week be put over until Wednesday next.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader please explain to us the purpose, the intent, and the reason behind his request?

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. I have discussed this with the distinguished minority leader. The purpose of the request is to enable us to proceed with business on Monday and Tuesday, which are Jewish holy days. We do this only on rare occasions. It is only for that reason that we are asking to put over to Wednesday any votes which may be requested on Monday or Tuesday, except on rules.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished majority leader please advise the Members of the House as to whether or not it is the intent of this session, 89th Congress, which even the President has said he would hope to be finished by July 30 at the latest; for the House to honor all the primary election days that are coming up this year, and put off votes until after said primaries are held?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, we do not intend to put over any votes for primaries. It would be impossible to run the House efficiently during a primary year if we put votes over that came up on primary days.

Mr. HALL. I could not agree with the majority leader more, but we have in the past and I wanted the record clear. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader indicate, without being specific, whether we are going to have business on Monday and Tuesday?

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. We will have business. It is expected that we will have important business.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And all rollcall votes that would be requested for Monday and Tuesday would be put over to Wednesday, but any votes on rules or responses to quorum calls would be taken on Monday and Tuesday, regardless?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

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

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, Thursday, March 31, to file a report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1967.

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

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota reserves all points of order on the bill.

UNIFORM TIME ACT OF 1966

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (REPT. NO. 1385)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2 to the House amendments, and agrees to House amendments.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
WALTER ROGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
GALE W. MCGEE,
NORRIS COTTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1404) to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, 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 House amendments, insofar as they relate to "daylight saving time," provide that beginning at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 a.m. on the last Sunday of October of each year the standard time of each time zone shall be advanced one hour. However, any State could by law exempt itself from the provisions relating to the advancement of time, but only if the State by law provides that the entire State observe the standard time otherwise applicable.

The Senate amendments would have allowed any State by law to exempt either the entire State or a single contiguous part of such State from the provisions relating to the advancement of time. The Senate receded from both of its amendments; thus, the conference agreement results in a bill

which is the same as that passed by the House.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
WALTER ROGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
WILLIAM SPRINGER,
J. ARTHUR YOUNGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe that the details were worked out so that the conference report was adopted in accordance with the bill which was presented to the House, and the Senate yielded on all points. This conference report is the House version.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House with a vote of 292 to 93. The other body amended the House version of the bill in two respects, as the ranking member of the Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, pointed out. At the conference the conferees from the other body agreed to recede from their amendments. This action was adopted yesterday by the other body. Thus, the conference report now before the House returns the legislation to the precise posture which existed when the House acted upon it on March 16.

Unless there are any questions, I should like to yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman in a few words tell what the House version was in order that Members may know again exactly what the conference report contains?

Mr. STAGGERS. I shall try to recapitulate briefly the action taken on March 16 by this body. In plain language, the House bill states that any State that is on daylight savings time or will be on daylight savings time this year will start at a uniform date, the last Sunday in April, and end the last Sunday in October. That is simply all it does for this year. Next year, starting on April 1, 1967, every State in the Union will be on daylight savings time and start at a uniform date, unless the State legislature prescribes standard time, in which case, the whole State must be on standard time. This is the essence of the bill, very simply put.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia yield?

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the consideration by this body there was considerable discussion about the legislation as it affected the State of Michigan. There was an amendment offered to correct the situation. The amendment was

defeated. The bill, as it went through this body, complicated and did not resolve any problems in the State of Michigan. For that reason, many of us in Michigan, Democrats and Republicans, voted against it.

As I understand it, the Senate version would have given us in Michigan an opportunity to resolve the problem. As I understand further, the proposal, as it comes back to us today, is the House version, not the Senate version. Is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the problem in Michigan is complicated, not resolved, by the bill before us today.

Mr. STAGGERS. With this exception, that I might explain to the minority leader. Section 4 of the bill provides that the ICC shall define by order the limit of each zone, having regard for the convenience of commerce and the existing junction points and division points of common carriers and that any such order may be modified from time to time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if this proposed legislation is signed into law by the President, will it become effective April 24, 1966?

Mr. STAGGERS. Only for the purpose of establishing uniform starting dates and closing dates for this year.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In other words, if the State of Michigan is to resolve its problem, it would be necessary to go to the ICC and to get an affirmative answer by April 24, otherwise the Northern Peninsula would end up on one time, and the Southern Peninsula would end up on another time; is that correct? Is the answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. STAGGERS. I am trying to determine the intent of the gentleman's question.

I said that only starting and closing dates in any State that has the daylight saving time will be determined this year, 1966.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. To further refine the question, before any relief can be obtained which would preclude the Upper Peninsula from being on one time and the Lower Peninsula from being on another time, the State of Michigan will have to go to the ICC and get the ICC to redraw the time zone line; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. If the State of Michigan does not agree with the way the zones are now, that would be the relief; they would go to the ICC and point out the problems. These are to be considered.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The only relief the State of Michigan can get, if the bill should become law, is to go before the ICC and to get the ICC to redraw the time zone lines; otherwise the State of Michigan will end up with two times, one for the Upper Peninsula and one for the Lower Peninsula; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; in 1967.

I understand the gentleman's problem very well. And I believe the House does. In the consideration of these problems before the committee we tried to resolve,

as much as we could, this problem, as it has existed through the years.

The gentleman from Michigan mentioned the amendments of the Senate. I am not certain that the amendments would have helped the situation to which the gentleman refers, because it referred to "contiguous" and there is a question whether a dividing river would divide these two time zones in Michigan, as they have it now.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am glad to yield.
Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The State of Michigan for approximately 30 years has solved this problem very, very successfully, and the net result has been that we have had continuous identical time in the Upper Peninsula and in the Lower Peninsula. Unfortunately, this legislation will change the whole picture. If this should become law, there will be people on one side of the Straits of Mackinac who have one time, and those on the other side, 8 miles away, will have another time. That just does not make sense.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today we have taken a bold step to end decades of costly confusion and unnecessary waste resulting from nonuniform observance of time in this Nation.

The bill will put an end to, for the most part, to the annual time scramble.

I wish at this time to thank my colleagues who supported this bill and commend those who argued against it for their honest discussion and comment which so sharply defined the issue.

Chairman STAGGERS also is to be commended for his efforts, without which this bill could not have come to the floor and for his able handling of the bill in conference which gave us strong and meaningful legislation.

Also, special commendation is due to Mr. Robert Redding of the Transportation Association of America for his work done in behalf of this bill through the Committee for Uniform Time Observance. Mr. Redding has worked tirelessly in this field for the past 3 years both in Washington and at the State level. This work has been done in addition to his regular duties with the TAA. He has in every way assisted me and cooperated with my office in our efforts to secure passage of this legislation as well as working with other Members and committees in both bodies.

Very few people will ever know or fully appreciate the work that Mr. Redding has done here but I believe I can say that without his tenacity, alacrity, and inexhaustible energy this bill might not have been possible at this time.

Passage of this legislation measured in dollars alone will mean literally millions in savings for business enterprise across the Nation. In terms of conven-

ience it is going to mean a great deal to the conduct of commerce across the Nation.

For these savings and this convenience, Mr. Redding deserves commendation and acknowledgment for his work. He is the unsung hero in the success story of this legislation.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 282, nays 91, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—282

Abbutt	Everett	Kee
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Keith
Addabbo	Fallon	Kelly
Albert	Farbstein	King, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Farnsley	King, N.Y.
Anderson, Tenn.	Fascell	King, Utah
Annunzio	Findley	Kluczynski
Arends	Flno	Kornegay
Ashley	Fisher	Krebs
Aspinall	Flood	Kunkel
Bates	Flynt	Laird
Beckworth	Foley	Landrum
Bell	William D. Ford,	Lipscomb
Bennett	Fraser	Long, Md.
Bingham	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Boggs	Friedel	McClory
Boland	Fulton, Pa.	McDade
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	McDowell
Brock	Gallagher	McEwen
Broomfield	Garmatz	McFall
Brown, Calif.	Gibbons	McGrath
Broyhill, Va.	Gilbert	McVicker
Burke	Gilligan	Macdonald
Burton, Calif.	Gonzalez	Machen
Burton, Utah	Grabowski	Mackay
Byrne, Pa.	Green, Oreg.	Mackie
Byrnes, Wis.	Green, Pa.	Madden
Cabell	Grider	Mahon
Cahill	Griffin	Maillard
Carey	Griffiths	Marsh
Clausen,	Grover	Martin, Mass.
Don H.	Gubser	Matsunaga
Clawson, Del.	Gurney	May
Cleveland	Hagan, Ga.	Meeds
Clevenger	Hagen, Calif.	Michel
Cohelan	Halleck	Miller
Collier	Halpern	Minish
Conable	Hanley	Mink
Conte	Hanna	Monagan
Conyers	Hansen, Idaho	Moore
Cooley	Hansen, Wash.	Moorhead
Corbett	Hardy	Morgan
Craley	Hathaway	Morris
Cramer	Hawkins	Morrison
Culver	Hays	Morse
Cunningham	Hechler	Morton
Curtin	Helstoski	Moss
Daddario	Herlong	Multer
Dague	Hicks	Murphy, Ill.
Daniels	Holland	Murphy, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Horton	Natcher
Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Nedzi
Dawson	Howard	Nix
Delaney	Hull	O'Hara, Ill.
Dent	Huot	O'Hara, Mich.
Denton	Ichord	Olsen, Mont.
Derwinski	Irwin	O'Neal, Ga.
Dingell	Jacobs	O'Neill, Mass.
Donohue	Jarman	Ottinger
Downing	Jennings	Passman
Dulski	Joelson	Patman
Dwyer	Johnson, Calif.	Patten
Dyal	Johnson, Okla.	Pelly
Edmondson	Johnson, Pa.	Pepper
Edwards, Calif.	Karsten	Perkins
Ellsworth	Karth	Phillbin
Erlenborn	Kastenmeler	Pickle
		Pike

Pirnie	Ryan	Trimble
Poff	Satterfield	Tuck
Powell	St. Onge	Tunney
Price	Scheuer	Tupper
Pucinski	Schisler	Tuten
Quile	Schneebeil	Ullman
Quillen	Schweiker	Utt
Race	Shipley	Van Deerlin
Rees	Sickles	Vanik
Reid, Ill.	Sisk	Vigorito
Reid, N.Y.	Slack	Vivian
Reinecke	Smith, Calif.	Walker, N. Mex.
Reuss	Smith, N.Y.	Watkins
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.	Watts
Rhodes, Pa.	Springer	Weltner
Rivers, Alaska	Stafford	Widnall
Robison	Staggers	Wilson, Bob
Rodino	Stalbaum	Wilson,
Rogers, Colo.	Steed	Charles H.
Rogers, Fla.	Stephens	Wolf
Rogers, Tex.	Stratton	Wyatt
Ronan	Stubblefield	Wydler
Roncalio	Talcott	Yates
Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.	Young
Rosenthal	Tenzer	Younger
Rostenkowski	Thomas	Zablocki
Roybal	Thompson, Tex.	
Rumsfeld	Thomson, Wis.	

NAYS—91

Abernethy	Duncan, Tenn.	Minshall
Adair	Edwards, Ala.	Mize
Andrews,	Edwards, La.	Mosher
George W.	Ford, Gerald R.	Nelsen
Andrews,	Fountain	Olson, Minn.
Glenn	Gathings	Poage
Andrews,	Gregg	Randall
N. Dak.	Gross	Redlin
Ashbrook	Haley	Reifel
Bandstra	Hall	Roberts
Battin	Hamilton	Roudebush
Belcher	Hansen, Iowa	Roush
Berry	Harsha	Schmidhauser
Betts	Harvey, Ind.	Secret
Bolling	Harvey, Mich.	Selden
Bow	Henderson	Shriver
Bray	Hungate	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Skubitz
Broyhill, N.C.	Jonas	Stanton
Buchanan	Jones, Ala.	Sullivan
Callan	Jones, Mo.	Sweeney
Callaway	Jones, N.C.	Taylor
Casey	Kupferman	Waggonner
Cederberg	Langen	Walker, Miss.
Chamberlain	Latta	Watson
Clancy	Lennon	White, Idaho
Curtis	Long, La.	White, Tex.
Devine	Love	Whitener
Dickinson	McCulloch	Whitten
Dole	Martin, Ala.	Williams
Dow	Martin, Nebr.	
Duncan, Oreg.	Mills	

NOT VOTING—59

Ashmore	Farnum	O'Konski
Ayres	Feighan	Pool
Baring	Fogarty	Purcell
Barrett	Fuqua	Resnick
Blatnik	Gettys	Rivers, S.C.
Bolton	Glaimo	Rooney, N.Y.
Brooks	Goodell	St Germain
Burleson	Gray	Saylor
Cameron	Hébert	Scott
Carter	Hollifield	Senner
Celler	Keogh	Smith, Iowa
Chelf	Kirwan	Teague, Tex.
Clark	Leggett	Thompson, N.J.
Colmer	McMillan	Todd
Corman	MacGregor	Toil
de la Garza	Mathias	Udall
Diggs	Mathews	Whalley
Dorn	Moeller	Willis
Dowdy	Murray	Wright
Evans, Colo.	O'Brien	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Hollifield with Mrs. Bolton
Mr. Celler with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Senner with Mr. Ashmore.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. Dowdy.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Teague of Texas.
 Mr. Toll with Mr. Matthews.
 Mr. Moeller with Mr. Pool.
 Mr. Feighan with Mr. Gettys.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Chelf.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Evans of Colorado with Mr. Murray.
 Mr. O'Brien with Mr. Willis.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Scott.
 Mr. Cameron with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Purcell.
 Mr. Todd with Mr. de la Garza.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Farnum.
 Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Fuqua.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 807

Resolved, That LERA (Mrs. ALBERT) THOMAS, of Texas, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND SUBCHAPTER S OF CHAPTER 1 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9883) to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 8, line 3 and 4, strike out "corporation to which this subsection applies—" and insert: "corporation—".

Page 11, after line 13, insert:

"(5) Section 46(a) (3) of such Code (relating to liability for tax for purposes of the credit for investment in certain depreciable property) is amended by striking out 'or by section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 541 (relating to personal holding company tax), or section 1378 (relating to tax on certain capital gains of subchapter S corporations)'."

Page 11, line 17, strike out "Act" and insert: "Act, but such amendments shall not apply with respect to sales or exchanges occurring before February 24, 1966".

Page 13, after line 14, insert:

"Sec. 4. (a) Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended—

"(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: 'No election (other than an election referred to in subsection (f)) may be made under this subsection after the date of the enactment of this sentence.';

"(2) by striking out in subsection (c) ', except as provided in subsection (m).';

"(3) by striking out 'subsection (f)' in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsections (f) and (n)';

"(4) by striking out subsection (m); and

"(5) by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(n) REVOCATION AND TERMINATION OF ELECTIONS.—

"(1) REVOCATION.—An election under subsection (a) with respect to an unincorporated business enterprise may be revoked after the date of the enactment of this subsection by the proprietor of such enterprise or by all the partners owning an interest in such enterprise on the date on which the revocation is made. Such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after the effective date of such revocation. A revocation under this paragraph shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(2) TERMINATION.—If a revocation under paragraph (1) of an election under subsection (a) with respect to any unincorporated business enterprise is not effective on or before December 31, 1968, such election shall terminate on January 1, 1969, and such enterprise shall not be considered a domestic corporation for any period on or after January 1, 1969.

"(b) Effective on January 1, 1969—

"(1) subchapter R of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to election of certain partnerships and proprietorships as to taxable status) is repealed;

"(2) the table of subchapters for chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to subchapter R; and

"(3) section 1504(b) of such Code (relating to definition of includible corporation) is amended by striking out paragraph (7).

"(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) (2) and (4) shall apply with respect to transactions occurring after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall not object—I feel that the Senate amendments are appropriate but I do so in order that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] may explain the amendments.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9883 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 7, 1966, contained three provisions relating to the option for corporations and their shareholders to be taxed in a manner similar to partnerships and partners.

The Senate adopted the three House-passed provisions of the bill and added an amendment repealing the provisions of the subchapter R of chapter 1 which provides a special option for partnerships and proprietorships to be taxed basically like corporations. The amend-

ment would also provide for the tax-free incorporation of these businesses in certain cases.

We may recall that subchapter R—section 1361—was originally added by the Senate as an amendment to the House-passed version of H.R. 8300, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

As stated in the committee report—Senate Report No. 1622, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 119:

The privilege of unincorporated businesses to be treated as corporations for tax purposes is complementary to the similar option granted certain corporations. It permits the business to elect the form of organization which is most suitable to its operations without being influenced by Federal income tax considerations.

At the time when section 1361 was originally enacted, many States did not permit organizations such as brokers to incorporate. Today, many States permit such organizations to incorporate.

We are advised that the subchapter R companies at one time may have numbered as many as 1,000, but that they are continually declining, and it is believed that there are fewer than 500 in existence today.

This provision is to become effective January 1, 1969. A partnership or proprietorship which had previously made the election under section 1361 will be permitted to become an actual corporation in a tax-free reorganization. After the date of enactment of this bill, no partnership or proprietorship, which is not already under the election of section 1361, will be permitted to elect the corporate tax treatment.

A Senate floor amendment provided that the one-shot capital gains provision is not to apply with respect to installment payments in the future where the sale or other disposition took place in the past. It is my understanding that the intent of this provision is to treat such installment payments in the same manner as other income in determining the applicability of the one-shot capital gains provision. The effect of this in applying the one-shot capital gains provision is to treat the installment payments in the same manner as if they were not capital gains.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, with respect to these matters now pending and which I shall call up, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUSPEND THE DUTY ON CERTAIN TROPICAL HARDWOODS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7723) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive.

Page 3, line 1, strike out "Sec. 3." and insert: "Sec. 2."

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I do so in order that the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], might explain the Senate amendments. I would, however, say this: I am in full accord with the action taken by the Senate.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to this bill, H.R. 7723, relating to the suspension of duty on certain tropical hardwoods, simply struck section 2 from the bill and renumbered section 3. The effect of the amendment, as explained in the report of the Senate Finance Committee, is to eliminate that provision in the House bill which would have authorized the President to proclaim continued duty-free treatment for the tropical hardwoods affected by the bill beyond December 31, 1967, if he determined it was required to carry out a trade agreement entered into under the Trade Expansion Act. Under the bill, as amended, the duty on tropical hardwood would be suspended until January 1, 1968.

As further explained by the Senate Finance Committee report, the Trade Expansion Act permits the duty on many of the hardwoods affected by this bill to be eliminated immediately rather than by progressive reductions over a period of years, and this amendment does not cut back on that authority. Thus, in the event of a successful trade agreement permanent and continued elimination of the duty on most of these hardwoods could be assured.

There are some tropical hardwoods, however, notably mahogany, with respect to which the duty can be eliminated only over a period of years. If a trade agreement is entered into during the period of suspension of duty provided by this bill, it would have to provide for progressive elimination of the duty unless Congress later acted to terminate it altogether.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would add that the elimina-

tion of this provision is consistent with actions that the Committee on Ways and Means has subsequently taken on similar bills where a request has been made to delete this subsection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALTERATION OF DUTIES ON IMPORTATION OF COPRA, PALM NUTS, AND PALM-NUT KERNELS, AND THE OILS CRUSHED THEREFROM

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6568) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to make permanent the existing temporary suspension of duty on copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, and the oils crushed therefrom, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, strike out all after line 3 over to and including line 3 on page 7.

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 2. The amendments and repeals made by the first section of this Act shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 3. (a) The limitation for the calendar year 1965 contained in headnote 2(b) for schedule 1, part 14, subpart B of the Tariff Schedules of the United States is hereby increased by 28,308,955 pounds.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 or any other provision of law, entries during 1965 of coconut oil, which is a Philippine article (within the meaning of the Tariff Schedules of the United States), shall be liquidated or reliquidated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a), and appropriate refunds of duty shall be made, if request therefor is filed with the appropriate customs officer on or before the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

Page 7, after line 3, insert:

"Sec. 4. For purposes of applying paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 256 (19 U.S.C. 1886) and section 351(b) (19 U.S.C. 1981(b)) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and section 350(c) (2) (A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1351(c) (2) (A))—

"(1) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1962.

"(2) The rates of duty in rate column numbered 2 of such Schedules as changed by this Act shall be treated as the rates of duty existing on July 1, 1934."

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do so only that the chairman might give a brief explanation of the

Senate changes, and shall appreciate it if the gentleman will do so at this time.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as passed by the House on October 18, 1965, the bill, H.R. 6568, would make permanent the duty-free treatment, or lower rates of duty, that are now temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts and palm-nut kernels; the oils expressed therefrom; and specified fatty acids, salts, and other chemical products derived from such oils. The temporary duty-free treatment or lower rates of duty applicable to such products, which are presently to be in effect until July 1, 1966, reflect the suspension of the processing taxes that were applicable under former section 4511 of the Internal Revenue Code.

As passed by the House, the bill would also have enlarged the duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil for the year 1965 from 120,000 to 160,000 tons. A like increase for the years 1966 and 1967 was also provided for, conditioned on the waiver by the Philippine Republic of its existing preference on copra.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate left intact and accepted without change the principal part of the House bill, that is, the provisions of section 1. This is the section that makes permanent the temporary duty-free treatment, or lower rates of duty, temporarily applicable to copra, palm nuts, and palm-nut kernels, the oils expressed therefrom and certain derivatives.

The Senate deleted section 2 of the House bill, the provisions relating to enlargement of the duty-free quota for Philippine coconut oil for the years 1965, 1966, and 1967. Section 3(a) of the Senate bill, however, does provide for an increase in the duty-free quota on such oil only for the year 1965 by 28,308,955 pounds. The Senate Committee on Finance advises that this limited increase in the quota is in the nature of equitable relief for importers to whom customs officers have erroneously released certain coconut oil as being within the duty-free quota, all such releases having occurred in the period May 17 to June 11, 1965, after the quota was actually filled on May 17, 1965.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a Senate floor amendment added a new section 4 to the bill to provide that the rates of duty under this measure are the rates to be taken into account by the President in cutting or raising tariffs on these products.

Mr. Speaker, all the departments that have any interest whatever in this legislation have advised that they favor the bill as passed by the Senate. These include the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Interior, Labor, and Agriculture. In view of the acceptance without change of the principal provisions of the bill as passed by the House and the favorable reports from the departments with respect to the Senate amendments, I recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE ENTRY OF STAINED GLASS FOR CONGREGATION EMANUEL, OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 4599, providing for the free entry of stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, of Denver, Colo., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty the chipped colored glass windows set in cement imported before the enactment of this Act for the use of Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nevada."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 2, line 2, after "(a)" insert "or (b)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colorado, and of certain chipped colored glass windows for Saint Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nevada."

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only in order that the gentleman from Arkansas, chairman of the committee, might give us a brief explanation of the bill and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that H.R. 4599, as it passed the House, provided for the free entry of stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel of Denver, Colo. The situation involved was that chipped colored glass windows which were bonded or joined together by cement and which were valued at more than \$15 per square foot were imported by the Congregation Emanuel. The Congregation Emanuel claimed these items to be free of duty. However, the customs collector denied free entry.

In 1960 a U.S. Customs Court decision held that this type of glass was entitled to free entry under the then existing tariff laws. However, the Bureau of Customs refused to follow this decision on the contention that such colored glass set in cement, even though imported to be used in houses of worship, was not entitled to free entry. Such glass set in lead was permitted free entry. In the new Tariff Schedules of the United States, which became effective on August 31, 1963, it was provided that such colored glass whether set in lead or cement was entitled to duty-free treatment. H.R. 4599, as it passed the House, provided such duty-free treatment be-

cause it was felt that in equity the importer was entitled to this treatment.

The Senate added an amendment involving the same type of glass which was imported for the use of St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev. The Senate amendment would also provide free entry for this glass. This glass, like the glass in the case of the Congregation Emanuel, was set in cement and, here again, the Bureau of Customs had refused to follow the Customs Court decision and the duty was assessed.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the same considerations apply to the colored glass imported by St. Ann's Church, and I hope that the House will be agreeable to accepting the Senate amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be added that the problem that confronted these two churches in 1963 and before that period has now been eliminated by basic changes in the tariff act.

Mr. MILLS. That is true.

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

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Wednesday, April 6, to consider the 1967 appropriation bill for the Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader at this time, is it his intention to program this bill for Wednesday and the Interior Department appropriation bill on Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. That is the intention. The gentleman from Oklahoma who handles this bill is present and he has requested that it be scheduled for this Wednesday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am informed by the minority ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] that he has no objection to this proposal and is in accord with the scheduling of this bill for Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Admin-

istration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1387) on the resolution (H. Res. 614) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-Ninth Congress, for the purpose of making a complete evaluation and study of the operations of the United States Office of Education, incurred by the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed \$50,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out all language on lines 2 and 3 and add: "chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1388) on the resolution (H. Res. 784) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, with respect to a study and investigation of legislation relating to international education, incurred by the Task Force on International Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed \$15,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the task force, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such task force, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

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

PROVIDING FOR EXPENSES OF AN INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 94—AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 1389) on the resolution (H. Res. 787) to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of an investigation authorized by H. Res. 94, Eighty-ninth Congress, with respect to a study and investigation of problems and legislation regarding handicapped children, incurred by the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Handicapped Children of the Committee on Education and Labor, not to exceed \$45,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees who will be engaged in the activities of the ad hoc subcommittee, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such ad hoc subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the President of the United States.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRICE. 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. 51]

Anderson,	Dorn	O'Brien
Tenn.	Dowdy	O'Konski
Ashmore	Evans, Colo.	Pool
Baring	Feighan	Powell
Barrett	Fraser	Resnick
Blatnik	Fuqua	Rivers, S.C.
Bolling	Gettys	Rooney, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Grover	St Germain
Burleson	Harsha	Saylor
Cameron	Keogh	Scott
Carter	Leggett	Senner
Casey	Long, La.	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	Long, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Chelf	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Clark	McMillan	Todd
Colmer	MacGregor	Toll
Curtis	Martin, Mass.	Udall
de la Garza	Matthews	Whalley
Dickinson	Moeller	Willis
Diggs	Murray	Wright
Dingell	Nix	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FOOD CRISIS IN INDIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 417)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

In recent months I have been watching with deep concern the emerging problem of world food supply. And I have been especially concerned with the prospect for India. During this past week I have discussed the Indian food problem with the Prime Minister of India, who has been our welcome and distinguished guest here in Washington. I am persuaded that we may stand at this moment on the threshold of a great tragedy. The facts are simple; their implications are grave. India faces an unprecedented drought. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

Strong efforts by the Indian Government, and our help, have so far averted famine. But in the absence of cooperative and energetic action by the United States, by other nations and by India herself, some millions of people will suffer needlessly before the next crop is harvested. This, in our day and age, must not happen. Can we let it be said that man, who can travel into space and explore the stars, cannot feed his own?

Because widespread famine must not and cannot be allowed to happen, I am today placing the facts fully before the Congress. I am asking the endorsement of the Congress for a program that is small neither in magnitude nor concept. I am asking the Congress, and the American people, to join with me in an appeal to the conscience of all nations that can render help.

I invite any information that the Congress can supply. Our people will welcome any judgments the Congress can provide. The executive branch, this Nation and the world will take appropriate note and give proper attention to any contributions in counsel and advice that congressional debate may produce.

If we all rally to this task, the suffering can be limited. A sister democracy will not suffer the terrible strains which famine imposes on free government.

Nor is this all. The Indians are a proud and self-respecting people. So are their leaders. The natural disaster which they now face is not of their making. They have not asked our help needlessly; they deeply prefer to help themselves. The Indian Government has sound plans for strengthening its agricultural economy and its economic system. These steps will help India help herself. They will prevent a recurrence of this disaster. I also propose action through the World Bank and the Agency for International Development to support this strong initiative by the Government of India.

THE CRISIS

Since independence, India has done much to increase her output of agricultural products. Her agriculture has not been neglected. From 1950 to 1955 she increased food production 75 percent. This is a creditable achievement. But India has had to contend with a continuing and relentless increase in population. Her people have also consumed more from a higher income. Accordingly, she has remained heavily dependent on our help. Last year we provided, under Public Law 480, more than 6 million tons of wheat, equal to more than two-fifths of our own consumption. To keep this supply moving, the equivalent of two fully loaded Liberty ships had to put in at an Indian port every day of the year.

Now India has been the victim of merciless natural disaster. Nothing is so important for the Indian farmer as the annual season of heavy rain—the monsoon. Last year, over large parts of India, the rains did not come. Crops could not be planted, or the young plants withered and died in the fields. Agricultural output, which needed to increase, was drastically reduced. Not since our own dustbowl years of the 1930's has there been a greater agricultural disaster.

Indian leaders have rightly turned to the world for help. Pope Paul VI has endorsed their plea. So has the World Council of Churches. So has the Secretary General of the United Nations. So has the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization. And so, in this message does the President of the United States.

I have said that effective action will not be cheap. India's need is for at least 11 to 12 million tons of imported grain from January to December 1966.

Food in this world is no longer easy to find.

But find it we must.

Here is what I propose.

THE PROGRAM

Last fiscal year we supplied 6 million tons of food grain to India. So far in this fiscal year, I have allotted 6.5 million tons of grain for shipment to India—more than the total of 6 million tons which we had planned to provide as a continuation of past arrangements. It is even more necessary in this emergency to keep the pipelines full and flowing and to insure that there is no congestion of rail or sea transport. India, furthermore, estimates an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grain will be necessary through next December beyond what has already been committed or expected.

I propose that the United States provide 3½ million tons of that requirement, with the remaining 3½ million tons coming from those nations which have either the food to offer or the means to buy food. I invite those nations to match the amount which we will supply. For example, I am delighted to be informed that Canada is prepared to provide a million tons of wheat and flour to India.

Every agriculturally advanced country can, by close scrutiny of its available supplies, make a substantial contribution. I ask that every government seek

to supply the maximum it can spare—and then a little more. I ask those industrial countries which cannot send food to supply a generous equivalent in fertilizer, or in shipping, or in funds for the purchase of these requisites. All know the Indian balance of payments is badly overburdened. Food and other materials should be supplied against payment in rupees, which is our practice, or as a gift.

It is not our nature to drive a hard mathematical bargain where hunger is involved. Children will not know that they suffered hunger because American assistance was not matched. We will expect and press for the most energetic and compassionate action by all countries of all political faiths. But if their response is insufficient, and if we must provide more, before we stand by and watch children starve, we will do so. I, therefore, ask your endorsement for this emergency action.

I have spoken mostly of bread-grains. The Prime Minister of India spoke also of other commodities which can meet part of the requirements or replace part of the need. In response to her needs, I propose that we allot up to 200,000 tons of corn, up to 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, and up to 125 million pounds of milk powder to India. The vegetable oil and milk powder are especially needed for supplementing the diets of Indian children.

In addition, India's own exchange resources can be released for food and fertilizer purchases if we make substantial shipments of cotton and tobacco. I am suggesting the allotment for this purpose of 325,000 to 700,000 bales of cotton and 2 to 4 million pounds of tobacco. Both of these commodities we have in relative abundance.

I request prompt congressional endorsement of this action.

I urge, also, the strong and warm-hearted and generous support of this program by the American people.

And I urge the strong and generous response of governments and people the world around.

India is a good and deserving friend. Let it never be said that "bread should be so dear, and flesh and blood so cheap" that we turned in indifference from her bitter need.

FURTHER ACTION

The Indian people want to be self-supporting in their food supply.

Their Government has adopted a far-reaching program to increase fertilizer production, improve water and soil management, provide rural credit, improve plant protection, and control food loss. These essentials must be accompanied by a strong training and education program.

I have directed the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with AID, to consult with the Indian Government to ascertain if there are ways and means by which we can strengthen this effort. We have long experience with short courses, extension training, and similar programs. If they can be used, I feel certain that American agricultural experts would respond to an appeal to serve in India as

a part of an Agricultural Training Corps or through an expanded Peace Corps. Many of our younger men and women would especially welcome the opportunity.

I am determined that in our assistance to the Indian Government we not be narrowly limited by what has been done in the past. Let us not be afraid of our own enthusiasm. Let us be willing to experiment.

The Indian Government believes that there can be no effective solution of the Indian food problem that does not include population control. The choice is now between a comprehensive and humane program for limiting births and the brutal curb that is imposed by famine. As Mrs. Gandhi told me, the Indian Government is making vigorous efforts on this front.

Following long and careful planning and after discussions in recent days with Prime Minister Gandhi, I have proposed the establishment of the Indo-U.S. Foundation. This Foundation will be financed by rupees, surplus to our need, now on deposit in India. It will be governed by distinguished citizens of both countries. It will be a vigorous and imaginative enterprise designed to give new stimulus to education and scientific research in India. There is no field where, I hope, this stimulus will be greater than in the field of agriculture and agricultural development.

Finally, in these last days, the Prime Minister and I have talked about the prospects for the Indian economy. The threat of war with China and the unhappy conflict with Pakistan seriously interrupted India's economic progress. Steps had to be taken to protect dwindling exchange resources. These also had a strangling effect on the economy. Indian leaders are determined now to put their economy again on the upward path. Extensive discussions have been held with the World Bank, which heads the consortium of aid-giving countries.

The United States interferes neither in the internal politics nor the internal economic structure of other countries. The record of the last 15 years is a sufficient proof that we ask only for results. We are naturally concerned with results—with insuring that our aid be used in the context of strong and energetic policies calculated to produce the most rapid possible economic development.

We believe Indian plans now under discussion show high promise. We are impressed by the vigor and determination of the Indian economic leadership. As their plans are implemented, we look forward to providing economic assistance on a scale that is related to the great needs of our sister democracy.

An India free from want and deprivation will, as Mahatma Gandhi himself once predicted, "be a mighty force for the good of mankind."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 30, 1966.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the message is referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANK SUPERVISION, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Bank Supervision of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 771) providing for consideration of H.R. 5147, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 771

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. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 5147, a bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 thus permitting certain additional health benefit plans to come within the purview of such act for Federal employees would not cost the Federal taxpayers a single penny, nor would it create additional administrative costs to make available an additional health benefit plan for Government employees.

The fact is that the U.S. Civil Service Commission charges 1 percent of all premiums paid on each health benefit plan to cover all costs of administering and operating programs under the Health Benefits Act, while their actual cost is currently running at only 0.6 percent.

Recently, one of the larger Government employee unions, affiliated with the AFL-CIO, expressed concern over substantial and continuing premium rate increases in some of the Federal employee

health plans. A representative of the union stated that every effort will be made to have the Senate and House Civil Service Committees and the Commission investigate the "skyrocketing" hospital and medical costs relating to the Federal employee health program, and that the union would seek legislation to increase substantially the Government's contribution to the health premiums.

This concern is real amongst all Federal employees. There is, therefore, a real need for true competitiveness which would come about through the participation of larger insurance companies in the overall program. Thus the NAGE health benefit plan can be instituted if H.R. 5147 is passed by the Congress, a plan which would provide a broad comprehensive major medical program with maximum protection for NAGE Government members and their families at the lowest possible cost. The carrier for the NAGE plan is Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., of New York.

The NAGE plan is unique in that it offers only one high option plan. This has a three-fold purpose:

First. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees.

Second. The one option approach reduces substantially the cost of administration to NAGE and the carrier involved.

Third. The Government employees have shown an overwhelming preference—90-10—for the high option plans.

Thus while present Government sponsored plans have been increasing their charges, the NAGE plan conceivably would hold the line for at least 5 years without any escalation of charges or costs.

The U.S. Civil Service Commission's objections to H.R. 5147 are unrealistic when they state:

Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.

The Commission's statement is erroneous due to the fact that there are about 13 employee organizations offering such plans. A Government employee must be a member of one of these organizations in order to participate in their health benefit plan. Therefore, a Government employee has only, in fact, three choices: his organization's plan or one of the two Government-sponsored plans. A choice of three can hardly be considered a bewildering number from which to choose. The remaining 25 plans presently in force are small local programs around metropolitan areas of the Nation.

EMPLOYEE INTERESTS PROTECTED BY H.R. 5147

We feel that the Civil Service Commission's position is untenable when they state:

Neither the Government's nor the employees' interest are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefit program.

This statement infers that only the Civil Service Commission has the wisdom and foresight to direct what, in fact, is in the best interest of the Federal Government and its employees. Recently many of the present programs

raised their premium rates. Certainly the Government and the employees interests were not served by these rate increases. New plans with wider areas of coverage are constantly being developed within the insurance industry to provide the broadest coverage at the lowest possible cost. Also, the present law practices a form of discrimination in that it prohibits any existing as well as any future employee organization from participating and securing a health benefit program for its members.

NO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE TO GOVERNMENT

The Civil Service Commission further stated to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that:

Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and the Commission, and increases the administrative complexities and expense of operating the health benefits program.

This objection raised by the Civil Service Commission is not factual. New plans do not add to the duties and responsibilities of employing Federal agencies. Actually these agencies have only to forward employee deductions plus the Government's contribution to the Civil Service Commission. Modern electronic equipment reduces these administrative complexities to simplicity. Further, the Civil Service Commission charges 1 percent of all premiums paid on each health benefit plan to cover all of their costs of administering and operating programs under the Health Benefit Act. Their actual cost is currently running at only 0.6 percent. This 1 percent has therefore proven to be more than enough to cover their administrative expenses and thus the financial objection is unrealistic.

BENEFITS AND COSTS

The minority report quotes the Civil Service Commission spokesman as stating that "new union plans could not possibly offer more health benefits for less money than do existing plans."

The testimony presented to the subcommittee convincingly demonstrated that this is not so. The plan described at that time is a broad comprehensive major medical plan intended to provide maximum protection at the lowest possible net cost—a cost which is approximately \$1 per quarter less than that under the Government-wide service plan. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees. And with the increased costs announced earlier this year for a number of existing plans, the cost comparison today is even more sharply defined.

It is my understanding now that if we open the act for one new additional organization, the National Association of Government Employees would like to come in under the program. They have submitted to the committee a plan which was offered by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and which I shall put into the RECORD at this time.

The plan is as follows:

ADVANTAGES OF THE NAGE PLAN SUBMITTED BY METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO.

A. The NAGE plan is a broad comprehensive major medical plan intended to provide a maximum protection for NAGE employees

and their families at the lowest possible net cost.

B. The NAGE plan is unique in that it offers only one high option plan. This has a threefold purpose:

1. The plan competes more than favorably with all high option plans available to all Government employees.

2. The one option approach reduces substantially the cost of administration to NAGE and the carrier involved.

3. The Government employees have shown an overwhelming preference (90-10) for the high option plans.

C. The specific plan benefits have the advantage of providing:

1. Broad semiprivate room and board and hospital special service benefits for 365 days for any hospital confinement.

2. Surgical allowances up to \$450 under the basic benefits with supplemental surgical benefits on a reasonable and customary fee basis. (No schedules.)

3. Attending physicians' allowances of \$10 for the first day and \$5 for the next 364 days which are more than adequate in relation to current charges.

4. Diagnostic X-ray and laboratory benefits providing wide coverage, when such services are received other than on an in-patient basis with no deductible.

5. A nominal deductible of \$75 per individual with a \$150 maximum family deductible in a calendar year. This deductible is substantially less than the most popular plan available to Government employees.

6. A \$40,000 reinstatable major medical maximum which is more than liberal in relation to the popular Government-wide plans.

7. A very ample maternity benefit for normal delivery while providing full regular plan benefits for Caesarean or complications.

8. A cost which is approximately \$1 per quarter less than that under the Government-wide service plan.

Self only..... \$8.75
Self and family..... 23.50

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

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

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. Would he care to explain a little bit further why this particular organization is submitting a plan by a private insurance carrier such as Metropolitan, and why they would not deal directly with an insurance carrier for health benefit plans under and with that organization as an insurance carrier, rather than with the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 as amended in 1963?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I am really not familiar enough with the legislation to answer the question. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who apparently knows more about that subject.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the answer is that there are many private plans that are now in existence in addition to the Government's own plan. This simply would allow an additional organization to have its plan approved. There are many private plans, but they all have to be approved by the people who run the entire program.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would accept that, although I understand that in 1963, when this program was open to the same group, at that time, according to the

hearings and the record, they preferred a private insurance carrier's plan to the Federal employees' health benefit plan.

There is considerable objection on the part of the Civil Service Commission to further opening and diluting the Federal Employees' Health Benefit Act by taking on additional members. I believe the gentleman remarked in his opening statement, insofar as the benefit plan of the group is concerned, that that is what would happen. Is that not correct?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Some objection has come from Mr. Macy, who represents the Civil Service Commission. Personally, I do not think too much of his objections. Apparently the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service did not think too much of them, either, because the subcommittee and the full committee approved the legislation. The Civil Service Commission felt that there were enough private organizations in at the present time, and they were reluctant to bring any more in.

As I understand this situation, an employee is, I believe, allowed three choices. Of the three choices he is allowed to choose among two various Federal plans and the plan of an independent organization, such as the union or an organization that he might belong to. He would have a choice of one of the three.

In the third category, I think there are some 13 organizations or unions at the present time.

The bill would open the door to 13 more organizations to get into the third scope of this plan. But the NAGE is the only one interested in coming in. I think in view of the fact that we have 13 Federal employee organizations that currently have this choice, with 38 various plans, and in view of the fact that there are 72,000 members of this organization, they, too, should have the right to get into this plan.

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

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

Mr. DANIELS. I believe the gentleman is slightly in error as to the number of employee organizations involved. There are 13 employee organizations which have 38 plans with 57 options. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit another employee organization with one high-optional plan to participate in the program.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Do I correctly understand from your opening statement that the Civil Service Commission would have the option of accepting or rejecting a plan submitted by this NAGE after it was submitted, or would the legislation make it mandatory that it be accepted by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I advise the gentleman to read page 1 of the report of the committee.

Mr. HALL. I have read it.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The purpose of H.R. 5147 is exactly stated there.

Mr. HALL. Then the Civil Service Commission, or its Director, would have the option of turning this plan down if it were not a well-worked-out or properly balanced plan under option 3?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I am presenting the rule on the bill. The gentleman from Missouri would have to ask technical questions about the bill of members of the committee that handled the bill.

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

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

Mr. DANIELS. If the gentleman will look at page 2 of the report, he will see that the Civil Service Commission has approved this plan as one that meets the requirements of law. The only reason why the Civil Service Commission objects to it is because of the administrative responsibility and the alleged increase in cost.

I might say that as a result of our study of this bill we believe the administrative responsibility and cost are negligible.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman who has been so kind as to yield, that this can be taken up in the debate on the bill itself.

For the record, the reasons, in addition to administrative costs, are very plainly stated in the report, as follows:

1. Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.

2. Neither the Government's nor the employees' interests are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefits program.

3. Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and the Commission, and increases the administrative complexities and expense of operating the health benefits program.

The third item is the point made by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Let me refer to the rule itself. In view of the fact that there are excellent minority views stated, may I ask the gentleman whether the writers of the minority views were asked to appear in hearings before the Rules Committee before the rule was passed?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. No; they were not.

Mr. HALL. Were there any hearings on the part of the Rules Committee before the rule was passed? I find nothing wrong with the rule, but I am asking for technical information.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. The answer is "no." Having been the sponsor of this legislation and a member of the Rules Committee, in executive session I moved that the rule be passed; and it was passed unanimously.

Mr. HALL. It was passed by a unanimous vote of those present?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. By a unanimous vote of those present.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder whether the statement that this is to correct an inequity is, in fact, correct, so far as the purpose of the bill is concerned, and I wonder whether it was considered in

depth by the Rules Committee before being brought to the floor of the House.

I find nothing wrong with the rule. Apparently, insofar as the bill is concerned, these people had an opportunity at a previous time. I believe we are opening up a Pandora's box, to which the Civil Service Commission and others object, and I wonder whether a private plan would not be better.

I believe it involves a question of deciding who is to be involved and how long this is to be open under the rule and under the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the explanation of this bill and of the rule, already given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], together with the colloquy the gentleman had with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], has been adequate to explain the purpose of this legislation.

I wish to say one thing, because of the colloquy which took place between the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL]. I was not personally present at the time the rule was approved.

I believe that perhaps the better part of wisdom, in the future, when there are minority views and when the matter involved is going to call forth some controversy—as apparently this will—would be to undertake some hearings and to have some people in. I say this without any criticism at all with respect either to the gentleman from Massachusetts or to the procedure which was employed in this case, but I believe it would be wise in cases of this kind to have a further hearing, with the summoning of witnesses and interested persons.

The purpose of the bill is to permit additional Federal employee organizations which have health benefit plans for their members to submit these to the Civil Service Commission for approval, in order to qualify the plans for participation in the overall Federal employees' health benefits program.

The original Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959 provided for the participation of such employee organizations. For an organization to be eligible, it must have applied to the Commission for approval of its health program prior to December 31, 1963. This date was an amendment to the original cutoff date of December 31, 1959, to enable many organizations to submit their plans.

The bill seeks to again reopen the date to allow organizations to offer their programs of health benefits.

The Civil Service Commission opposes the bill on the grounds that neither the Government employees' interests nor the Government will be served by admitting new plans. The committee answers that 38 carriers are already involved and that one more will not materially increase the administrative costs and will give employees a further choice of plans. There is no estimate of the additional costs available.

There are minority views signed by five members. They point out that the

basic act was amended in the 88th Congress to allow carriers to present their plans for approval up to December 31, 1963, at which time the committee report emphasized that the extension was for this one period only. Only four employee groups offered plans for approval, and only two are in fact now participating.

Only one employee group testified for this bill, and it was one of those qualified to offer a plan prior to December 31, 1963. They did not do so then.

The organization is the National Association of Government Employees.

There are now over 2.2 million Federal employees enrolled in 38 different plans which offer 57 different options. Who needs another?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 771, 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. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits claims to come within the purview of such act.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5147, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5147 is identical in purpose and effect as was the enactment of Public Law 88-59, approved July 8, 1963. Its objective is to allow additional Federal employee organizations to qualify for participation in the Federal employee's health benefits program, by submitting their plans to the Civil Service Commission for approval.

One of the fundamental principles of the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Act, upon its adoption in 1959, was to furnish the employee with a reasonably free choice of plans—a choice whereby he might select one of several plans he deemed to best fulfill his individual needs, and the needs of his family. This principle resulted in the approval under the program of 38 different plans.

Although this legislation proposes to permit any organizations or carriers of health benefits plans to submit their plans for approval, only one employee organization appeared before the Subcommittee on Retirement, Insurance, and Health Benefits in support of the bill under consideration. That organization,

the National Association of Government Employees, has already submitted its proposed plan to the Civil Service Commission, and it is considered by the Commission to be one which would meet the requirements of law.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that the participation of one more carrier in a program that presently includes 38 carriers, will not appreciably add to the administrative burdens of the program. Any administrative expense of operating the program by the addition of but one more plan will be negligible.

Any objection to the enactment of this legislation on the grounds of immaterial cost or insignificant administrative burdens, in the opinion of the committee, is outweighed by the advantage that a limited number of employees would enjoy by having the free choice of an additional plan—a plan that could possibly fulfill their health care needs to a greater extent than their existing coverage.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the report on H.R. 5147 was not filed until after the contemplated effective date of the introduced bill, December 31, 1965, such date having since passed, an amendment to the title and text will be offered at the appropriate time to fix a prospective effective date.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill and the subordinate amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member of the committee that handled this legislation, I approve it, and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any need to go into any further detail as to what we are talking about here. This is a very simple matter, really, and needs no extended debate as far as I am concerned. It has been amply explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS.]

But just to repeat, this is what it does: It makes it possible for an organization that was not prepared at the time this was opened up 3 years ago and now is prepared to submit its plan for approval. It simply opens it up for this organization now to present its proposal to the Civil Service Commission. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the statements that have been made that the objections of the Civil Service Commission are negligible. Certainly it should not, in my opinion, cost any significant amount of money and time, and so I would urge that this legislation be enacted.

I agree, Mr. Chairman, that there are some minority views. Nevertheless, I do not support them. I support the legislation under consideration.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly support this legislation. It was taken up very carefully by the subcommittee and by our full committee, and was gone into very thoroughly. All witnesses who wanted an opportunity to

be heard had that opportunity. This bill was passed out of the subcommittee by a unanimous vote. When it came to the full committee it was passed out by a majority vote of 13 to 4.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this organization demonstrated and, certainly, by its testimony exhibited that with 100,000 members it was certainly eligible and certainly legally entitled to be able to be represented in this employees' insurance program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe they have made a good case. I believe that certainly it would be of tremendous benefit to these 100,000 employees to have this opportunity to join in this program and at the same time, insofar as expenses and costs of administration are concerned, that would be very nominal, because the expenses have to be taken into consideration along with the other 38 plans that are contained in this program. Any additional expense would be most nominal when added to the present costs.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see any reason in the world why we should not go ahead and pass this bill.

This bill, I believe, serves the best interests of a vast number of Federal employees and their families—a bill which I further believe is also in the best interests of the Government.

The enactment of this legislation will add little, if any, costs to the administrative expenses of the Federal employees' health benefits program. It will add little, if any, to the duties and responsibilities of the Government agencies toward the operation of the program. It will, however, grant to thousands of Federal employees an additional free choice of another health plan that could very well be the answer to their health care needs.

It is well established that it was the intent of Congress, when it adopted a health program for Federal employees, to give as many employees as possible a variety of choices of plans. Opponents of this legislation would have us believe that all employees have a bewildering choice to make. The truth of the matter is, however, that the bulk of employees have but three plans to choose from—two Government-wide plans and the organization plan that may be offered them if they are members of a union. To claim that a selection of, at most, three plans is bewildering, is a gross overstatement of fact.

The great majority of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee realize that to improve this employee program, innovations and novations are essential. In order to provide for improved plans, it is necessary that Congress amend existing law so as to make such improved plans available to all employees. Yesterday's best, undoubtedly, is less than adequate today.

I urge this body to support this necessary and worthwhile legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret that the Committee on Rules saw fit to pass out this bill, accompanied as it was by a minority report, without any

hearings and without any notice to those of us on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who signed the minority report.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the future, and in behalf of the process of orderly procedure, that this does not occur again, regardless of the nature of the bill. I insist that members of the minority are entitled to better consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this bill opens the door again to another association. On April 4, 1963, the House of Representatives was put on notice through the medium of the report, which accompanied a bill at that time, that it would close the door to additional organizations becoming involved in the Health Benefits Act. The report, No. 190, under date of April 4, 1963, contained the following statement:

This committee further emphasizes that this action is not to be a precedent for similar action in the future. The so-called open season will exist for only this one period of time specified in the bill, and organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers of health benefit plans will have only this one opportunity to do so.

The association to benefit through this legislation was on notice at that time and did not see fit to qualify or at least to get their plan in order.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. As the testimony indicates, they did not come up with a plan which was superior or that had benefits additional to the plans already in existence. However, they do feel today that the plan they have obtained from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., is superior to some of the existing plans and this will afford their membership an opportunity to make a choice.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that. But I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that they were on notice at that time to come in if they wished to be considered for participation.

Mr. DANIELS. That is true. I am not disputing that. I said I was aware of that.

Mr. GROSS. The door was closed at that time and now we are opening it again. How can we deny it to others?

Mr. DANIELS. I would point out to the gentleman that where a superior plan is offered or if a superior plan comes into existence in the future, we should not deny Federal employees the opportunity to get the benefits of such superior plan.

Mr. GROSS. The Civil Service Commission, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, did not say in testifying before the committee that a superior plan was being considered under the terms of this bill.

The Civil Service Commission over the signature of the Chairman, Mr. John Macy, says:

For the reasons stated, the Commission strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 5147.

If he thought the association to be benefited through the terms of this act offered an extraordinary plan, I cannot

believe he would have made that statement.

The Commission went further, and I will quote briefly from the statement of Mr. Andrew E. Ruddock, Director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

He says:

1. Each new plan adds to the already bewildering number from which employees may choose.

2. Neither the Government's nor the employees' interests are served by admitting new union plans to participation in the health benefits program.

3. Each new plan adds to the duties and responsibilities of employing agencies and expense of operating the health benefits program.

He also says:

New union plans could not possibly offer more health benefits for less money than do existing plans.

There is a further statement by Mr. Ruddock on behalf of the Civil Service Commission, but since it is available to all Members on the floor today I will not read it.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated, I must oppose this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL], a member of the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to state that the gentleman from Iowa has very briefly outlined the opposition to this bill today. I subscribe to what he has stated here. He has read into the record some of the objections by Mr. Ruddock who is the director of the Bureau of Retirement and Insurance and also some of the objections for the record of Mr. Macy who is the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I feel that these are very valid objections and that this committee and that this House should take these objections into consideration in considering this legislation today. I would also call to the attention of Members, the minority views in the committee report. These views are brief, to the point and outline in detail some of the objections to this legislation. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina yields back 2 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2(1) of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (73 Stat. 710, 77 Stat. 76; 5 U.S.C. 3001(1)), is amended by striking out "1963" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANIELS: On line 6, strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, as stated during the discussion of the rule and after carefully reviewing not only the report but the rule and the manner in which this was brought on the floor—and furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the minority report and the report of the then existing committee, report No. 190 for 1963 dated April 4 of that year, at which time this was considered, I would simply like to take a moment or so to further clarify the record.

Paradoxically, we are considering in H.R. 5147 today a bill which not only has a minority report but which has already been given substantive approval of the new plan, even though the legislation will authorize such plans to be submitted "for approval."

I think there is sincere question about the purpose of H.R. 5147 insofar as correcting any inequity is concerned. Although I am perfectly willing to acknowledge that there may well have been developments or further actuarial soundness found by this particular organization that seeks admission to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

Mr. Ruddock who has already been quoted in the colloquy says:

It is difficult to stretch any plan to the place where it can yield 110 percent without either divesting the Federal Treasury or the retirement plans of some of the principal in the gaining of benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that the Civil Service Commission does oppose this. In fact, in the report of the committee itself on page 3, it says,

For the reasons stated—

Which Mr. Chairman, I shall not repeat because I read them during the consideration of the rule—

the Commission strongly opposes enactment of H.R. 5147.

Then just for the record, and referring to the committee report of 1963, I would like to say, at that time the committee emphasized that the action is not to be a precedent for similar action in the future. The committee stated:

The so-called open season will exist for only this one period of time specified in the bill. Organizations desiring to apply for approval as carriers of health benefit plans will have only this one opportunity to do so.

Further, in the same report, after going over the reasons why the proposed amendment might open a Pandora's box to further such organizations in the future which attempt to divest 110 percent for the value that is put into them—and, of course, it comes from the General Treasury or from the principal of the retirement plan—they state that the Commission has not observed any need for additional employee organization plans. I, too, must, perforce, in view of

the minority views and in view of the history of this legislation and in view of the legislative situation in which we find ourselves today, be opposed to H.R. 5147.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5147) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to permit until December 31, 1965, certain additional health benefits plans to come within the purview of such act, pursuant to House Resolution 771, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended to strike out "1965" and insert in lieu thereof "1966."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUALATIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 799 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 707, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 254), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Sen-

ate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 707 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 707, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The project authorized by the bill would be located west of the Portland metropolitan area in the valley of the Tualatin River, a tributary of the Willamette. The Tualatin project is a multiple-purpose development providing for the irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, municipal and industrial water supply to several towns in the project area, recreation opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation.

The unregulated natural streamflow of the Tualatin River is inadequate to meet the seasonal water requirements for the various water uses in the project area. While the Willamette River valley receives substantial rainfall annually, it is not evenly distributed throughout the year. On the average, only 1 or 2 inches of rain falls in the valley during the summer months, and for extended periods there is no rain. Dryland agriculture is quite limited as to productivity and variety of crops.

The owners of the land to be served by the project have expressed support for the project and a willingness to contract for the water service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 799, in order that H.R. 707 may be considered.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have my stock question on this particular resolution 799, making it in order to consider H.R. 707. Will the gentleman explain why all points of order against such bill are waived, in the wisdom of the Rules Committee?

Mr. DELANEY. There is just one possible objection, and that is the transfer of funds into a revolving fund, so that they can be reused from time to time. So that is necessary.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think the contents of the bill here would make it possible to use funds earmarked in the wisdom of this Congress, after it has worked its will, for the reservoir development, or irrigation purposes, or conservation, or recreation, or anything else in the construction of the impounding dam itself?

Mr. DELANEY. I would not say so for reloans, and so forth. The revolving sum is to be given to other applicants, as they are paid off.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, is this another example of the transfer ability that would be vested in the Reclamation Authority or the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. DELANEY. In my opinion, it is not, but I yield to the gentleman who is the sponsor of the bill. He can explain further.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this does not take away from Congress any of its right at all to appropriate the funds and to designate where the funds are to be placed. This simply states that these funds, which are necessary to pay out what the users cannot afford or cannot pay out, will be taken from the Northwest fund that is attached to the Bonneville project. This does not affect our appropriation responsibility whatsoever, Doctor.

Mr. HALL. But it does allow us to take not only from this reservoir impoundment but from the whole area, the Bonneville area.

I ask the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, does this apply to the cost of feasibility effectiveness studies of this impoundment?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, not to the feasibility, or cost of impoundments, but of course the repayment of what the irrigation and M. & I. users cannot pay. There is an amount which they are unable to pay, which is a cost of this project. So it takes it, not from one power project in the Northwest, but from this whole group of revenues from all projects of the Northwest Basin.

Mr. HALL. In the opinion of the gentleman, is it germane and does it not violate the customs of the House as far as our prerogatives are concerned?

Mr. ASPINALL. My opinion is that this is germane. But there is a question as to whether or not this question might be raised, and this is the reason why I asked points of order to be waived.

Mr. HALL. But the distinguished chairman did ask for it? It was not inserted by the Rules Committee or any one else?

Mr. ASPINALL. It was inserted by the Rules Committee at the request of the chairman.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 799 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 707.

The purpose of H.R. 707 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin reclamation project near Portland, Oreg., on the Tualatin, a tributary of the Willamette River. This is a multipurpose project providing for irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, a municipal and industrial water supply for several towns in the area, recreational opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation.

The construction cost of the Tualatin project is estimated to be \$20,902,000. Under this legislation, as amended, the

cost would be allocated among the project functions as follows:

Irrigation.....	\$15,543,000
Municipal and industrial water.....	2,099,000
Fish and wildlife enhancement.....	2,052,000
Recreation.....	868,000
Highway transportation.....	290,000
Flood control.....	50,000
Total.....	20,902,000

Most of this cost will be reimbursed over a 50-year period by local water and power users. Additionally, approximately \$400,000 in local funds will be used for recreational and fish and wildlife enhancement.

Of the \$15.5 million projected costs for irrigation purposes, \$5.1 million will be repaid by water users, and \$10,388,000 will be repaid by local power users.

Several amendments have been added to the bill by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conform it to other acts. The surplus crops amendment will insure that irrigated land will not be planted in unneeded crops.

In conformity with another committee policy an amendment was adopted to place a ceiling of \$22 million on the amount to be authorized to be appropriated. This amount includes \$1,100,000 for construction of flood control outlet works at Scoggin Dam should studies presently being conducted show such works are justified. If these additional flood control works cannot be justified the project cost is expected to not exceed the \$20,902,000, changed only as necessary to reflect changes in price levels.

As to waiving the points of order, I am advised that there might be a question of taking the money out of the Columbia River Basin fund to reimburse most of the cost of the dam.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget.

There is no minority report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2829, MANSON UNIT, CHELAN DIVISION, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 800 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 800

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. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes,

and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 2829, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 490), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 2829 as passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 800 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, waiving points of order, for consideration of H.R. 2829, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

The Manson unit is a reclamation project in Chelan County in central Washington, which is primarily for irrigation with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. The unit is designed to improve and extend the existing irrigation water collection and distribution system of the Lake Chelan Reclamation District. The lands in the unit area that are now irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production, and it is expected that the new lands will also be developed as irrigated apple orchards. The existing irrigation system is a composite of several privately financed developments which have been enlarged and improved over the years. This system collects the water from the watersheds of seven streams above Lake Chelan and conveys it throughout the service area. A total of 5,770 acres will be served under the proposed plan of development.

The construction cost of the Manson unit is estimated at \$13,344,000. Except for about \$150,000 which is allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, the entire cost of the unit is allocated to irrigation and will be repaid within a 50-year period plus the development period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 800 in order that H.R. 2829 may be considered.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman who brings this rule from the Committee on Rules to the floor of the House if the gentleman can explain why in lines 7 and 8 all points of order against said bill are hereby waived?

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, did the gentleman say lines 7 and 8?

Mr. HALL. Lines 7 and 8 of House Resolution 800. It simply states, Mr. Speaker, that all points of order against that bill are hereby waived. Therefore it is not truly an open rule. It is a closed rule.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is for the same reasons that were explained just a few minutes ago. This will go into the general Bonneville area, and the money can be used and reused after the repayments are made, exactly for the same reason as explained in the other project.

Mr. HALL. It is not a question of anything contained in the bill being non-germane?

Mr. DELANEY. If the gentleman will yield further, nothing in the bill itself.

Mr. HALL. Nor does it represent a violation of the Ramseyer rule or any of the other rules? It is just the one question of recouping in case the people are not able to pay from the entire area reclamation project; is that correct?

Mr. DELANEY. The gentleman is correct, and that is the reason.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if these rules continue to come out with waivers of points of order, we must expect to vote on them. But I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and providing this information in this instance.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 800 provides a rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 2829.

The purpose of H.R. 2829 is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam in central Washington. It is primarily an irrigation project with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

The existing storage reservoir system holds 2,500 acre-feet of water. The bill will enlarge this to 9,000 acre-feet by construction of one dam and the enlargement of another. The distribution system will also be enlarged to serve a greater area. Now 3,965 acres are served; the new total will be 1,525 larger. The existing facilities, besides being inadequate, are old and must be updated if they are to continue at their present level. Equipment failures are frequent now. Some equipment in use is over 50 years old.

The cost is approximately \$13,344,000. It will be repaid within 50 years by the water and power users, with the exception of \$150,000 used for fish and wildlife enhancement, non-repayable under law. All facilities will be operated by the Forest Service.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs amended H.R. 2829 to make it clear that not only the amount to be repaid by the water users would have to be repaid in the 50-year repayment period plus any authorized development period, but that the amount to be repaid from power revenues would also have to be repaid during this period.

The committee also amended H.R. 2829 to conform this legislation to the payout procedure now in effect for the Federal Columbia River power system. Under the amendment, the repayment assistance would be furnished from the entire Federal Columbia River power system rather than the Chief Joseph Dam project.

Other committee amendments conform this legislation to the recently enacted Federal Water Project Recreation Act and update the amount authorized to be appropriated.

As to waiving the points of order, I am advised that there might be a question of taking the money out of the Columbia River Basin fund to reimburse most of the cost of the dam.

The Department of the Interior supports the bill, as does the Bureau of the Budget.

There is no minority report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUALATIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. 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. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 707, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation in the Committee, discusses what is involved in H.R. 707, I would like to make a brief general statement to set the stage for the consideration of this bill and the bill that follows, H.R. 2829.

H.R. 707 and H.R. 2829 authorize two relatively small Federal reclamation projects in the Columbia River Basin—the Tualatin project in the State of Oregon and the Manson unit in the State of Washington. These are two of four Federal reclamation projects in the Columbia Basin which have been approved by the other body. In addition, we have the legislation to authorize a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam which has also passed the other body and which will be before the House in the near future.

Mr. Chairman, the two projects we bring before the House today constitute another step in the development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin project. They are both good projects from an economic and financial standpoint and are urgently needed to bolster the economy of the areas they will serve.

The Tualatin project which H.R. 707 would authorize is an excellent multiple-purpose reclamation project and is very important to the continued economic well-being of the Tualatin Valley west of the Portland metropolitan area. The Tualatin project is truly a multiple-purpose development providing for irrigation, municipal and industrial water supply, recreation opportunities, and fish and wildlife conservation. Only 1 or 2 inches of rain falls in the Tualatin Valley during the summer months and this seasonal exhaustion of the natural water supply has prevented the expansion of irrigation and municipal use of water, and has effectively halted economic growth in the Tualatin Valley. The area is well suited by climate, topography, and proximity to major markets for the production of livestock, dairying, and to the raising of a variety of vegetable crops—but under present conditions, water is not available. The communities in the areas as well as other commercial and industrial water customers also have difficulty in obtaining enough water to meet their needs throughout the year. With a dependable supply of water to meet irrigation and municipal needs, the area should grow and prosper.

With respect to recreation and fish and wildlife, there is an ever-increasing demand in this area, as in all areas near heavily populated centers, for the additional water-oriented recreation opportunities which the project will provide. The recreation facilities will be administered by some local public body.

Mr. Chairman, we have placed all the amendments in this legislation that are necessary to conform it to the policies we are presently following. At the appropriate time an amendment will be offered to reduce the appropriation ceiling set out in the bill by \$1,100,000, because the

studies of the Bureau of Reclamation have failed to justify the inclusion of flood control works at the dam. The Tualatin project meets all requirements for authorization and construction at this time and I urge the approval of H.R. 707.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas will discuss the bill in more detail.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the able, industrious, wise, and enterprising gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT], the author of this bill, in order that he may go to the well literally as well as figuratively in connection with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes for the purposes stated.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in the First Congressional District of Oregon is one of the most important and significant reclamation projects ever proposed for the State of Oregon. It is the first reclamation project in northwest Oregon. The concept of water shortage in northwest Oregon is sometimes difficult to understand. However, the Tualatin River at one point has been flooded so that it is nearly a mile wide on a given occasion in the wintertime while at the exact identical spot in late August it is so narrow that you can literally step across it. The committee has photographs showing this.

This project would service a rich farm area. It would make possible growing row crops involving no agricultural surpluses. The tremendous boost to the agricultural economy of the area is almost beyond belief. At the present time there is a real shortage of industrial water. This project would supply adequate industrial water, permitting great expansion in this area. The growing of row crops plus the availability of industrial water would make feasible canning and freezing operations.

Municipal water likewise is in desperate need for the cities of Hillsboro Forest Grove, Beaverton, Tigard, and numerous water districts. Lake Oswego would also benefit.

By bringing 17,000 acres of land under irrigation it would change the summer desert-dry Tualatin Valley into one of the most important agricultural areas in the State of Oregon. The heart of this project is the Scoggin Dam. This dam will form a very substantial size lake which will be important to the entire area, including the city of Portland.

I commend the Bureau of Reclamation for their work on this important project. Likewise I extend my own personal gratitude and the gratitude of the residents of my district to Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL of the House Interior Committee and to Congressman WALTER ROGERS, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, for their prompt scheduling of hearings on this important project and their valued assistance in bringing this project to this point.

It is my urgent hope that this body will today overwhelmingly approve this project which was passed out of the In-

terior Committee with strong support from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], such time as she may desire.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project will correct a quirk of an unsympathetic Mother Nature which for years has plagued the farmers in the valley of the Tualatin River with bad droughts in summer and worse floods in winter. I was pleased to hear the very distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee say this was one of the best projects from an economic standpoint.

I applaud the efforts of my able colleague, WENDELL WYATT, for his work on behalf of this valuable legislation. I am proud to say that I have worked with him and have supported him in this and that in previous years I cooperated with my good friend, the late Walter Norblad, to bring before this House, now, the product of 35 years of careful planning.

Authorization of this project will insure the Tualatin Valley of an adequate and sustained water supply; thus providing its many residents with irrigation, municipal and industrial water, control of floods, preservation of fish and wildlife, and expansion of recreation.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and also thank her for her kind remarks. She has been most helpful to me in connection with this project.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DUNCAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to lend my support to H.R. 707, the bill authorizing construction of the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in Oregon.

Although the project is not in my district, I have been very interested in it for years, since it will serve people in one of the most populous portions of my State. Planning has been underway for approximately 30 years, culminating in this proposal, to harness the full potential of the water resources of this valley.

I am sure it is difficult for many to understand the unusual nature of the weather patterns in the western part of Oregon. Precipitation is almost nonexistent during the summer months, and at times becomes painfully abundant during the winter. All of you, of course, remember the hardships this section of our country endured during the disastrous Christmas week floods of 1964. The Tualatin River can be characterized as a stream which has extreme varia-

tions in its unregulated natural streamflow, dwindling to a mere trickle in late summer.

The economy of the Tualatin Valley is largely agricultural production of hay, silage, dairy products and a few specialty crops. About 40,000 acres now have a partial irrigation water supply. About 45 percent of the arable land currently used is in the production of crops which are in surplus. Construction of this project would stabilize streamflow and would capture the abundant winter rainfalls for use in irrigating 13,000 acres not previously irrigated and in providing full water supply for the 4,000 acres now partially irrigated. The effect on agriculture would be to bring about an adjustment from grain crops to the higher value row crops which are not in surplus. As a result of the shift in the agricultural economy, the area used in the production of crops which are currently in surplus would diminish from 45 percent to 10 percent.

Several of the small municipalities in the area now have difficulty obtaining enough water to meet their needs throughout the year. This project would provide a stable municipal and industrial water supply for the cities of Forest Grove, Hillsboro, Beaverton, the Tigard Water District and the Lake Oswego Corp.

The edge of this project would be only 15 miles from the suburban areas in Portland. There are few natural lakes in this area, and I believe that the recreation use of this 1,100-acre reservoir would exceed the estimates which have been made for this project.

This project would also provide benefits for sport fishing by creating a reservoir trout fishery, by low flow augmentation of the main stream of the Tualatin and by removing, by modification of the Oregon Iron & Steel Co. dam, an existing impediment to migration of anadromous fish in the Tualatin River.

The cost-benefit ratio for this project, computed over a 100-year period, is 2.12 to 1. The irrigators to be benefited by this project, in addition to the responsibility for paying for the operation, maintenance, and replacement costs allocated to irrigation, will repay 36 percent of the construction cost allocated to irrigation. The balance of the irrigation allocation will be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived from power sales by the Bonneville Power Administration. Although I think we still have some problems concerning the form that basin accounting for the Columbia River Basin will take, I approve this method of repayment to the reclamation fund.

The analysis upon which the Tualatin project report was predicated was made prior to the Christmas week floods in 1964. This natural disaster has brought about an awareness of the need to take a new look at allocations for flood control. Invariably, flood control allocations computed since the Christmas week floods have been greater.

Mr. Chairman, this project has my full and unequivocal support. I urge the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 707. I think that this piece of legislation is a fine example of the Federal

Government's desire and ability to come into a region and, in cooperation with the local people, provide works for the benefit of the local citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER].

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

As reclamation projects go, this is about as good as they come. It is not an expensive project in relation to most of the others that come up. It is slightly under \$21 million. Repayment of the Government investment is assured. If there were never a nickel paid back by the irrigators, the electric power projects in the Pacific Northwest stand good for the sum. But there will be considerable paid by the irrigators.

It is my judgment that in time the ever growing city of Portland will extend its boundaries and its suburbs into this area that is now proposed to be covered by the Tualatin project, and that its financing will be further secured by arrangements within the bill which would permit the shift over to sale of water for municipal and industrial use and, as a consequence, make the economics of the project even more favorable.

The cost-benefit ratio is something over 2 to 1. There are a number of people who regard the cost-benefit ratio as somewhat of a myth. I think that regard is probably well taken; nevertheless, the supporting figures which were used to generate this ratio do indicate that this project will well repay the investment of the taxpayers.

It is a pleasure to join in support of H.R. 707 particularly because it was introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

H.R. 707 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project. The project envisages a multipurpose development providing not only for the irrigation water needs for about 17,000 acres of agricultural land, but also for the expanding municipal and industrial water service and for new recreation and fish and wildlife conservation opportunities.

This legislation has widespread support among the people of the State of Oregon. The owners of the land to be served by the project formed the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District and, through it, expressed their support for the project. Witnesses representing the State and the Legislature appeared in behalf of the project as well as representatives of various groups.

Oregon, of course, is not usually regarded as an arid State, and the valley in which this project is to be located cannot really be so considered. Substantial rainfall is received annually in the area; it just is not evenly distributed throughout the year. The area is subject to heavy rains for part of the year, we were told, and to a virtual drought during 4 or 5 critical summer months.

As with other similar irrigation-reclamation projects, the costs of this one, which are beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay, are to be born by power

revenues—in this case the Federal Columbia River power system. To insure that these costs are repaid within the usual 50-year payout period, your committee is recommending that section 2 of the bill be amended to require the return from power receipts to be made within that same repayment period.

Another committee amendment is designed to bring the bill up to date in light of the action which the Congress has taken since this bill was introduced. I am speaking of the amendment which strikes section 3, as it appears on pages 2 and 3, and inserts in lieu thereof a new section referring to the Federal Water Project Recreation Act which was adopted last year. The provisions which were embodied in the original section 3 are in substantial conformance with the new Water Project Recreation Act so that this is just a better way of handling the situation.

Although it is generally agreed that the land which would be served by this project would be used to produce crops which are not now in surplus, the committee felt that the customary amendment to prohibit the reclamation program from contributing to any surpluses should be incorporated in this bill; therefore that provision was added to H.R. 707 with the approval of the sponsor as section 5.

There are three other amendments which the committee is recommending which are worthy of mention in the course of this discussion.

No. 1 has to do with the deletion of the provision making water quality control a nonreimbursable cost in the project. Originally, section 1—at page 1, lines 6 and 7—would have allowed water quality control to be included on a non-reimbursable basis in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It was the feeling of the committee that considerable attention should be given this matter before authorizing any new nonreimbursable costs; therefore by deleting this provision the \$2,021,000 attributed to water quality control had to be reallocated among the other project purposes and will, accordingly, be repaid.

Second, the committee added a new subsection 4(c)—at page 5, lines 4 through 6—providing that charges allocated to highway transportation should be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 203 of the Flood Control Act. As under the usual procedures, it is intended that cost of moving the same kind of road as presently exists will be repayable as a cost of the project. The effect of this amendment is to do the job right as long as we are doing it—to bring the road up to present day standards. To do this additional funds are necessary and it would be unfair to burden the water users with this additional responsibility. The amount involved in the item is estimated to be \$290,000.

The third and last amendment which warrants some discussion is the new section 6 H.R. 707 originally provided an open-ended authorization; however, in recent years, it has been the general practice of your authorizing committee to provide a ceiling on the appropria-

tions authorized. You will note that the amount which this bill authorizes is \$22 million—the amount the project was expected to cost based on January 1965 prices.

Because the authorizing committee endeavors to keep these cost figures as realistic as humanly possible, it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered at the appropriate time reflecting a \$1.1 million reduction in the amount authorized. This reduction is based on the most recent communication from the Secretary of the Interior indicating that the flood control benefits from this project will not justify the additional flood control works at the dam. This amendment reduces the authorized appropriations to \$20,900,000.

I am pleased to join with the other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in recommending your approval of H.R. 707.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 707 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in Oregon. This multi-purpose project would be located west of the Portland metropolitan area in the valley of the Tualatin River, a tributary of the Willamette. In addition to providing for the irrigation of approximately 17,000 acres, the project would provide municipal and industrial water for several towns in the project area and provide recreation opportunities and for fish and wildlife conservation.

The plan of development calls for construction of a dam and reservoir, about 70 miles of main canals, pumping plants, laterals, and drains. Of the 17,000 acres that would be irrigated, about 4,000 acres now have a partial irrigation water supply. The facilities to distribute stored water for municipal and industrial use would be provided by the municipalities and other customers for this water and not as a part of the Federal project. These customers have already expressed a desire to contract for municipal and industrial water from the project.

The reservoir provides an excellent opportunity for recreation development. The plan for such development calls for acquiring about 300 acres around the reservoir for public use and for the construction of recreation facilities including boat ramps, picnic tables, sanitation facilities, and parking areas. The National Park Service has estimated that visitor use for boating, swimming, water skiing, fishing, camping, and so forth, would be on the order of 98,000 visitor days per year.

Measures to conserve fishlife include fish passage facilities, fish trapping facilities at the dam, the installation of fish screens, and enlargement of an existing hatchery.

The construction cost of the Tualatin project, estimated at \$20,902,000, is allocated equitably among all of the purposes to be served. About 75 percent, or \$15,543,000, is allocated to irrigation, \$2,099,000 to municipal and industrial

water supply, \$2,052,000 to fish and wildlife enhancement, \$868,000 to recreation, \$290,000 to highway transportation, and \$50,000 to flood control.

The small amount allocated to flood control would be nonreimbursable pursuant to reclamation law. The allocation to highway transportation, which represents the incremental cost incurred in constructing relocated roads to current traffic standards, would be nonreimbursable in accordance with the provision of the Flood Control Act of 1962. The cost allocated to municipal and industrial water would be fully repaid with interest by the municipal water users within a 50-year period.

Of the amounts allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, \$206,000 of the recreation cost and \$190,000 of the fish and wildlife enhancement cost would be borne by non-Federal public entities pursuant to the provisions of the Water Project Recreation Act. These amounts represent one-half of the separable costs allocated to these two purposes. The remainder of the cost allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement would be nonreimbursable pursuant to the provisions of the Water Project Recreation Act.

Project construction costs allocated to irrigation would be repaid within a 50-year period plus any authorized development period. On the basis of the economic studies of the Bureau of Reclamation, it is estimated that the irrigation water users could repay \$5,155,000, or 33 percent of the \$15,543,000 allocated to irrigation.

The remainder of the irrigation allocation, amounting to \$10,388,000, would be returned to the reclamation fund within the repayment period from revenues derived from power sales by the Bonneville Power Administration.

It is anticipated that parts of the project area will change in character in the years ahead and become part-time farms and suburban developments. Provision will be made in the repayment contracts for periodic adjustments to effect these shifts of water use from irrigation to domestic and industrial water supply.

The annual benefits attributable to the construction and operation of the Tualatin project exceed the annual costs in a ratio of 2.12 to 1.0, demonstrating a favorable economic justification for this project.

The committee amended the legislation to make it clear that the entire amount allocated to irrigation including the amount to be repaid from power revenues would have to be repaid in the 50-year period plus any authorized development period.

The committee also amended the bill to delete "water quality control" as a purpose to be served. While recognizing that inclusion of water quality control is authorized under the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the committee believes that additional consideration must be given to this matter before nonreimbursable allocations are authorized in reclamation projects. This committee amendment necessitated the reallocation of \$2,021,-

000 among the other project purposes and this reallocation is reflected in the amounts referred to earlier.

The committee also added the standard "surplus crop" amendment which has been placed in most reclamation project bills in recent years. Representatives of the irrigation district indicated their willingness to accept this amendment and assured the committee that newly irrigated lands would not be devoted to the production of so-called surplus crops.

The committee placed a ceiling of \$22 million on the amount authorized to be appropriated which includes \$1,100,000 for construction of flood control outlet works should studies show such works to be justified. Since the committee approved this legislation, I have been advised by the Secretary of the Interior that flood control benefits from this project will not justify the construction of the additional flood control works and, therefore, at the appropriate time, I intend to offer an amendment to reduce this appropriation ceiling from \$22 million to \$20,900,000.

The owners of the 17,000 acres of land to be served by the project have formed the Tualatin Valley Irrigation District for the specific purpose of contracting for water service, and the district has indicated its agreement with the proposed repayment arrangements. The committee received testimony favoring this legislation not only from the irrigation district but from the State of Oregon, the Oregon Legislature, numerous organizations in the State interested in water development, the towns in the project area, and numerous companies and individuals in the project area and in the State. The committee received no testimony in opposition to the project.

This project is needed to meet the seasonal water requirements in the project area. While the annual rainfall in the area is substantial, only 1 or 2 inches comes during the summer months. This has prevented the expansion of irrigation and municipal use of water and has effectively halted economic growth in the Tualatin Valley.

With a dependable water supply, there will be an increase in the production of livestock and livestock products as well as in a variety of vegetable crops including peas, sweet corn, beans, asparagus, and tomatoes. Under project conditions, the area can expect to prosper by virtue of its marketing advantage for dairy and specialty produce to be sold in the Portland metropolitan area. As the towns and cities in the area grow, their needs for municipal and industrial water will expand.

In summary, the Tualatin reclamation project provides for maximum use of the available water resources of the Tualatin Valley and is necessary for continued growth and prosperity in the area.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends approval of the Tualatin Reclamation project and the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT] has some questions to ask of the chairman of the full committee, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the project planning report for the Tualatin project includes provision for certain recreation and fish and wildlife developments in connection with the project. Am I correct in this understanding?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas yields to me, what I understand the gentleman from Oregon wishes to do is to make a legislative record here, to assure the development of the recreation and fish and wildlife programs as a part of this project.

The gentleman's assumption is correct, in the question he asked.

Mr. WYATT. That is what I seek to do.

Mr. Chairman, these very necessary developments are also authorized by this bill, are they not?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The first section of the bill authorizes construction of the project and, therefore, includes these developments. Even though there have been some questions raised as to the way the matter is referred to, nevertheless the gentleman is correct in his position.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, for the record, I wonder if you would explain the purpose of section 3 of this bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. That section refers to the Federal Water Project Recreation Act. It is necessary to insure that the recreation and fish and wildlife developments conform to the provisions of this recreation act in all respects—for instance, cost allocations, preliminary agreements with local agencies as to operation of recreation facilities, and the like.

Mr. WYATT. I have one more question; that is, does the amount authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the project in section 6 include funds for these recreation and fish and wildlife developments?

Mr. ASPINALL. The answer is, "It does."

Mr. WYATT. I thank the chairman of the committee, and I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Tualatin Federal reclamation project encompassed in H.R. 767 represents further orderly development of Northwest water resources. I believe it is important to emphasize to my colleagues that this project in Washington County, Oreg., will provide more than agricultural benefits to the citizens of my State and the Northwest area. The multipurpose benefits from the project will include irrigation, municipal water supply, flood control, and fish and wildlife and recreation benefits. The benefit-cost ratio of 2.12 to 1 is considered highly favorable for this type of reclamation project.

This project will enable growers to produce greater quantities of fruits for fresh and canning uses and a large variety of vegetables. These products are in great demand by the consuming public and are not subsidized by the Federal Government. The attendant processing requirements for such crops provide additional employment for people in the immediate area. In short, the proposed project will do much to strengthen the economy of our Northwest area.

Due to the rapidly expanding population of this area, we must look to future reliable sources of domestic water supply. This project will allow further urban development with the knowledge that adequate water is available to accommodate growth. We in Oregon are also alert to the need for adequate flood control measures in view of the disastrous floods which hit our area in the 1964-65 winter. Many area residents have expressed support for the flood control features of the project. And lastly, the recreation aspects of the project will provide pleasure and relaxation for the thousands of people who visit this area throughout the year.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that my fellow House Members will support the measure before us today.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to supply irrigation water to approximately seventeen thousand acres of land in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon, to develop municipal and industrial water supplies, to provide facilities for river regulation, water quality control, and control of floods, to enhance recreation opportunities, to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The principal features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir on Scoggin Creek, canals, pumping plants and water distribution facilities.

SEC. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide, with respect to any contract unit, for repayment of the irrigation construction costs assigned for repayment to the irrigators over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be returned to the reclamation fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Tualatin project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project areas such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project functions. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange upon such terms and conditions

as will best promote the development and operation of such lands and facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the foregoing undertakings and the costs of developments and operations for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, including an appropriate share of joint costs of the project, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreation purposes.

(b) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other projects functions.

Sec. 4. (a) Costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations, as defined in section 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, supra.

(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such interest rate to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum if the computed average interest rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder, if I support these bills being considered today, whether there will be any money left for a very valuable flood control project in the Third District of Iowa.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to make an observation, there will be, because all of this money is going to be paid back.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot wait for the payback. That will be 50 years from now. That would involve a little bit too much economic loss in the meantime.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman from Texas will say that he is always glad to help the gentleman from Iowa. If there are floods, we will help. If we could divert this to my district, I believe we could get the money quickly.

Mr. GROSS. The best news I have had today is the assurance from the gentleman from Texas that he is going to help me. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out “, water quality control.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 13, after “repay”, insert “during the repayment period”.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 13, after “fund”, insert “within said repayment period”.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, through page 3, line 23, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

“Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Tualatin project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL to the committee amendment: Strike out the word “Projects” and insert in lieu thereof the word “Project.”

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, this is a clerical amendment to properly designate the name of the act referred to.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 21, add a new subsection to read as follows: “(c) Costs of the project allocated to highway transportation shall be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1196).”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 21, add a new section to read as follows:

“Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for

the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.”

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 19, strike out all of section 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

“Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Tualatin project the sum of \$22,000,000 (January 1965 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project.”

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL to the committee amendment: Page 5, line 24, strike out “\$22,000,000” and insert in lieu thereof “\$20,900,000.”

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, after we had our hearings and had written up the bill in the full committee, we were advised by the Secretary of the Department of the Interior that the facilities which were originally referred to before our committee could not be built because they were not feasible, the cost of which was \$1.5 million. Therefore we have asked that this be stricken from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. Brooks, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 707) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 799, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 799, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 254.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 254, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 707, as passed, as follows:

"That in order to supply irrigation water to approximately seventeen thousand acres of land in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon, to develop municipal and industrial water supplies, to provide facilities for river regulation and control of floods, to enhance recreation opportunities, to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The principal features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir on Scoggin Creek, canals, pumping plants and water distribution facilities.

"Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide, with respect to any contract unit, for repayment of the irrigation construction costs assigned for repayment to the irrigators over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the reclamation fund within said repayment period from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Tualatin project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him.

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Tualatin project shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"Sec. 4. (a) Costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations, or other organizations, as defined in section 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, supra.

"(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the

fiscal year in which construction is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such interest rate to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum if the computed average interest rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(c) Costs of the project allocated to highway transportation shall be nonreimbursable in accordance with section 208 of the Flood Control Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 1196).

"Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"Sec. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Tualatin project the sum of \$20,900,000 (January 1965 prices) plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved therein, and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said project."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The motion was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 707) was laid on the table.

A MORE ADEQUATE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 801, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 801

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. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the

House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments hereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 3606, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 22), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 3606 as passed.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 801 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 3606, a bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The purpose of the bill would be accomplished by amending the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to provide basic authority to the Secretary of the Interior for a program of extramural research into all aspects of water problems relating to the mission of the Department of the Interior. Under this program, research grants or contracts could be made on a matching or other basis with State water resources research agencies or other government agencies or with universities or other educational institutions or with private firms or individuals in order to fulfill the requirements of a sound research program. The objective of the program is to bring to bear on our national water problems the talents and research competence of our best trained scientists and the use of the best facilities available wherever they may be located. As amended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, H.R. 3606 would authorize the appropriation of \$85 million over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 801.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding again. I have by now a standardized question on these rules that waive points of order. In lines 10 through 12 of the resolution, House Resolution 801, it says:

It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

As to the bill now before us, can the gentleman assure me that the same reason for waiving points of order pertains as in the last two rules that were just discussed?

Mr. DELANEY. The same reason pertains—with one possible exception and that is as to the State matching funds. I will yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,

the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for the purpose of answering that question.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there is also, as I understand it, a question here of the relationship between the executive and legislative departments. We have placed in the bill a provision for oversight authority for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The President in 1964 when he signed the parent legislation took exception to title II and has failed to implement it since then because he said that the action we asked for to have the contracts reported back to the Congress and give us in that legislation the power to negate those contracts trespassed upon the authority of the executive department.

So in this bill we are still keeping the oversight and we have made it necessary to report back to the Congress under subsection (b) of the first section, that is section 200, with this language:

(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die.

Now my position, and I think the position of everybody on our committee, is that this is germane. But if the question of germaneness was raised, it would take quite a bit of time perhaps to thrash it out.

What our committee has tried to do, if I may say to the good colleague from Missouri, is to retain our oversight authority on all of these programs so that we know specifically and in detail what is being carried on because with 1,450 plus contracts in being at any one time, the only way you know what is going on is to have the reports processed up to the committee. We are not doing anything about it except as the chairman of the committee or somebody from the committee where a contract might be made would take exception and would ask to have it held up and my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, knows that this would be very effective.

Mr. HALL. I certainly thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for his explanation.

If the gentleman from New York will yield further, may I say I have nothing but the greatest admiration for the surveillance and oversight which the gentleman plans to write into the bill.

Last year when the Committee on Armed Services on which I serve attempted to do the same thing under a section on military construction, it was actually vetoed for the same reason because there was a question of the transgression on the authority of the executive branch in the opinion of the President and his counsel and the Attorney General. Of course, the House of Representatives has no counsel of its own. You may recall this came to a final vote on the floor of the House at the insistence

of the gentleman from Missouri. There is a question in my mind about waiving these points of order and not permitting the House to work its will when we eliminate all points of order or questions of germaneness in the rule and making the consideration of the bill in order. Such rules, of course, repeatedly come down from the Committee on Rules. That is the problem that is bothering me. I will say, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it bothers me not just as an individual but as a member of the Joint Committee with the other body on the reorganization of the Congress. We have this under very active consideration at this particular time including the rules of germaneness in this body. Of course, there is no such rule of germaneness in the other body, as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, and the gentleman from New York, well know. It is for this reason that I am building up this dossier on waiving points of order in the rules that make otherwise perfectly good bills, with perfectly good intent, in order.

In doing this, may I say I am in full sympathy with what the committee and the distinguished chairman of the committee have in mind. I am seriously concerned about not being able as one elected Member of the people's personal Representatives in this House to make a point of order, whether the bill be for a good purpose, as in this instance perhaps—or for a bad purpose—when these rules are brought to us waiving such points of order. I take it in view of the explanation of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that he himself did ask for the waiver of all points of order in this rule?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. DELANEY. I can assure the gentleman that the Committee on Rules does not take lightly any request for waivers of points of order. Such requests are discussed at great length as this request was and we were satisfied with the explanation of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who explained it to the satisfaction of the Committee on Rules. Each time a request is made for a waiver of points of order, it causes quite a discussion and the committee is not inclined to grant waivers of points of order except where it is deemed proper after an explanation.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate that statement and I hope they are even more strict in the future about not granting such requests for waivers of points of order. There has been evidence here today about a rule coming out where all matters were not even present, although the chairman, the gentleman did not bring that out—the gentleman in the well did not bring that out. There has been some other evidence in this session of the Congress wherein waivers were apparently granted which were not requested either by the committee or the chairman—which is quite beside the point I know.

Mr. DELANEY. I know of no such waiver. I do not think the Committee on Rules has ever assumed during the years that I have been a member of the committee, the right to waive points of

order unless that was requested by the chairman who presented the bill.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman would be good enough to see me later, I will be glad to document my statement.

Mr. DELANEY. I will be glad to see the gentleman.

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

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate it. Thank you, sir. If the gentleman will look back over the record, he will see that it was only a month or two ago, as I remember, in this session of the Congress that points of order in at least one, and perhaps two instances, were waived without the request of the chairman of the committee. I happen to serve on one of the committees from which no request of waiver of points of order was made.

Mr. DELANEY. I do not know of a single instance.

Mr. GROSS. There is on record one, and perhaps two.

Mr. DELANEY. It is possible that it might have happened, but I know of no instance.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want to engage in a discussion of semantics with my friend from New York, but I question that when he says the rule is an open rule waiving points of order that that is exactly correct. It seems to me that waiving points of order infringes upon the open rule.

Mr. DELANEY. A point of order may be made and the section to which it applies could be thrown out. But it would give you the right under an open rule to amend any part of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I question whether it is a fully open rule when points of order are waived.

Mr. DELANEY. That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 801 provides a rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 3606.

The purpose of H.R. 3606 is to improve current research programs in the field of water resources by amendment the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a program of research into all aspects of water problems under the control of the Department.

Under H.R. 3606, research grants and contracts on a matching or other basis are provided for State agencies, universities, firms, and individuals working in the field. The bill authorizes \$85 million over a 10-year period.

The principle language of the bill was included in title II of the Water Resources Research Act. Additionally, only \$1 million was authorized for each year of a 10-year period, and either Interior Committee could bar appropriations to fund projects. The President objected to this and no requests for funds under title II have been made.

The need for research into our water resources is evident in the testimony it

received, according to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It has therefore determined to alter its previous position. The language approved here is much the same as was approved by House conferees in the 88th Congress during the passage of the act.

The \$85 million authorized for 10 years—through fiscal 1976—is broken down as follows: Fiscal 1967, \$5 million; \$6 million in 1968; \$7 million in 1969; \$8 million in 1970; \$9 million in 1971; and \$10 million in 1972-76 inclusive.

There are two other major changes of the act contained in the bill: First, no contract or other agreement may be entered into until 60 days after it has been submitted to Congress during which Congress is in session; second, a broadening of the reporting requirement. Presently only an annual report is required. The bill requires a report by March 1 to the President and the Congress, giving a complete accounting of funds appropriated during the preceding year and a report on the results expected and conclusions reached in projects funded and underway.

There is a question that the language in section 307 might not be germane, and waiving the points of order would make it in order.

There are no minority views in the report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no objection that a rule be granted. Reserving the balance of my time, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

MANSON UNIT, CHIEF JOSEPH DAM PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. 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. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2829, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, when H.R. 707 to authorize the Tualatin project was being considered earlier, I indicated that these two projects constitute another step in the development of the water resources in the Columbia River Basin.

The plan for the \$13.3 million Manson unit, which would be authorized by the legislation now under consideration, calls for rehabilitation of an existing private irrigation system and extension of the system to serve some additional lands. In all, almost 6,000 acres will be irrigated. In addition to serving irrigation water, the reservoir will be developed for recreation. Since the reservoir will be in a national forest, the recreational facilities will be administered by the Forest Service.

Mr. Chairman, we find here a situation which is true of so many of our recent irrigation projects. The original facilities were built totally by private interests many, many years ago. The time has come when the facilities have deteriorated to the point where a major rehabilitation job is required and the cost of this major improvement plus the cost of extending the system to serve additional lands is beyond the ability of the local water users to repay. In the case of the Manson unit, the water users will repay almost 50 percent of the total project cost and the remainder will be repaid from the net power revenues of the Federal Columbia River Basin system—that is, net revenues that are over and above revenues needed to repay the entire power investment in the Federal Columbia River power system with interest within 50 years from the time each project or unit becomes operational.

Mr. Chairman, the committee concluded that the Manson unit meets all of the criteria for authorization and construction at this time. I urge the approval of H.R. 2829 as amended by the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas will discuss it in more detail. At this time I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to propose to the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, a question or two regarding recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement, for the purpose of making legislative history.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand the gentleman, he wishes to have the same history made on this legislation as was made on the prior bill, so that there will be no question in respect to the matter involved.

Mr. FOLEY. The gentleman is correct. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, is it the intent of the committee that the Secretary of the Interior shall carry out such work as is required for recreation development and fish and wildlife enhancement in connection with the Manson unit?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; to the extent that this is consistent with the Water Project Recreation Act. We have referred to the act and expect to have development carried on in conformance therewith.

Mr. FOLEY. Is it correct that this authority to do this work is found in the first section of the bill which both enumerates the purposes of the project and authorizes its construction?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FOLEY. Will the chairman state, then, what is the purpose of section 3 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, that it assure conformity with the Water Project Recreation Act. More specifically, it is to insure that agreements are signed as called for by that act and that cost allocations conform to the standards laid down in that act itself and that we do not vary from the provisions of the act, to which the Congress and the Executive gave their approval recently.

Mr. FOLEY. But is it correct that the recreation and fish and wildlife development are part and parcel of the project itself; that is, they are authorized by section 1 of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes; the gentleman is correct again. I add, the amount authorized to be appropriated includes an allowance for this work as well as for construction of the irrigation features of the project, and that the modes of repayment, whatever they may be, are in accordance with the provisions of the act referred to.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, just two questions, requesting technical information for the gentleman from Missouri, from the distinguished chairman.

Are these dams we are considering today in what is ordinarily referred to as high terrain—or rugged terrain—areas with boxlike canyons and steep walls or are we inundating alluvial soil in order to provide irrigation for other areas to be reclaimed?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have not seen the site of the reservoir referred to in the liquidation now under consideration, that is the reservoir that is to be enlarged. It would make very little difference in this particular instance if I understand my colleague correctly.

I have seen the reservoir site for the Tualatin project. There is a small amount of good farmland that will be inundated, but most of the area is hillsides and there would be very little of value that would be destroyed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, my second question to the distinguished chairman is, in view of the statement that this one is entirely within a forest preserve or a national forest, would the 50 cents a day or the annual \$7 fee for the Land-Water Conservation Fund be applicable for ingress into this area, since it is in another department, under the bill that we passed last year? Would that be in force, and is it contemplated that it would

be imposed by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, under the President's recent Executive order?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague will allow me, I cannot speak about what is in the minds of the Secretaries involved, but if there is any development which would lead to the necessity for an entrance fee, an entrance fee could be charged in this particular project.

On the other hand, a user fee will more than likely be charged. There is no question about the user fees. There is a question as to the entrance fees, because there has to be a substantial development that is perhaps a road providing for ingress and egress, or proper policing facilities, or such.

In this particular instance, I may say to my colleague, I would doubt if the entrance fees will be charged. I mean, this is a small reservoir. There is a question about entrance fees, but I am sure user fees will be charged.

Mr. HALL. The user fees pertain to those who actually use the water for hydrology, irrigation, and other purposes in general?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. I go a little further than that. If the Forest Service, in developing a recreation area, constructs recreation facilities, such as parking places or campsites or boat ramps, something like that, then charges will be made for these facilities, but not for the water. The use of the water itself carries with it no fees, as my colleague will remember.

Mr. HALL. I do remember. But that means the only way that you can gain ingress to the lake, which is "free of charge," is to float downstream on a contributing tributary.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think my colleague is correct, providing the administering authorities wish to go that far and incur the wrath of some of the users. I know a difficulty is going on at the present time.

Mr. HALL. It is going on, of course, on some of the Corps of Engineers impoundments. That is why I wanted to make a record here without reference to this particular project.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it will be involved here.

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

Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], this is economically a good project. Its cost-benefits ratio is high, for whatever value people place on the cost-benefit ratio.

Mr. Chairman, the project is estimated to cost a little over \$13 million, somewhat less than the previous project.

Also, Mr. Chairman, like the previous project, even if the irrigators are unable to pay any money at all—which is not likely because testimony indicates they will be able to repay—the finances of the project are backed up by the power revenues of the Chief Joseph Dam.

Mr. Chairman, it is notable that the area to be served by the project is

largely devoted to the growing of apples. If the escalation of inflation that we have now, and are going to experience throughout this year, leads us to some kind of an economic chaos and depression, probably there will be plenty of use for these apples for people to sell on the street corners.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I feel it is notable to note that this project is a Washington project. The previous project was an Oregon project, both projects being located in the humid West, the Pacific Northwest.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, the Pacific Northwest has received the benefits of an enlightened and benevolent policy of the Federal Government to use national resources for the development of natural resources, particularly in connection with hydropower and irrigation developments such as this.

The growth and development of the Pacific Northwest has been underpinned by this policy, and I believe it has been of benefit to the Nation as well as to the residents of the great States of Oregon, Washington, and adjoining areas of the Pacific Northwest.

However, I believe it should be pointed out—and I referred this area as the humid West—another portion of the West is the Pacific Southwest, it is the arid West. It, also, is an area of great growth and also makes great contribution to the Nation. Inevitably, in the very near future, the arid Pacific Southwest must look outside its boundaries for the satisfaction of its basic needs for water. There is no secret that at the present time the arid Pacific Southwest—not only Arizona and California, Nevada, and New Mexico, but Texas also—is looking longingly at the Pacific Northwest for help to satisfy these growing requirements for life-giving water.

Annually after the Pacific Northwest has made entire use of the waters of the system, both for the development of electricity and for use in agriculture and industry, the Columbia River Basin flows upward of some 90 million acre-feet of fresh water into the Pacific Ocean. So, it is logical that the arid Pacific Southwest looks toward this water, the sole use of which now is the dilution of the salinity of the Pacific Ocean. It looks with hope for the generous understanding of our neighbors to the north in Oregon and Washington, who through the demonstrated benefits of these public projects by the Federal Government in its area, know the value of consolidating the use of water to the highest good of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, we do hope that the honorable gentlemen, our colleagues from those States, will look as favorably and as kindly upon the water problems of the Pacific Southwest as today we have looked upon their water problems as evidenced by the two projects before us.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to express in advance of expressions which I shall make later of the appreciation of the State of Washington and the people of my district for the cooperation and

assistance of the gentleman from California in the preparation and hopeful passage of this act.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not feel that the gentleman wants to leave the impression, which I am sure he did not intend to do, that the only States in the West which have benefited from Federal expenditures have been the States of Oregon and Washington. I am sure the gentleman from California will concede that the great State of California, the largest and most advanced in the West, has had some paltry Federal expenditures over the years, such as perhaps the Central Valley project?

Mr. HOSMER. I will say to the gentleman from Washington that that is indeed true. We do share this knowledge which demonstrations have given us, of the benefits not only to ourselves, but to the rest of the Nation of such Federal programs. As a matter of fact, irrigation and reclamation development began almost the first year of this century, and has been making its contributions ever since.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I assume, based upon what the gentleman says, that he would certainly agree that the Federal Government in the State of California and its efforts have not benefited the people of that State alone, but have been of major benefit to the entire Nation, and that those projects such as irrigation and power development in California, which have been repaid to the Treasury—and many of them with interest by the people of the State of California—have represented a Federal investment which accrues to the interest of the entire Nation. Is that not correct? Will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. HOSMER. That is true, and I might further advise the gentleman from Washington that in connection with our own projects in California, and those of our neighboring States to the east and to the northeast, and to the north, we have always regarded that the natural resources being developed in a State are subject to a first priority by the originating State.

I think there is no question that in the future we will adhere to the same philosophy. In other words, should we look to the north for supplemental water supplies, we would not look for any supply that is at any time needed in the originating Pacific Northwestern States. Only after those States have fully utilized their water resources, would we ask to step in and have the benefits of such water as otherwise would go to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. FOLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments. I would also suggest, and I would hope the gentleman would agree, that throughout the history of Federal projects in the West and all of our States in the West, it has been not only the principle of respecting the priority of use in the State of origin, but the principle of the legislation to require and to expect that those States which would benefit by Federal expenditures show a clear feasibility and justification for the expenditure of Federal funds. I think, if I may suggest it today,

that both the Tualatin project in Oregon and the Manson project in the State of Washington very clearly meet these feasibility standards—and exceed them; and I am sure the gentleman would agree that any future projects of any kind should meet the same standards of economic feasibility and justification when they come to the Congress and ask for the investment of Federal funds.

Mr. HOSMER. I must state that the gentleman from Washington with his latest declaration has me a little bit confused. He seems to be talking like a Republican instead of a Democrat.

The bill which we have before us at this time—H.R. 2829—authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project in the State of Washington.

It is important to point out that this is not an entirely new system. The existing system consists in part of aging wood-stave pipes and flumes which were constructed some 50 years ago. That system is in need of repair and rehabilitation if it is to continue to provide irrigation water for nearly 4,000 acres of irrigated apple orchards. Failures are frequent in the existing system and, most certainly, a major failure would jeopardize the continued productivity of these orchards.

In addition to providing for the rehabilitation of the existing system, H.R. 2829 provides for more adequate facilities for collection, storage, and delivery of water. The expansion of the system would enable it to serve 1,525 acres of presently dry lands—including 120 acres which now have only a partial water supply.

This land is, of course, in the apple country. The lands presently being irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production and it is reasonably expected that the new lands will be developed primarily as irrigated apple orchards. Notwithstanding that fact, however, I do want to point out that your committee retained in this bill the customary provision which you will find at section 4 of the bill. Sections such as section 4 have been placed in similar bills in order to assure the taxpayers of this Nation that these early projects will not contribute to any unnecessary agricultural production so as to create unneeded and unwanted surpluses.

As has already been pointed out by the chairman of the committee, this \$13.3 million project is principally an irrigation project which will be almost entirely repaid to the Treasury. To insure that the \$13,194,000 allocated to irrigation is repaid within the established 50-year period—plus the development period—the committee inserted into H.R. 2829 at section 2—page 2, lines 16 and 17—the necessary wording to insure that the construction costs allocated to irrigation, which are to be repaid by power revenues, are to be returned to the reclamation fund within that period.

Another fundamental amendment which the committee made in the language of H.R. 2829 appears later in that same section—at page 2, line 19. Where

the bill, as originally introduced, provided for the power revenues to be used to help repay the construction costs were to be derived from the revenues produced by the Chief Joseph Dam, the committee revised the bill to provide that repayment should be derived from the entire Bonneville Power Administration. The long-range effect of this amendment is to establish a basin fund in the Columbia River Basin and its tributaries.

This has been a matter of considerable concern to the committee for some time and it is a matter about which it is expected that this Congress will be again concerned when some other expected measures come before it. By working out a basin accounting arrangement such as we have in the Central Valley project and some others, a pool will be created from which necessary project costs can be drawn to pay allocations which the water users would otherwise be unable to repay.

I am pleased to join with the chairman of the committee in recommending this legislation to the House for its approval at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take only a brief moment to speak on the bill before the Committee.

It has been very succinctly and exactly explained by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and I think the dialog that has taken place has clearly put before the Committee all the relevant information.

I would like to emphasize first of all, the imminent need of this project. There is in the Manson area an existing reclamation facility which was created and largely built over 50 years ago. That system is now so badly deteriorated and in such imminent danger of a breakdown, that it is not certain even if this bill were passed and funded today that it would be possible to construct the project and rehabilitate the system soon enough to prevent a major disaster in the area. We are living by the grace of Providence so to speak from day to day with reference to this project.

Last July 19 there was a serious breakdown of the works in a large and valuable orchard that was flooded and very seriously damaged. That could occur at any time with other orchards in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my very deep appreciation to the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Colorado, for his consideration and foresight in bringing this legislation before the Committee today. My appreciation certainly goes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ROGERS], and certainly to every member of the Interior Committee, especially the ranking minority member and the gentleman from California who is here today from the minority side. All of them have cooperated splendidly on this matter which is, the record will show, the most economically feasible project to come before

the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in many, many years if not in its entire history. It is my hope that all Members of this Committee of the Whole will give their support to this much needed and valuable project and pass it unanimously today.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from California if he has any more requests for time?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Manson unit, a relatively small reclamation project in Chelan County in central Washington. The project is primarily for irrigation with incidental benefits from recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement.

The plan of development for the Manson unit calls for improving and extending the existing irrigation water collection and distribution system of the Lake Chelan Reclamation District. The existing system is a composite of several privately financed developments which have been enlarged and improved over the years. This system collects the water from the watersheds of seven streams above Lake Chelan and conveys it throughout the service area. The system would be rehabilitated and extended, and the existing reservoir would be enlarged. The rehabilitated and extended system would continue water service to 4,245 acres now irrigated and bring a full irrigation water supply to an additional 1,525 acres, making a total of 5,770 acres that would be served under the proposed plan of development. Recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities would be provided to the reservoir and would be administered by the Forest Service.

Lands in the unit area that are now irrigated are devoted almost exclusively to apple production, and it is expected that the new lands will also be developed as irrigated apple orchards. These orchards cannot exist without the irrigation system. A major failure would result in their destruction and, unfortunately, there is danger of a major failure unless the system is rehabilitated at an early date. Some of the existing works were constructed as long as 50 years ago and are in urgent need of repair or replacement.

The Manson unit would cost an estimated \$13,344,000 and all of this amount, except for about \$150,000, is allocated to irrigation and would be repaid under reclamation law. The economic studies of the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that about \$6,051,000 can be repaid by the water users and that the remainder of about \$7,143,000 would be returned from revenues derived by the Secretary of the Interior from the disposition of power marketed by the Bonneville Power Administration. The committee amended the bill to make it clear that the entire amount, the part to be repaid by water users and the part to be repaid by power revenues, would be repaid within a period not exceeding 50 years plus any authorized development period.

The amount of about \$150,000 allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement is nonreimbursable pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Water Recreation Project Act. The facilities would be in the national forest and recreation, user fees would probably be established pursuant to the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The Manson unit has a benefit cost ratio of 6.5 to 1.0 showing that this is an excellent project from an economic standpoint.

The Manson unit not only has the full support of the irrigation district involved, which has agreed to the repayment arrangements, but it has the support of the State of Washington as well as groups and organizations in that State interested in water development. The committee received no testimony in opposition to this proposed development. This is a relatively small project but it is extremely important to the economy of the area it will serve.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee recommends approval of the Manson unit and the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2829

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of supplying irrigation water for approximately five thousand eight hundred acres of land, undertaking the rehabilitation and betterment of works serving a major portion of these lands, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the unit shall consist of dams and related works for enlargement of Antillon Lake storage, related canals, conduits, and distribution systems, and works incidental to the rehabilitation of the existing irrigation system.

Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the Reclamation Fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Chief Joseph Dam project. The term "construction costs", as used herein, shall include any irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay during that period. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Manson unit shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized, as a part of the Manson unit, to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities; to acquire or otherwise to include within the unit area such adjacent lands or interests

*therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to assign water and reservoir capacity to recreation and to provide for public use and enjoyment of unit lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project purposes. The Secretary shall transfer lands acquired for the unit within exterior national forest boundaries to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration as national forest, and jurisdiction of national forest lands within the unit shall remain with the Secretary of Agriculture for recreation and other national forest system purposes: *Provided*, That the lands and waters within the flow lines of any reservoir or otherwise needed or used for the operation of the project for other purposes shall continue to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to the extent he determines to be necessary for such operation. The costs of the undertakings described in this section, including costs of investigation, planning, Federal operation and maintenance, and an appropriate share of joint costs of the unit, shall be nonreimbursable.*

Sec. 4. Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other project functions.

Sec. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Manson unit, Chelan division, for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Manson unit, \$12,400,000 (October 1959 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, strike out "Reclamation Fund" and insert "reclamation fund within said repayment period".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 119, strike out "Chief Joseph Dam project." and insert "Bonneville Power Administration."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, through page 4, line 6, strike out all of sections 3 and 4 and insert the following language in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Manson unit shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Projects Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213)."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL to the committee amendment on page 4, line 10: Strike out the word "Projects" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Project".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 12, strike out "Sec. 5." and insert "Sec. 4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 24, strike out "Sec. 6." and insert "Sec. 5."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, line 1, strike out "\$12,400,000 (October 1959 prices)," and insert "\$13,344,000 (April 1965 prices)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2829) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 800, 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? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 800, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 490.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 490 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 2829 as passed, as follows:

"That, for the purposes of supplying irrigation water approximately five thousand eight hundred acres of land, undertaking the rehabilitation and betterment of works serving a major portion of these lands, conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and enhancement of recreation opportunities, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto). The principal works of the unit shall consist of dams and related works for enlargement of Antillon Lake storage, related canals, conduits, and distribution systems, and works incidental to the rehabilitation of the existing irrigation system.

"Sec. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide for repayment of the obligation assumed thereunder with respect to any contract unit over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by laws. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay during the repayment period shall be returned to the reclamation fund within said repayment period from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration. The term "construction costs", as used herein, shall include any irrigation operation, maintenance, and replacement costs during the development period which the Secretary finds it proper to fund because they are beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay during that period. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Manson unit shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by the Secretary.

"Sec. 3. The conservation and development of the fish and wildlife resources and the enhancement of recreation opportunities in connection with the Manson unit shall be in accordance with provisions of the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (79 Stat. 213).

"Sec. 4. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Manson unit, Chelan division, for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

"Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Manson unit \$13,344,000 (April 1965 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said unit."

The motion was agreed to.

Then Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at the appropriate place on H.R. 2829 and the bill H.R. 707, which the House passed just previous to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROMOTING A MORE ADEQUATE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. 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. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3606, with Mr. Brooks in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER], will be recognized for 30 minutes.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this legislation in the committee, discusses what is involved in H.R. 3606, I would like to take just a few minutes to indicate the need for water research generally and how the program authorized by H.R. 3606 fits into and is coordinated with our overall Federal water resources research effort. The bill we have before the House today, of course, is limited to research into water problems relating to the mission of the Department of the Interior.

It is the ever-increasing demands upon our limited water supplies throughout the Nation that have pointed up the importance of research in the process of matching water supply to such demands. Over the years, the nature of our water problems has changed and the size and scope of the solutions have increased until, today, far greater demands are pressing upon both our water resources and the technology required to meet our varied water needs.

In the past, our Nation's available water supplies were plentiful and we let ourselves become too dependent upon nature to meet our needs. We also became

wasteful of our supplies. We have expected our streams and ground water sources not only to meet the needs of our expanding population for food, fiber, and industrial processing, but also, at the same time, to carry off the waste products of our homes, industries and farms. The result has been serious shortages of usable water in many parts of our Nation and the conclusion that our water problems may be expected to become more serious in the future. Research, of course, is not itself the answer to all our water problems but it will help provide the answers we need. It has become quite clear that, if we are to find the solutions necessary to meet this Nation's growing water problems, we must have a continuing and effective water resources research program.

On March 18, President Johnson transmitted a special message to the Congress emphasizing the need for expanding our water resources research effort. The report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology which was a part of the President's message, includes a proposed 10-year expanded program in water resources research and sets out the specific goals we should work toward in the years ahead. The program which H.R. 3606 would authorize would assist in attaining these goals.

The concern which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had with respect not only to the program involved in this legislation but to the entire Federal water research effort has been that we have had inadequate coordination and have had duplication and waste. In an attempt to overcome this situation, we placed provisions in the 1964 act requiring clarification of Federal agency responsibilities for water research and for coordinating all Federal water resources research activities. We are pleased with the actions which have been taken pursuant to these provisions.

By Executive order dated October 24, 1964, the President has given this responsibility to the Office of Science and Technology and to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A Committee on Water Resources Research has been established and staffed, and the testimony we received during the hearings indicates that progress is being made toward the elimination of duplication and waste in this field. Other actions which will assist in this effort include the cataloging of all research work by the Science Information Exchange in the Smithsonian Institution and the establishment of a Water Resources Science Information Center within the Department of the Interior.

The report, mentioned earlier, of the Federal Council for Science and Technology setting forth a coordinated 10-year program of Federal water resources research is a product of our efforts to coordinate all Federal work in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the water resources research program which will be extended by the legislation we have under consideration today is a meritorious program which is an important part of our overall Federal water resources research effort, and I urge favorable action on H.R. 3606.

I would advise my colleagues that under the provisions of this legislation we will be able to get into the water research program many capable and able scientists and scientific groups which we are unable to get into the program with the authority that we presently have under the provisions of the parent legislation, which is centered toward the land-grant colleges and those colleges associated with them.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Do I understand that this is an \$85 million bill, spread over a period of 10 or 15 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is spread over 10 years. The legislation that came over from the other body carried with it an open-ended authorization, no time limit on the activities of the research studies. It also carried with it additional money. But the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House thought the program should be stepped up gradually.

This is what we did with the original bill, as my friend knows so well. It was also thought that we should put a cutoff date, that we should have a definite term for this activity, and that if it were necessary to come back at the end of 8 or 9 or 10 years, and make a new case for additional authority, the agency would have to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, it is a step-up from the previous program of \$1 million a year for 10 years. Is that right?

Mr. ASPINALL. What we did in the House, if my colleague will remember, when we were considering the Water Research Act of 1964, is that we had no title II. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommended that title II not be included within the legislation at that time, thinking that it would be sufficient to start out with the Water Institutes which were provided for in title I.

The other body, however, placed in the original bill, as they have this time, an unlimited authority for the Secretary in respect to the authorizations contained in title II.

We went to conference. As my friend so well knows, in conference there is a give-and-take. We finally came up with a decision by the conferees to authorize \$1 million annually.

The House was able to retain, however, in that legislation that provision which said that the Executive would have to send to the Congress of the United States the contracts which were provided for under the provisions of title II, and that the different bodies of Congress would have 60 days in which either to approve or disapprove.

It was to this that the Executive himself took exception, and he has failed to implement the provisions of the limited title II that we provided for in the conference report in 1964.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on page 12 of the report I see brackets, in conformity with the Ramseyer rule, that ap-

parently the language is stricken under the terms of this bill, which provides that the Secretary shall make an annual report to the Congress of receipts and expenditures, and so forth. Is there any substitute for this in the bill today?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. We have substitute language. In this we created a new section. I do not have the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I think the gentleman from Iowa will find that on page 14 of the report, section 307, at the bottom of the page. That requires a more detailed report.

Mr. ASPINALL. What we had to do was work the reporting directive into both titles. This we have done. There is an annual report required. This report has to be made by March 1, so that the Congress of the United States will know what is going on before the appropriation authorities are able to make their decisions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that I think that is a very good provision. I compliment the committee upon section 307, now that I have seen it.

I ask the gentleman, will all this \$85 million be spent upon research—exclusively on research—or how is the \$85 million to be spent?

Mr. ASPINALL. The \$85 million is to be spent by contracts entered into. Some of the moneys will be in grants, some of it may be in matching funds, and some of it will be in just outright payments for contract services.

Mr. GROSS. Is not the \$85 million all Federal funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Then are there to be matching funds in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. I might have misspoke myself in regard to the matching funds. The matching funds are contained in title I under the water institute program if I remember correctly.

Mr. GROSS. The Government is going to go out and hire consultants and research organizations of one kind and another? That is the purpose of the \$85 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is the purpose.

Mr. GROSS. There is no actual cleaning up of streams, or anything of this kind? This is all in addition to that?

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my colleague that the amount provided for water research activities is a very small amount of research funds expended by the Federal Government in its various activities. Two of the most important elements with which we have to live are air and water. The scientific studies which are involved in this area of research are manifold.

Mr. GROSS. I believe I understand the importance of it. On the other hand, I do not minimize \$85 million being spent on research, even though it is expended over a period of years. I did not have time to read the hearings in justification of this expenditure.

I am willing to accept the gentleman's word that that much money is necessary and proper, for the purposes of research.

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will permit me to say—and when we think of these figures the gentleman knows what we are up against. There were over 1,450 contracts in existence for research in water matters during this last year. These were contracts by industry, contracts by the various agencies of the Government as well as by other organizations. There are six agencies or departments of Government engaged in this work. However, if it had not been that we provided for a clearinghouse, as it were, in the parent bill, the act of 1964, so that all research activities in water is coordinated at the present time and the reporting back procedures which we have in this legislation, I would have the same fears of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa. However, I believe we have this pretty well wrapped up so that there cannot be anything but efficient and effective operation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, so there will be no misunderstanding about the matching funds, the gentleman from Iowa is correct in his understanding that funds for this \$85 million can be matching funds. This is another reason that we want it under section 307, and have these reports from the Secretary so we can see and take a look and provide the oversight that we feel the Congress should have over this program.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, is it my understanding that the act of 1964, and continued by this bill today, if passed, is interested primarily in doing a better job of research for the development of natural resources of water in their natural states, such as the basin development, the conservation of streams, et cetera?

Mr. ASPINALL. Only indirectly, I would say to my friend from California. As far as the overall basin development is concerned, we are not as interested here in the scientific study of water and how water can be made potable and usable and how its use can be extended as we are in the basin plans which come under the provisions of the legislation we passed for such purposes.

Mr. REINECKE. Perhaps I should ask the question differently: Are we concerned here more with water before it gets into the pipeline than after it gets into the pipeline?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Before?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate the work which has been done by the committee on this matter, and I sincerely hope that through

the enactment of this legislation water conservation and utilization will continue into the period after the pipeline stage as well.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill for research. Now, today, being against research is about like being for sin. This is good, simply because the more knowledge we have the better off this country will be in every way.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join in the support of this bill which proposes research on such an important matter as water which is basic to our national life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3606 provides for the expenditure of some \$85 million on an escalating scale during the first 5 years. Some \$35 million during the first 5 years, starting out at \$5 million a year, and \$50 million during the last 5 years at a rate of \$10 million a year.

An authorization this far into the future—and, incidentally, this takes us to the 1st session of the 94th Congress—might be questionable because over that period of years the operations of the program could conceivably get far out of hand, and conceivably involve the wastage of a good deal of Federal sums that might be involved.

However, Mr. Chairman, I do not worry about that simply because—and I want to get this on the record—of the work and the responsible attitude taken toward this and every other measure which comes before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that calls for expenditure of Federal funds, by its chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and by the chairman of its Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

These gentlemen and other members of this important committee have, during all of the years of their service on this committee, nalled down tighter and tighter control over the expenditure of money that is authorized and voted by the Congress. That is all to the good.

This has not been an easy task. There are constitutional questions as to the line of authority between the legislative and executive branch.

The gentlemen whom I have mentioned have worked to hew as closely to that line as possible insofar as the constitutional prerogatives and duties of the Congress are concerned. They have done the difficult job at times of devising language that will accomplish that purpose and I am satisfied that because of this work and because of that zeal and because of this dedication, we do have a measure here which insofar as it is constitutionally possible by legislative oversight to guarantee the wise expenditure of money which may be appropriated in the years ahead, does so guarantee it.

H.R. 3606 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and other arrangements for research on water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior. These research grants or contracts could be made on a matching ba-

sis or under some other arrangement with educational institutions or private foundations, private firms or with individuals. Water research under this program could also be conducted by Federal and State agencies. This program is designed to bring to bear on our national water problems the best scientific talent and research competence available whether it be in educational institutions or in private firms or in Federal agencies.

The program authorized by this act is an extension of the water resources research program we authorized in 1964 by the enactment of Public Law 88-379, the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. Under the 1964 act, Water Resources Research Institutes have been established in each State and that program is off to a good start.

During the hearings, the committee was advised that cooperative arrangements for conducting the research work of the research institutes in each State have been carried as far as possible under the limited funds available for the present program. However, there are still many strong and competent universities not in the program and with no prospect of being in the program unless the legislation we have under consideration today is enacted. Thus, the present program is not tapping the total research talent and competence of our universities.

For example, in my own State of California there are nine separate campuses in the University of California system not to mention Stanford, the University of Southern California, and the California Institute of Technology, all of which have research and training competence in the water field. There is no possibility of taking advantage of this talent under the present program because of the limited funds available and the excessive fragmentation of the one institute's allotment that would result.

In addition to the research talent and competence available in our universities, there are numerous nonprofit and private organizations which through years of experience have developed competence in certain specific areas in the broad research field of water resources.

Mr. Chairman, the committee received excellent testimony this year demonstrating the need for this expanded program to assist this Nation in resolving the many and ever-increasing water problems. Based on this demonstrated need, the committee is recommending enactment of this legislation. However, the committee intends to retain control of what is being done under this legislation.

Two years ago a limited program similar to the one that H.R. 3606 would authorize was included in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. The President objected to language which Congress attached to that authority because it permitted the authorizing committees of the Congress to bar appropriations to fund water research projects.

The language which the committee has placed in this bill does not permit the committees to veto the projects but it does require that all research contracts and proposals be submitted to the authorizing committees 60 legislative days

prior to their execution. This gives the committee an opportunity to review the proposed research work and advise the Secretary of any objections to the proposed projects.

The committee also amended the bill to limit the life of the program to 10 years beginning in fiscal year 1967. This will provide an opportunity for an overall review of the accomplishments and needs at the end of that period in order to determine whether the program should be extended. One other committee amendment requires a full annual report covering the entire program and a detailed accounting for the appropriated funds.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 3606 authorizes a meritorious and much-needed program and that we have amended the legislation so that the program can be kept under control and on the right track. I am happy to join the chairman and other members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in supporting H.R. 3606 and recommending that it be approved by the House.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of commending the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] for the interest they have shown in this measure.

I had introduced a companion bill to H.R. 3606 which companion bill was H.R. 6282, and I have followed the hearings very closely.

I would like to point out to the House, that I think the committee has written language in this measure which not only provides worthwhile research funds but also has eliminated the possibility of duplication and waste as the chairman has said earlier.

When the Water Research Act was passed, I must confess I was somewhat disappointed because title I language was more or less restricted to the land-grant schools and title II funds were very limited.

This prevented a school like the University of Texas, which has a very large and effective water resource research program underway, from being able to contribute its talent and knowledge in this field.

This bill restores these funds and will enable the University as one school to go forth in this field.

I might add that a situation in Texas might be typical of the same situation as would have occurred in other States and that is, that some institutions, public and private, might now be in line for the administration of these funds.

Three schools in Texas, because of the caution that the chairman of this committee and his members have exercised, have finally gotten together and resolved their differences and have joined hands now in a written agreement to serve as an institute to handle these funds.

This has been a commendable development in our State because now we have

Texas Tech and the University of Texas and Texas A. & M. all joining hands to administer the funds.

So I want to express myself as being in favor of this measure and I commend the committee again for the advancement of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, worthwhile research needs adequate financial participation to extend over several years so as to afford adequate opportunity to pursue promising leads. I, therefore, seek support and urge passage of H.R. 3606, a bill that will promote a more adequate national program of water research. I think that the funds made available for research through this bill are necessary to thwart the acute water crisis and supply shortages that are spreading across the Nation. I also believe that the bill is a realistic compromise under present fiscal conditions.

I am pleased that three fine schools in Texas—the University of Texas, A. & M. University, and Texas Tech—have joined hands to provide a water resource research council within the State. The effects of this measure will be so comprehensive that it will cover nearly every river and watershed in the State of Texas—from the Red River to the Gulf coast and from the Sabine to the Rio Grande in far south and west Texas.

Our expanding population is placing greater demands on our natural resources, and it behooves us as a nation to make available the tools to preserve our great natural water wealth.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has made reference to the University of Texas. He, of course, is not excluding other schools in Texas and in other States, which are not land-grant colleges which could be considered under this program. As the gentleman knows, I have a deep interest in Texas Technological College in my own district.

Mr. PICKLE. As the gentleman from Texas knows, now the three schools in Texas have joined and are on an equal basis in an institute to handle these funds. Texas Tech is a great school on the Plains. It is interesting to note in our State that three schools—Texas Tech, the University of Texas, and Texas A. & M.—cut across the high plains area through all the water districts down through the coastal areas, and this is good because every aspect is covered.

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

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. You would let some of the Iowa schools and some of the other schools have a little of this research work; would you not? I just do not want it all divided up between you two Texans over there.

Mr. PICKLE. I am sure the Department of Interior would accommodate the gentleman and he will get his equal share, I am certain.

Mr. GROSS. I notice the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives on the floor. I wonder if the

State of Massachusetts might figure on getting in on some of this research work.

Mr. PICKLE. I will let the chairman of the committee express himself on that. But, of course, all 50 States equally will participate as the gentleman from Iowa knows—even Iowa.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of the regular order.

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

There was no objection.

YESTERDAY'S DEBATE ON INFLATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I simply take this time to refer to the debate that occurred yesterday on the appropriation bill as it is reported in the March 29, 1966, RECORD.

As those who were present—and there was a pretty full attendance—know, one of the issues developed was this question of inflation and the seriousness of it. I took the floor of the House after listening to some of the presentation on the part of the majority party particularly the majority leader and the majority whip when it appeared to me quite clearly that they were treating inflation quite lightly. In fact, reference was made to inflation being a Republican cliché. In my remarks which appear on pages 7111-7112, I was directing attention to that aspect of the debate. I said among other things that we should get this debate back in context of the seriousness of inflation. Now I read the RECORD and I find, and I have just spoken to the majority leader, his remarks on pages 7109-7110. There is a very scholarly—and I want to commend him for it—a very scholarly discussion of inflation and the inflationary pressures that indeed face us.

Had these remarks been made on the floor of the House—and, as he said, the gentleman did not have time to present them—I, of course, would not have made the remarks that I did. I was trying to bring the debate around to a serious discussion of the problems of inflation. I do wish to commend the gentleman and others in the majority party for now making the record quite clear that inflation is far from a Republican cliché and that it is a serious issue which is facing our society.

For years I have suggested that a reform be made as far as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is concerned. I think that which is said on the floor of the House during the debate should be in one type and that which is put in the RECORD later—and those matters should be put in, I want to say; I am not arguing against the right to extend one's remarks. I think these considered observations belong in the RECORD—but for those who read the debate the next day, or for those who want to read it in the future, particularly interpreting or setting legislative history, these kinds of remarks not subject to cross-examination or the rebuttal of those who are on the floor participating in the debate ought to show up in a different kind of type.

I hope that this reform will be adopted. I understand that at one time in the Senate they had a procedure whereby matters which were inserted in the RECORD were printed in one type and that which was actually spoken on the floor and subject to rebuttal appeared in a different type.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. The gentleman will concede that there were some Members on this side who recognized yesterday the danger of inflation.

Mr. CURTIS. Oh, indeed so, and I am happy to say that the RECORD now shows quite clearly that we all, Republicans, Democrats, and the administration, do recognize that this is a serious situation that faces us. It undoubtedly will be a campaign issue, and it is just a shame, I would say, that the debate was not on that basis.

But, of course, the attempt yesterday by the majority leaders was to minimize inflation. It was on this basis that the majority were able to move forward this bill that had nothing to do with guns and nothing to do, really essentially, with helping the poor. It had to do with programs that could well have been deferred. Had the majority leaders presented inflation the way they did present it as one reads it in the RECORD today, I think the switch of the additional five votes that we lacked in order to cut back on nonessential expenditures might have occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I wish to compliment the chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the other members of the committee for the fine work that they have done in cooperating in the solution of one of the most serious problems with which our Nation is faced, and that is the water problem. It is not a problem that is confined to any particular section of the country, although it is more acute at times and in some places. It is more serious in some places generally. But it is a problem that faces all of us.

I think that this bill has been designed to provide a means of implementing a program that we did start earlier, and will make it possible to tap the scientific brains in all segments of the economy of this country, whether in educational areas or in the corporate industrial areas. We are able to go clear across the board in trying to find solutions to these very serious problems, and certainly they are most serious in the West.

The legislation which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings to the House today is designed to promote a more adequate national program for water research. This purpose would be accomplished by extending the authority in the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. As Chairman ASPINALL said, this expanded program is an important part of our overall national water re-

sources research effort. H.R. 3606 provides authority to the Secretary of the Interior for a program of research into all aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior.

Research grants or contracts could be made on a matching or other basis with Government agencies or with universities or other educational institutions or with private firms or with individuals. The objective of this program is to bring to bear on our national water problems the talents and research competence of our best trained scientists and the use of the best facilities available wherever they may be located.

As amended by the committee, H.R. 3606 would authorize the appropriation of \$85 million over a 10-year period beginning in fiscal year 1967.

Some of you may recall that the legislation which the committee recommends today authorizes a program which, 2 years ago, we deleted from the legislation enacted as the Water Resources Research Act of 1964. We disapproved it at that time because we favored a more modest beginning for this new program and because testimony at that time failed to show the immediate need for the authority requested.

In conference, 2 years ago, we reached agreement on the token title II program presently in the act, but that program has not been implemented because of language which permits the authorizing committees to bar appropriations for research projects.

The committee is now recommending the full title II program but we have placed in the legislation limitations which we believe are necessary if we are to meet our oversight responsibilities. We have limited the life of the program to 10 years in order to provide an opportunity for an overall review of accomplishments and needs at the end of that period and determine whether the program should be extended.

We have placed a provision in the legislation requiring that all contracts and other arrangements be submitted to the Congress 60 days in advance of execution in order to afford the committee an opportunity to review the research proposals and resolve any questions before the contracts or other arrangements are entered into.

We also have broadened the reporting requirement in the present act so that it covers the entire program and provides a detailed annual accounting of the appropriated funds.

All the testimony which the committee received during the hearings was designed to show that this additional authority under title II was needed if we were to take full advantage of available non-Federal scientific talent and research competence in the water field. This year a very good case was made for this legislation by the excellent testimony we have received.

The committee is now of the opinion that the title II program is needed and that it will greatly assist in resolving this Nation's ever-growing water problems. Contributing also to the committee's approval is the excellent start which has

been made in getting the program authorized 2 years ago off the ground and the leadership exemplified by Dr. Roland R. Renne, Director, Office of Water Resources Research, in administering the program.

We believe that the 2-year delay in approving the title II program has been beneficial. This was brought out in the testimony. The many cooperative arrangements that have been worked out among universities for participating in the research work of the State institutes would not have been possible had the title II program been fully authorized 2 years ago. Also, with the present program having gone through the shake-down period, we have been able to determine more accurately the extent of the scientific talent and research competence which is available and should be called upon but which cannot be utilized under present authority.

Mr. Chairman, after full and complete hearings and extensive study of this legislation, we are recommending that the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 be expanded to include the program authorized in H.R. 3606.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3606

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 331, 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 200. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969, \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, and \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972-1976, inclusive, from which appropriations the Secretary may make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in his judgment, adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which he may deem desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

"(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die."

Sec. 2. The last paragraph of section 104 of said Act is hereby repealed and a new sec-

tion 307 is added to that Act reading as follows:

"SEC. 307. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress on or before March 1 of each year showing the disposition during the preceding calendar year of moneys appropriated to carry out this Act, the results expected to be accomplished through projects financed during that year under sections 101 and 200 of this Act, and the conclusions reached in or other results achieved by those projects which were completed during that year. The report shall also include an account of the work of all institutes financed under section 100 of this Act and indicate whether any portion of an allotment to any State was withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment be considered as read in full and open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROOKS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3606) to promote a more adequate national program of water research, pursuant to House Resolution 801, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 801, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 22.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Motion offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 22, to promote a more adequate national program of water research, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 3606, as passed, as follows:

"That section 200 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 331, 42 U.S.C. 1961b) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 200. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1967, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1968, \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969, \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year

1970, \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971, and \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1972-1976, inclusive, from which appropriations the Secretary may make grants to and finance contracts and matching or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations or other institutions, with private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in his judgment, adequate for the conduct of water research projects, and with local, State, and Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior which he may deem desirable and which are not otherwise being studied.

"(b) No grant shall be made, no contract shall be executed, and no matching or other arrangement shall be entered into under subsection (a) of this section prior to sixty calendar days from the date the same is submitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and said sixty calendar days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die."

"Sec. 2. The last paragraph of section 104 of said Act is hereby repealed and a new section 307 is added to that Act reading as follows:

"Sec. 307. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and Congress on or before March 1 of each year showing the disposition during the preceding calendar year of moneys appropriated to carry out this Act, the results expected to be accomplished through projects financed during that year under sections 101 and 200 of this Act, and the conclusions reached in or other results achieved by those projects which were completed during that year. The report shall also include an account of the work of all institutes financed under section 100 of this Act and indicate whether any portion of an allotment to any State was withheld and, if so, the reasons therefor."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 3606) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 3606.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FOOD FOR INDIA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has forwarded for our consideration a message of great urgency and historic

significance. His eloquent message combines humanitarian motives with very realistic and very practical considerations.

I do not think we can emphasize too greatly the humanitarian aspects of this message. But it is about the more earthy and practical considerations which I speak now.

First: the national interest of the United States is clearly involved here. In Asia, where democracy has only a tenuous foothold, India can boast a deep commitment to free institutions. We cannot allow the light of this beacon to falter.

More than 500 million people—one-seventh of the population of the world—are Indians. For this number of people and their nation to be shaken by a tragic food crisis would undoubtedly have serious consequences for U.S. foreign policy. The President is not merely giving us an opportunity to throw a lifeline to a neighbor in danger; he is warning us that we must help sustain our friends if we are to save ourselves.

Second. India, perhaps more than any other developing nation, has proven its capacity for self-help. She has proclaimed an agricultural revolution, increasing her agricultural budget by well over 30 percent in recent months. India's leaders, gravely concerned at population growth totaling a million persons a month, have made a major commitment to population control, dispensing family planning information to literally millions of villagers across the subcontinent.

Third. This commitment of resources is one which our wealthy Nation can easily afford. The President proposes to supply wheat and food grains, and fiber with a total market value of \$400 to \$500 million. This is a prudent and realistic commitment; we could go far higher without diminishing our wholly adequate grain and commodity supply at home.

I am deeply impressed with the force and fervor of the President's appeal but I am even more struck by its shrewd and pragmatic approach. It makes good sense.

For that reason, I urge that the Congress give its approval to the pending resolution. By doing so we will demonstrate not only our compassion, not only our solidarity with the President; we will give historic testimony to our realism and commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in a forthright and frank message on the India food situation has laid the case before us.

Last year the rains did not come as expected over large sections of India. Farmers could not plant their crops in the dry soil. Other crops withered and died for lack of water. Indeed, as President Johnson pointed out, not since the Dust Bowl years of the 1930's here in

America has there been a greater agricultural disaster.

This natural disaster is not the fault of the Indian people. In a year in which Indian food production had to rise to meet the needs of India's growing population, the drought could not have come at a worse time.

Unless we act—unless the world acts—to help India over this crisis, the people of India face hunger, deprivation, and hardship.

The President's program of providing 3.5 million tons of food grain and other commodities such as corn, vegetable oil, and milk powder—and asking other nations to contribute generously—deserves our consideration and support.

This is a humanitarian program, in keeping with the finest traditions of our democracy, of sharing our abundance with the needy. We shall not turn our backs. We shall lend a helping hand.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the President has laid before us a stark message of impending tragedy. The drought which has afflicted the Indian subcontinent is of such massive extent that unless India receives, during the present year, several million tons of food from abroad, she will soon be facing the specter of mass starvation.

Leaders of India have appealed for help. The President of the United States has responded with an emergency program to add 3½ million tons of food grain to the 6½ million tons of grain already allotted for shipment to India during this fiscal year. He has asked Congress to endorse these shipments, and I believe that we should do so immediately and overwhelmingly.

India has been making considerable progress in self-help. During the past decade and a half she has increased her food production by 75 percent. She is in the midst of programs to greatly expand production of fertilizer and to introduce modern methods of agriculture. But in the midst of this continuing struggle, she has suffered a natural disaster which is expected to reduce her food grain production from 88 million tons last year to perhaps 75 million tons this year. That is the fatal arithmetic of starvation.

Our Canadian friends have already announced plans to provide at least a million tons of wheat and flour to India. Other nations will come forward. Every civilized and humane people has a moral obligation to avert this terrible crisis. And that obligation rests heaviest on the people of America who are the wealthiest, most affluent people in all history.

We have never turned our backs to those who are in genuine need. We will not do so now.

The President has full authority to act on these emergency proposals without further congressional action. He could do so under Public Law 480. He has

asked us, however, for our concurrence and endorsement. I am sure that this endorsement will be promptly forthcoming from our Agriculture Committee. Let us then by our vote on this floor, tell the people of India and of the world that America's heart is as great as our resources. Let us give a strong and generous response and let India then show her cooperation by pushing the production of food on land now devoted to the production of cotton.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's message on the India food situation is a remarkable document.

In an hour of need, our great democracy seeks to extend a helping hand to a sister democracy. The President has called upon other nations of the world to join in this great humanitarian effort.

The Congress now has its responsibility. It is to consider the President's proposal carefully. Let us do this. Let us then arise as one body to approve this truly worthwhile program placed before us.

People of India are confronted with an unprecedented drought. This natural disaster is not of their own making. Unless the world responds, India faces famine.

To stem hunger, India estimates that it will need an additional 6 to 7 million tons of food grain through next December—beyond what has already been committed or expected. The President's proposal contemplates the shipment of 3.5 million tons of grain by the United States to help meet this need.

Other nations have been invited to match our contribution. I know that the response throughout the world will be strong and generous. The action of Canada in preparing to provide a million tons of wheat and flour sets an example for other countries and other people to follow.

The Indian Government is moving to help its nation in vigorous and farsighted programs of self-help. Our action in endorsing the program proposed by President Johnson to help tide India over the crisis of the drought will show that we are committed to the cause of free men everywhere.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the President has requested congressional endorsement for increased shipments of agricultural commodities to India during the coming months. I think it noteworthy that the President has communicated this request to the Congress even

though he already has authority to take the actions he contemplates under Public Law 480. This is an example of the President's continuing determination to act with the advice and cooperation of the Congress, and he is to be commended for it.

I urge that we endorse the President's emergency program forthwith. Let there be no doubt or question about what is at stake here: either India receives 11 to 12 million tons of imported grain during the present year, or millions of men, women, and children will starve to death on the Indian subcontinent. I do not believe that there is a civilized nation in the world that is prepared to stand by and watch such a calamity occur.

From my brief examination of the President's proposal, I judge that we are asked to send to India food grains of a market value of some \$400 to \$500 million. This is well within our resources. Furthermore, we can make these shipments without dangerously depleting our own agricultural reserves. It is worth noting, also, that India intends to pay for this grain with rupees which we may then turn back to India in the form of loans or other funding to help India move forward more rapidly into an era of modern agriculture.

I think the fact should also be recorded that India's present crisis is not of her own making. Contrary to what some believe, India's agriculture has been improving, year by year, and 80 percent of her effort in this direction has been self-financed.

Premier Gandhi has informed the President, I understand, that India intends to greatly expand its fertilizer program by encouraging more private foreign investment. There is to be a 30-percent increase in India's agricultural budget. Finally, it is the Prime Minister's intention to move forcefully to bring under control India's exploding population.

It is true that much more must be done and done faster and more efficiently. But the great human crisis now approaching India is the result of an unavoidable, natural disaster. India is now in the midst of one of the greatest droughts in human history. The magnitude of her problem can be seen from the fact that last year India produced a bumper crop of 88 million tons of food grains. With her population increasing by almost a million hungry mouths every month, she would have needed still more this year. But because of the terrible drought which has descended upon her, this year's production will be only some 74 to 76 million tons.

Unless the more fortunate peoples of the world now step forward and extend the hand of common humanity, this shortage will very soon be translated into the stark tragedy of starvation.

The President proposes to avert that tragedy. He urges—and intends to continue urging—other nations to do so. I wish to add my own voice to his, and to the pleas of decent men everywhere that help be sent—and sent now.

Let us not merely endorse the President's proposal. Let us endorse it overwhelmingly so that the world may see

that the American people are staunch friends in time of need, no less than we are firm allies in times of war.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the President's message on food for India.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CREDIT SOARS, CREDITORS SCORE

Mr. ANNUNZIO. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial entitled, "The Virtue of Profligacy." This editorial deals primarily with the rapid expansion of consumer credit in our country. It points out that in many cases credit is too easily obtained, a situation which has led to wage earners getting in debt over their heads.

Unfortunately, lenders too often encourage borrowers to "get in over their heads" because the creditors know full well that the law is on their side. For instance, among Inland Steel Co.'s 22,000 production employees in the Chicago area, nearly 10 percent have a portion of their wages withheld every payday to pay off delinquent debts. I am certain that many of these debts are bona fide obligations. However, interest rate laws in our country are shockingly lax and our courts in many cases have acted strangely in awarding debt charges and garnishments against debtors, who in many cases are never informed that they are being taken to court.

The debt judgment and garnishment procedures which follow have become far too automatic in our court system. It is time that our courts took a critical look at themselves to make certain that debtors are given every opportunity to present their side of the case and that high-pressure finance companies and other lenders are not gaining favorable positions in the eyes of the courts.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1966]

THE VIRTUE OF PROFLIGACY

Among Inland Steel Co.'s 22,000 production employees in the Chicago area, nearly 10 percent have a portion of their wages withheld every payday to pay off delinquent debts. While the Inland workers probably aren't typical of the whole population, their dreary credit record helps point up a growing national problem.

Consumer credit outstanding has nearly doubled in the past 7 years, rising to nearly \$90 billion. Though most Americans use credit responsibly, an increasing number are submerging themselves in overdue obligations; the result, as a recent story in this newspaper reported, can be personal tragedy, even suicide.

Obviously, then, a cause for serious concern, and yet some of the approaches to the

problem seem incapable of offering anything like a full solution.

Labor unions and other groups are urging new laws to defend beleaguered debtors, and perhaps certain changes are needed. It seems excessive, for instance, to allow Federal and State tax collectors to seize a man's entire paycheck or to permit Kentucky businessmen to take all but \$16.87 a week.

There's more than a chance, however, that the process of legal change will go too far. As a number of businessmen and other creditors are arguing, the Nation has come a long way since the days of debtors' prisons; personal bankruptcy laws and other statutes now often make it possible for debtors to avoid paying most or all of their legitimate obligations.

Any further legal revisions surely should be fair to creditors as well as debtors, and not only for reasons of equity. Credit is essential to the present-day economy, and many businessmen simply may not extend it if laws are passed to unduly weaken their ability to collect from customers.

Evenhanded debt-collection laws, in any case, clearly can't make all Americans use credit rationally. Nor will it help much to require, as the administration proposes, that all lenders state credit costs in the same way. If a consumer is foolish enough to overburden himself with debt, it won't matter greatly whether his credit costs are high, low, or in between.

More productive might be an extension of credit education through the Nation's schools, a process that is already underway. Something can be said, too, for stricter enforcement of present laws to curb deceptive and dishonest lenders; they may be a small minority, but there's no question that they exist.

Beyond that, a lot of quite reputable businessmen can't escape a share of the responsibility for the troubles in consumer credit. High-powered advertising and promotion has helped produce vast changes in public attitudes toward debt over the past three or four decades. Maybe it was overly puritanical to consider borrowing almost a sin, as many of our fathers did, but the pendulum now perhaps has swung too far in the other direction. In not a few business establishments today a customer who wants to pay cash finds himself regarded as a bit peculiar.

In their own interest, lenders could stand a stronger dash of self-restraint. By paying a little less attention to boosting their business and a little more to a borrower's actual ability to repay, they not only would protect their own solvency but possibly head off new restrictive legislation.

It's more than slightly ironical that the source of some of that legislation probably would be the same Federal Government whose own carefree fiscal and monetary policies have done so much to foster an easy-going philosophy among the public. The way Washington has been living it up, it may be surprising that a large proportion of the population still remains free of credit woes.

Many of these fortunate ones, of course, are sustained mainly by the present high level of prosperity. If more widespread trouble is to be averted in some perhaps not distant future, creditors, debtors and the Government all had better get over any notion that profligacy now is a positive virtue.

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. 2669. An act to establish safety standards for motor vehicle tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

UNITED STATES BLOCKING ACTION AGAINST RIGHTS LEADER

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently in Atlanta, Ga., one Hosea Williams, a top aid to Martin Luther King, was found in possession of keys to a stolen car.

According to William B. Williams, of the Atlanta Journal, the FBI and the district attorney in Atlanta wanted to bring charges against Williams but were told by the Justice Department in Washington "to keep quiet about the matter involving stolen cars that ended up in the possession of persons involved with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference."

Mr. Speaker, if this be true, it is an outrage. It is a serious indictment against the Justice Department. I am today calling on the Judiciary Committee of this House to investigate this case thoroughly.

The Attorney General of the United States should also make an investigation.

Why should a grand jury in Atlanta be prohibited by the Justice Department in Washington from investigating a serious charge against anyone.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the front page story which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of March 18, 1966, under the headline "United States Blocking Action Against Rights Leader."

I hope every Member will read this shocking report.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Mar. 18, 1966]
UNITED STATES BLOCKING ACTION AGAINST RIGHTS LEADER

(By William B. Williams)

The Justice Department in Washington has clamped a muzzle on local Federal law enforcement officials to prevent them from taking action against a prominent civil rights worker, the Atlanta Journal has learned.

The newspaper has just concluded a month-long investigation in which Government officials in Washington and Atlanta and civil rights workers themselves were questioned.

One local Federal officer told a reporter that employees of his agency here were "sick at the soul" because of what they consider to be high-handed tactics by the Justice Department.

None would * * * on the record. They were afraid of losing their jobs. But * * * sources high in the Federal Government said, in separate interviews, the following:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation here is concerned about one stolen car, at least, which had keys that were kept by Hosea Williams, a top attache to Dr. Martin Luther King.

The FBI and the office of Charles L. Goodson, U.S. district attorney here, wanted to bring charges involving the prominent civil rights leader, Mr. Williams, but were told to lay off by the Justice Department.

The Justice Department sent from Washington two attorneys, Alfred E. Moreton and Frank J. Cunningham, to prosecute two men, Harold Belton Andrews and Morris Finley, for the theft of a single car.

The FBI and the district attorney and his staff were told to keep quiet about the matter involving stolen cars that ended up in the possession of persons involved with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

The persons involved paid for the cars. How much they paid and what the circumstances were is a secret known only to the persons involved and the high brass of Federal Government.

The investigation by the Journal extended from the offices of the Justice Department in Washington to the racial ghettos of Atlanta.

Many would not talk. Some made guarded comments. But three men of officialdom, their faces drawn, quietly closed the doors of their offices and told their stories.

"I've been fighting this thing since November, and I'm sick at the soul to think what our country is coming to. Today it is auto theft. Maybe tomorrow it will be murder," one official said.

"I have to presume Hosea Williams is innocent. But believe me, it is a matter for a jury to decide. Not the Justice Department in Washington," another official said.

"Don't let them tell you this isn't a cover up. They are covering up for civil rights groups that seem to be getting bigger and stronger than the U.S. Government," another said.

All said they would not admit anything publicly because of their jobs.

All had thought that somehow the Justice Department finally would come through and permit local Federal officials to do what they consider is their duty.

But on a Monday, March 7, without any fanfare, a Federal grand jury here returned an indictment against Harold Belton Andrews and Morris Finley, a printer who turns out work for SCLC.

The indictment was curt. It charged that Andrews and Finley transported a stolen 1965 Dodge Dart from Arlington to Atlanta. It did not say what person the car was stolen from, nor did it give the serial number or motor number.

Efforts to obtain this information failed. An FBI spokesman in Washington said he could not locate the information and the newspaper should call the local FBI office. The local FBI refused to discuss anything about the case.

The Justice Department in Washington had been called more than a month ago to determine whether Hosea Williams was involved in an investigation concerning stolen cars.

There was hesitation on the other end of the line. And Jack Rosenthal, top information specialist for the Justice Department, said he did not know how to answer such a question. He said if there were any developments, he would inform the press.

After Andrews and Finley were indicted, Attorney Cunningham was telephoned at the Justice Department in Washington. He was asked if SCLC workers were involved in charges of possession of stolen cars and why he and Mr. Moreton were called into the case. It is rare for Washington attorneys to come down to Atlanta to handle an auto theft case.

Mr. Cunningham referred the call to Carl Belcher of the Justice Department. Mr. Belcher would not talk to the reporter, but told his secretary to refer the call to public information.

Mr. Rosenthal said he could not comment on why Washington attorneys were handling an auto theft case in Atlanta. He said that out of fairness to the defendants in the case, he could not discuss the matter.

Finley, who was indicted on the charge of transporting a stolen car, is president of Diamond Printing Co. His small shop in a seedy section of Cain Street was visited.

Finley said he feels that he is faced with the possibility of being forced to take the rap for something he did not do. He told a reporter that most of his business comes from SCLC and that he would rather "rot" in prison before he implicated SCLC.

He said that he had met a man he considered a used car dealer and bought a car from him. He said he used the car in his business. It was a 1965 Dodge Dart. Later, he said, he was told by law enforcement officers it was a stolen car.

He said that before learning this, he had introduced some "influential" people to the man. He said these people innocently dealt with the man. He added that he would not give the name of the "dealer."

Harold Behon Andrews, indicted along with Finley, has not been arrested. Officials at the U.S. marshal's office said they had sent the warrant to Macon. Macon officials said Andrews had not been located.

For more information, the Journal checked officials in DeKalb County. The county police had nothing on Andrews, but the sheriff's office did.

A warrant for his arrest, charging him with taking a car, was sworn out September 25, 1965, by Hertz Corp.

Andrews was charged with taking a car rented from the Hertz Corp. at 40 Auburn Avenue NE. It was a Chevrolet Impala, four door with engine number 164395a127033.

Max B. Barrett, manager of the Hertz branch office, said Hertz did not want to prosecute the case.

An employe of Hertz, however, said the car had been discovered in Madison, Ga., in the possession of civil rights workers.

Sheriff W. H. Knight of Morgan County said he remembers the arrest. The workers, headed by Peter Cave, were charged with driving a vehicle with improper registration, he said.

Records in his office showed the car had been missing since August 16. Sheriff Knight said the workers were arrested September 24, and were en route to racial demonstrations in Crawfordville.

He said the car contained a bill of sale to a man he identified as Lester Hankinson, a SCOPE worker. SCOPE, headed by Mr. Williams, is an arm of SCLC.

He said Mr. Cave said that Hosea Williams had given him the keys to the car.

State Trooper L. E. Miller and Sgt. Joe Henderson in Madison said that Cave had said although the car was in Mr. Hankinson's name, it bought for SCLC.

Trooper Miller said the license plate on the car had been stolen from an Augusta woman, Mrs. Della D. Armstrong.

He said the plate had been stolen from her Ford.

Hosea Williams told a Journal reporter he had no idea the car was stolen and that only one which subsequently proved to be stolen was involved in operations. R. T. Blackwell, program director for SCLC, acknowledged that "one or two stolen cars" had been connected with SCLC and "an investigation is being made."

He added that Mr. Williams was in charge of buying cars, and Mr. Williams had the bills of sale on the questionable cars notarized. He said SCLC and Mr. Williams never bought a car unless they believed they were dealing with a car dealer.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Hankinson had thought he had proper title to the car. He said that Mr. Hankinson left town on a mission and had left the car at home and turned the keys over to Mr. Williams.

The SCOPE leader said he had given the keys to the civil rights workers to participate in the demonstration. He added that Mr. Cave was incorrect if he told law officers that the car had been bought for SCLC.

Mr. Finley charged that some Government men used pressure to get him to lie about SCLC.

THE JAPANESE TRADE MISSION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an address by Mr. HANNA.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to visit here in our Capitol with a Japanese trade mission sent specifically to the Pacific coast to study and pursue possibilities of expanding new trade and eliminating or reducing problems in connection with existing trade relations. California enjoys a billion dollar business in Japan so we are understandably interested in and pleased by the visit of the outstanding delegates who make up this mission.

A substantial part of the goods sent from California to Japan are agricultural products such as soy bean, corn, wheat, and cotton. Coming, as I do, from one of the most productive agricultural areas in our great State, I am well aware of the very healthy trade my cottongrowers and other farmers enjoy with our Pacific neighbors. Far beyond my personal and parochial interest, however, I look on Japan and the other countries of the Pacific as holding rich and rewarding potentials for economic expansion of all the West.

Mr. Speaker, the spread of our national policy and influence in Europe has brought great advantages and prosperity to the Atlantic coast through the great ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Atlanta. We are a nation whose shores are washed by two great oceans. Why should not the Western States begin to enjoy, through constructive programs of partnership and cooperation, the benefits of Pacific trade flowing through the great ports of Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Stockton, Los Angeles-Long Beach, and San Diego.

At a noonday luncheon hosted by the Japanese-American Trade Council, and honoring the members of the Japanese trade mission, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA], presented a very excellent and instructive address indicating the great amount of time and thought he has given to the problem. In addition, he made statements which I think challenge both Americans and Japanese to face up to certain realities.

Mr. Speaker, because of the enthusiasm with which Mr. HANNA's address was received and the challenge it affords, under unanimous consent, I make his remarks available to my colleagues in the House:

THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY: LET US BEGIN TO BUILD

(By Congressman RICHARD T. HANNA)

It is indeed a great privilege for me to be invited to address the members of the distinguished economic trade mission from Japan. I am certain that the mission is prov-

ing productive and beneficial both to its members as well as the American Government and business officials who have been participating in the conferences on the west coast, and here in the East.

At the reception held this morning by Congressman STAGGERS, at which time the members of the economic mission had occasion to meet many Members of Congress, I remarked to Mission Chairman Hiyama how productive I thought it was to have the chance to develop personal, informal contacts that are not restricted by the structured situations so often the rule among diplomats. I have long felt that international relations are just too important to be left entirely to the diplomats.

Some of the most beneficial sessions I had during my trip to the Far East last year were during informal meetings with businessmen and fellow legislators. The meaningful rapport that develops during these less structured meetings go a long way in breaking down the artificial barriers between people. Too often diplomats become so concerned with what I call the strictures of structure that they do not allow themselves the necessary flexibility to deal with the real problems.

I know this first Japanese trade mission of the postwar era has done much to open new channels of this personal and meaningful type of diplomacy.

I was pleased to note that the mission spent some time in my home State of California, and I hoped they received a definite and clear indication of the enthusiasm for trade and other relations between my State and Japan.

As you know my enthusiasm includes not only Japan, but the entire Pacific community. I am sure that by now this audience is sufficiently impressed with the mutual admiration society exchanges that recite all the present and future advantages accruing from Pacific development and trade. And it has occurred to me that you might well prefer to hear some frank remarks on the problems to developing Pacific community, as well as the potentialities that Pacific trade holds forth.

One problem is the misconception as to what community is. Community is not just the same geographical neighborhood. Living in the same neighborhood, even being next door neighbors, is no guarantee of community.

Mutual aims and mutual effort produce community. The knowledge that goals are similar, and that the attainment of those goals can be more easily reached by working together, are the vital elements of community. Certainly we who are concerned with developing a Pacific community are fully cognizant of the concept. However, it is going to take more than just the recognition that Pacific community is desirable, and can be. It is going to take tremendous effort. We are going to have to determine what our mutuality of interests are, and then we will have to carefully build the machinery that will make the community. The concept is here, now let us move on to the building process.

One way to build is to increase understanding. Here in the United States there is not enough understanding of the political, social, and economic problems faced by the nations composing the Pacific community. Here is an area in which we can make substantial progress if we are willing. Here is an important first step—mutual understanding of the problems of our neighbors.

Another problem faced by those of us who would hope to build Pacific community relates directly to trade. It is the old and ever present problem of protectionism versus expansionism. Those who look to protect what they have only concern themselves with the

short-range goals. By protecting what already exists you open yourself to the danger of not recognizing the potentials of the future. The short-range people cannot afford to look to the future because of their fear of losing what little they have now. And so instead of bettering everyone's position the protectionist looks after his own, and, as a result, no one benefits.

Well, gentlemen, I can tell you that I have a commitment to the future. The short-range goals of protectionism are not the answer, for the burdens of protectionism far outweigh any of its advantages. The United States and Japan have the obligation to include the other Pacific community nations in the growing Pacific trade. We may well boast that more than 50 percent of the trade in the Pacific is dominated by the United States and Japan. But the volume of our joint sales is only \$11 billion a year. Percentages do not impress me. Volume is the key that determines the health of trade. Why can't we work to have 20 percent of a \$50 billion yearly trade. Certainly in terms of real money, we would gain more, and there would be a substantial slice for the other nations that make up the Pacific community. Yes, gentlemen, the future is in expanding our potential, not protecting the little that has already been gained.

I have noted with many other of my colleagues the strong growth of nationalism that has dominated the world scene in recent years. Many voices have been raised with concern that this emerging drive makes more difficult the building process. I prefer to believe that this modern nationalism is enlightened self-interest rather than blind chauvinism, and such enlightened nationalism is not incompatible with international cooperation.

The presence of the Japanese mission here has undergirded my confidence that at least in Japan modern nationalism is of the enlightened variety where self-interest is served by building institutions between nations, and not just for a nation. Certainly the historic meeting between the top level Cabinet Ministers of the southeast Asian countries to be held in Japan in April of this year to discuss intensified multilateral economic cooperation is another excellent example of this enlightened attitude.

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I believe it incumbent upon me to propose specific institutions that could serve in helping build and expand the potential of the Pacific. I have two such proposals to make today.

First, I think the time is now right to follow up the Asian Development Bank with a Pacific Trade Bank. The Asian Development Bank has been a significant step forward, but the Bank is designed to take care of one particular aspect of Pacific affairs—development loans. A Pacific Trade Bank would add additional momentum to developing Pacific nations by providing them with machinery that could make their trade currency more readily convertible. Convertible currency is the lubricant of healthy trade. Conversely, lack of foreign exchange is the main bottleneck stifling developing nations. Part and parcel with this we should strongly support Mr. Eugene Black's position that underdeveloped nations be given a position on the International Monetary Fund.

An institution on the order of a Pacific Trade Bank would have a tremendous stimulating effect on expanding trade potential within the Pacific community. The Bank would serve as a clearinghouse for settling accounts on an agreed formula to be worked out. And this Bank might also be used for types of commercial loans currently not being made by private commercial banks in the underdeveloped countries. Such loans, when made, might pursue and encourage participation by private banks now operating in the Pacific area.

Another institution that is long overdue in the Pacific is an association for Pacific bankers. There is a real need to promote communications which would facilitate an efficient flow of necessary information between the members of the Pacific banking community. An association of this nature would provide the vital machinery that would create and mold the contacts so essential for the smooth flow and expansion of business. Such an association could be an innovative and vital force in the promotion and support for the Pacific Trade Bank as well as other Pacific community building blocks of the future.

These, of course, are just two approaches that should be studied as means of building the Pacific community. There are many other imaginative and necessary areas that we must explore. We cannot afford to restrict our imagination or creativity. We cannot afford not to put all our great talent, energy, and ingenuity to the task of building; for the rewards will be astounding, and of significant benefit to all men. Our task is to begin constructing and expanding, and no obstacle, political, social, or economic, should be considered too formidable to overcome.

The great challenge before us today is insuring that the potentiality of the Pacific community is understood and pursued. Today we stand on the threshold. We cannot be satisfied with a small rice bowl with all the chopsticks crowded in trying to get their small share of the rice. We can, and must, work toward a tomorrow when there will be an ever larger and expanding rice bowl where all the chopsticks will receive an ever increasing portion.

George Bernard Shaw once commented that "We have no more right to consume happiness without producing it than to consume wealth without producing it." The potential of the Pacific community offers us our opportunity to produce wealth. To reach out and grasp this opportunity is the challenge.

DUMPING CORN TO CONTROL PRICES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, once again the farmer, particularly the corn farmer, is the victim of Secretary Freeman's corn marketing manipulations to regiment agriculture and control prices. During the past 3 months Government-owned corn has literally been dumped on the market. The obvious purpose of this action is to force farmers into the feed grain control program and to depress the price of corn so that meat prices will be lowered through an increase in production of hogs.

Instead of dealing realistically with the basic cause of the inflation that is rapidly engulfing our economy, the administration persists in employing the politically expedient stopgap method of trying to hold the line on prices. Instead of reducing nondefense spending on various social programs, that we may better meet the Vietnam defense demands, the administration uses the artificial approach of selling materials from our defense stockpiles, such as in the instance of copper and aluminum, and dumping agricultural commodities on

the market, as has been done with corn these past 3 months.

It is true that overall food prices have been rising. But feed grain prices have been declining. The explanation of the increased food prices is to be found in the increased processing, packaging, and marketing costs, certainly not in the price of the commodities off the farm.

The farmer himself is a sufferer from the increase in industrial costs. The farmer has had to pay more to produce the commodities for which he receives less. The purchasing power of the farmer's income dollar has declined like the dollar of every one of us.

Notwithstanding, Secretary Freeman proceeds to depress the price of corn that there may be a stimulant to hog and cattle production and in due course lower the price of pork and beef. The administration seeks to regulate our economy by artificial extra-legal means.

Addressing the annual convention of the National Farmers Union in Denver on March 16, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman sought to defend the dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation corn and other farm commodities. He asserted that "recent sales of CCC grain stocks are consistent with the ever-normal granary principle."

His words strongly suggest that Mr. Freeman does not understand the ever-normal granary concept. His grain-dumping operations indicate he does not realize Congress chartered CCC to support and strengthen farm prices, not to break them. The Corporation is specifically charged with "stabilizing, supporting and protecting farm income and prices."

Nevertheless, Mr. Freeman has again undertaken a market-wrecking liquidation of Government-owned corn stocks. This appears to be a dual effort to undercut cattle and hog prices and, at the same time, force farmers into compliance with his so-called voluntary feed grains control program. Farmers previously went through all of this with the Secretary during the 1961-62 marketing year and the results were disastrous for both producers and consumers.

Nearly a billion bushels of CCC corn were dumped on the market in competition with sales by producers. The depressed corn prices which resulted cost farmers about \$370 million dollars, according to a study by the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture. This was only the beginning. As many of us predicted at the time, an abundant supply of cheap feed would stimulate unsound expansion of cattle and hog numbers and marketings. The full effects were felt in 1963-64 when both cattle and hog prices plunged to disastrously low levels. Recordbreaking imports of foreign beef put additional pressure on the market. Most cattle feeders actually lost money on every steer they sent to market—as much as \$40 to \$50 per head.

This, Mr. Freeman might argue, gave consumers a break on meat prices. Temporarily, it did. But then what happened? Farmers cut back sharply on hog numbers and cattle feeding operations. Livestock prices started climbing and with this, of course, so did re-

tail meat prices. Today the prices of many meat cuts are prohibitive for middle-income and low-income families. And they feel the strain on their pocket-books even more because the costs of all goods and services are moving higher at the same time.

The average consumer has every right to complain about the rapid rise in the cost of living. At the same time, every American should remember that it is the inflationary policies of the Government itself which are largely responsible. Even Secretary Freeman's feed grain dumping program of 1961-62, which was launched as a price-deflating move, now has come back in the form of higher meat prices to haunt the administration.

But the Secretary seems determined to create another feast and famine cycle with his current liquidation of CCC inventories.

Livestock producers do not enjoy boom-and-bust prices any more than consumers do. They would much prefer more stability from year to year in hog and cattle prices, just as consumers would be far happier with less violent fluctuations in the cost of meats and other food products.

Today meat prices are high because livestock marketings are low. But price is only one factor in the farm income equation. It is price times volume, minus operating expenses, that determines net farm income. For many livestock producers, net income today would be higher if they had more hogs and cattle to sell, even at somewhat lower prices. The consumer would also benefit. I fear, however, that Mr. Freeman is setting in motion another boom-and-bust livestock cycle which will be harmful to both farmers and consumers.

Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently made it clear that the current corn-dumping program is a calculated administration move designed to control meat prices. In a television interview on the "Today Show," March 10, 1966, he said:

I mentioned the fact that increase in supplies of pork depend on the difference between the price of hogs and the price of corn, and we're trying to hold down the price of corn. The Government acquired large stocks of corn in its past price support operation; now we're releasing them into the market.

He makes it clear enough that Government-owned corn is being used to manipulate farm prices downward.

The Johnson administration might well look beyond farm prices, however, in its search for causes and cures relating to higher living costs. For example, more than three-fifths of the cost of the food the housewife wheels through the supermarket checkout counter is added after these commodities leave the farm.

Higher processing, packaging, transportation and handling costs, along with higher taxes and wages, have accounted for the major upward trend in food prices.

It is interesting to compare farm prices and retail food prices of February 1951, when the Korean war was at its height, with today's Vietnam war prices.

U.S. Department of Agriculture figures show that average prices received by farmers for the commodities they market were 13 percent lower in February 1966, than they were in the same month of 1951.

On the other hand, Bureau of Labor Statistics figures reveal that in 1951, it took \$9.54 to buy at retail the same food which today costs \$11.10—an increase of more than 16 percent.

With farm prices down 13 percent and retail food prices up 16 percent from America's last war to the present one, clearly you must look beyond the farmer for the explanation. The real villain is inflation—inflation created primarily by the policies of Government itself.

And among the principal victims of inflation are farmers. In 1960, for example, American farmers spent a total of \$26.242 billion to meet their production costs. For 1965, farm production expenses were estimated at \$30.249 billion. That represents an increase of \$4 billion in farm costs over a 5-year period. To put it another way, had farm production costs remained stable over that period, net farm income in 1965 would have been \$18 billion, instead of \$14 billion.

Even though the administration keeps saying that net farm income in 1965 was the highest ever, Secretary Freeman admitted in his Farmers Union speech that the 1965 level had been exceeded "five times in this century." The years involved were those immediately following World War II and the Korean war years of 1951 and 1952.

The number of farm units in the United States has declined by about one-fifth since 1960 and the trend shows no sign of abating. So now it is fashionable in administration circles to talk about the improvement in net income per farm. If a pie is cut into a smaller number of pieces, obviously each slice will be larger. This is the statistical gimmick which is being used today to make it appear that farm income is steadily improving.

Another point which the administration conveniently overlooks—and this gets back to inflation again—is the fact that the \$14 billion in net farm income reported for 1965 will buy only about as much as the \$12.675 billion farmers earned in 1958. Inflation has chipped about 10 percent from the purchasing power of the dollar since 1957-59, the base period which the Government uses in computing its consumer price index. Inflation hits farmers just as hard as it hits urban residents.

Disenchantment with administration farm programs is illustrated in the refusal of many farmers to sign up for the 1966 feed grains program. The Secretary expressed some alarm over this in his recent Farmers Union speech. During the first two-thirds of the 1965 sign-up, 936,114 farms with a total base of 52.4 million acres came into the program. During the same period of the current sign-up, which ends April 1, 903,038 farms with a total feed grain base of around 46 million acres were enrolled. According to the Department of Agriculture's recent report of "farmers intention to plant," indications are that corn acreage will be up about 2½ percent this year.

Apparently many farmers are getting tired of participating in a program which requires them to reduce their planted acreage only to have the Secretary of Agriculture come along with a massive feed grain dumping program which clobbers market prices for their crop. Farmers may have decided that if Orville Freeman is determined to push prices down, their only alternative is to produce and market more bushels in an effort to increase income.

There is little doubt that the current corn-dumping program is designed not only as an exercise in unauthorized price control but also as a device to club farmers into compliance with the feed grains program. Appearing before the House Agriculture Committee nearly a year ago, the Secretary candidly admitted this was the purpose of the 1961-62 grain dumping operation. He said:

We purposely sold in order to move our prices down far enough so that they would be way below the support level, the loan level, so that we could thereby get compliance. That was the whole intent and purpose and thrust of the program.

From the beginning of the crop year last October 1, through March 11, 1966, Commodity Credit Corporation sold 290 million bushels of corn for unrestricted domestic use, plus an additional 54 million bushels for export. During the single week ending March 4, CCC sales totaled 79 million bushels of corn. These sales were made in direct competition with farmer marketings and at a time when there would normally be a seasonal rise in corn prices. Instead, corn prices have dropped about 10 cents per bushel under the weight of Government selling.

By concentrating its heaviest sales in the January-February-March quarter, CCC has preempted much of the commercial corn market which farmers would otherwise supply from their own stocks. The Government's uncommitted inventory of corn was down to 215 million bushels by March 11 and must be considerably lower today. If CCC continues its present rate of corn dumping, the bottom of the bin will be reached shortly. The Government may be out of corn—with no uncommitted reserve supply—before the 1966 crop is even in the ground. This may be Mr. Freeman's concept of the ever-normal granary but it was not Henry Wallace's.

At the very time the administration is seeking legislation "to establish and maintain reserve stocks of agricultural commodities for national security," the Secretary of Agriculture is completing the liquidation of the Government's reserve supply of corn. It makes you wonder if the telephone line between the White House and the Department of Agriculture has gone dead.

In recent months, the copper and aluminum industries have had a taste of the same bitter medicine that farmers have been swallowing for several years. Dumping and threats of dumping Government stockpiles have been employed as a price-control mechanism. In the absence of specific legislative authority to control prices, the administration has

used, insofar as possible, the sale of Government stockpiled commodities to impose price ceilings. The process has worked to some degree, on a selective basis, up to now. But there are relatively few sectors of the economy which can be singled out for this kind of treatment. The Government has no inventory of automobiles, homes, television sets, clothing or professional services which can be fed into the market to control prices. Neither does it have an inventory of manpower which can be thrown into the job market as a means of controlling wages.

The administration has clearly indicated it will continue to push for increased Federal expenditures on the home front at the same time it is channeling more and more billions of dollars into the war in Vietnam. The Nation's economy is in another inflationary spiral which will not be halted by efforts to deflate or control farm prices and metals prices alone.

Are we fast moving toward the time when all-out wage and price controls will be sought by the administration as the only alternative to galloping inflation?

POWER PLAY

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the RECORD what I consider to be an extremely well written article that appeared in the March 29 issue of the Wall Street Journal. It is based on a recent decision of the Supreme Court of Colorado that an electric generating plant constructed by a group of rural electric cooperatives would simply duplicate the already existing capacity of investor-owned utility corporations serving the area. This article shows how far the Rural Electrification Administration has strayed from its original purpose; namely, to bring electric power to family farms. More than 98 percent of the Nation's farms now have electricity, but the REA's program continues to expand as it builds more generating and transmission facilities that to a large extent serve non-farm and nonrural areas and encroach more and more on fully taxed, investor-owned utility companies that have to pay the full market rate for the money that finances them.

In contrast to the investor-owned electric utility companies, REA cooperatives are financed with money borrowed from the Federal Government at the fantastically low rate of 2 percent. Yet the Government itself is now paying close to 5 percent on vast sums it owes the public. A bill that I introduced last January 6, 1965 (H.R. 1738), would put an end to this ridiculous 2-percent subsidy.

In its three decades of existence REA has advanced some \$4.5 billion of loans

to these cooperatives, and it estimates that its borrowers will want more than \$3 billion of such loans in the next 15 years. If allowed to continue, what does this octopuslike growth, nurtured on 2-percent borrowings, presage, not only for the investor-owned electric utility companies but also, perhaps, for the whole system of free private enterprise?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 29, 1966]

POWER PLAY—COLORADO CASE SHOWS REA HAS STRAYED FROM ORIGINAL AIM

(By Roger W. Benedict)

High in the Colorado Rockies, just west of the Continental Divide, a new coal-fired 150,000-kilowatt powerplant sends out a steady flow of electricity for customers as far away as Nevada.

Until a few weeks ago, this 9-month-old plant, which with its network of long-distance transmission lines represents an investment of about \$30.5 million, was the pride of thousands of the area's local residents, who technically own a share of it. But now it's suddenly become the source of considerable uneasiness to farmers and townspeople across much of the western slope, and even in neighboring States.

Last month, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled that use in the project of \$22,867,000 of Federal funds was illegal, and that the State's public utilities commission erred in approving its construction. Now even the plant's most ardent backers hesitate to predict what's to become of it.

"This has been quite a shock to this community," reports Ora K. Harris, a lumber dealer in nearby Craig, Colo., one of the few who opposed the plant. "Most of the people around here knew this wasn't a feasible project, but they were spooked into supporting it as a boon to the local economy," he asserts. "Now they're worried about what's going to happen."

How the steamplant at Hayden, Colo., came into being is a murky, complex tale that's been largely shrouded in Government secrecy. But the controversy surrounding it is one of interest to power users and taxpayers throughout the country.

The Federal funds involved were borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration by Colorado-Ute Electric Association, Montrose, Colo., a group of 13 rural electric cooperatives and 1 public power district, which has taken preparatory steps toward appealing the Colorado Supreme Court decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

If the ruling is upheld, it will become the most significant in the stormy 30-year history of REA, and it could well shape the future course of the federally financed rural electrification program. But even should it be overturned, the Colorado-Ute case holds significance far beyond its legal impact—which is limited by a number of factors—as it has become the focal point of a private versus public power controversy over the aims and purposes of REA.

THE POINTS OF LAW

The points of law in question are important, to be sure. The Colorado decision "confirms that it is in the public interest for a State to prevent unnecessary duplication of utility facilities that waste the consumer's money," declares Robert T. Person, president of Public Service Co. of Colorado, in Denver, one of the utilities that brought suit against the State commission. Mr. Person also heads the Edison Electric Institute, trade group for the investor-owned segment of the power industry.

"If REA must withhold funds in any project in litigation, as this decision holds, then utilities can simply stop up the whole program of REA-financed generating plants and transmission lines, through endless legal

maneuvers," concedes Charles Robinson, staff engineer and general counsel for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D.C., trade group for 997 co-ops borrowing from REA.

Potential impact of the decision is tempered, however, by two factors: Utility commissions of only 16 other States, like Colorado, regulate rural electric cooperatives; Federal courts have repeatedly declined to rule on similar cases, holding that the actions of REA are accountable only to Congress.

As a result, the Colorado-Ute case may prove more important as part of a growing controversy over the marked changes that have occurred in the REA program since its inception. Both sides agree that REA is no longer what it started out to be, but they sharply disagree over what it has become.

REA was set up in 1935 as a means of encouraging, through Federal loans, the extension of power distribution lines to farms and rural areas lacking central station service. But it now makes subsidized outlays mainly to build powerplants and long-distance transmission lines that provide service primarily to nonfarmers.

In the last 5 years, REA has nearly doubled the Federal investment in rural powerplants and high voltage powerlines to \$1.7 billion, which exceeds the funds Congress has appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and amounts to more than 43 percent of the total \$3.9 billion REA has loaned for distribution lines over the first 30 years of the program. REA estimates its borrowers will need an additional \$3.1 billion of such loans over the next 15 years.

Almost two-thirds of the 5.4 million customers served by REA borrowers are not farmers, and increasingly these borrowers are competing with conventional utilities to hook up suburban housing projects, factories, and shopping centers. At present 98.2 percent of the Nation's 3.3 million farms have central station power—about half of it supplied by REA borrowers—up from 11 percent of the 6.8 million farms when REA was launched.

REA borrowers get 35-year loans at 2 percent interest, although similar money currently costs the U.S. Treasury about 4.6 percent; over 95 percent of REA's loans have gone to cooperatives and public power agencies which are exempt from Federal income taxes; and unrecoverable costs of the REA program to the Federal Government, even after all loans are repaid, is already approaching \$400 million.

Rural electric co-ops, which have received over 90 percent of REA's loans, view the program's new mission as a "socioeconomic" one not unlike the antipoverty program. They note that rural areas have over half the Nation's poverty and about two-thirds of its unemployment, and they assert that subsidized help and loans to build generating plants are necessary to their task.

"If it were not for generating and transmitting loans, the rates cooperatives pay for electricity purchased from utilities would be substantially higher than they are," asserts Mr. Robinson. "Without low wholesale rates on power," he says, "it just wouldn't be feasible to serve many rural areas." He notes that a recent survey shows co-ops average only 3.3 customers and \$460 of revenues per mile of line, compared with 33.2 customers and \$7,164 of revenues per mile for commercial utilities.

But utility executives charge that the new concept of REA is a far less beneficent one in which REA loans for generating plants and transmission lines have become the means of obtaining Federal financing for power projects Congress has refused to authorize for Federal power agencies. They say REA is now spending more for such projects than the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONGRESS' INTENTION

"Congress never intended that the Rural Electrification Act be used as a backdoor means of building a nationwide, federally subsidized electric system," declares Mr. Person. "The Colorado-Ute case brings into sharp focus the way in which REA officials have acted by administrative fiat to accomplish their aims in complete disregard of the law."

That such angry comments have some validity is indicated by the way the Hayden plant came into being. Prior to undertaking the project, Colorado-Ute was made up of just five small co-ops in northwestern Colorado, and was operating well in the red. Obviously too small to build a 150,000 kilowatt generating plant, it set out to build up its membership.

One new member was a subsidiary of Salt River Project Agricultural & Power District, serving over 100,000 customers in suburban areas of booming Phoenix, Ariz., 700 miles away. Colorado-Ute agreed to sell Salt River one-third of the plant's power at less than half the price to its co-op members, in return for a one-third investment in the plant. Another was Arkansas Valley G. & T., Inc., made up of three co-ops in southeastern Colorado, across the Rockies. It, too, got a special low price.

Colorado-Ute also added seven more distribution co-ops. Why did they join? "We were informed that we'd no longer be able to buy power at low prices under our co-op preference rights from the Bureau of Reclamation," reports Mr. Harris, a director of Yampa Valley Electric Association, Inc., one of the seven. "But after the powerplant deal was completed, the Bureau of Reclamation said it was willing to sell us all the power we wanted at a price that's about half what the Hayden power costs us—but, of course, it was too late to do anything about it."

As a further inducement, Colorado-Ute bought Yampa Valley's powerplant "which was just junk" for \$250,000, Mr. Harris reports. Colorado-Ute offered \$1 million for three other co-op plants. Its offer for facilities of Bridger Valley Electric Association in Wyoming, however, was rejected by the Wyoming Public Utilities Commission, which noted that Bridger Valley could buy power cheaper from the Federal dam at Flaming Gorge than from Colorado-Ute, and pointed out that Colorado-Ute's indebtedness exceeded its assets by \$2.1 million.

Mr. Harris, one of two directors on Colorado-Ute's 24-man board to oppose the Hayden project, asserts that most co-op members didn't know about all this maneuvering. "The whole thing was a crash project promoted, formulated, and pressured by REA officials, the Bureau of Reclamation, Salt River and the coal industry," he charges.

RECLAMATION BUREAU'S ROLE

Why would the Bureau of Reclamation be interested in promoting such a project? It, like all other Federal power agencies, got into the power business through hydroelectric projects incidental to dams purportedly built for flood control, navigation, and irrigation. Congress has refused to permit any Federal agency other than TVA to build coal-fired electric plants. But hydro power is principally useful when interconnected with coal-fired plants. Utilities also note that the country has nearly run out of economically feasible hydro projects, due to advances in power technology.

"REA is being used to get coal-fired plants to firm up Federal hydro power in an all-public power network," charges Edwin Vennard, executive vice president and general manager of Edison Electric Institute. "And not one of REA's loans for generating plants can be justified on the basis of either need or economics. Utilities are selling co-ops power for a lower average price than the average cost of generating electricity in REA-financed

plants, and we have ample reserve supplies to handle their future needs."

Co-ops buy 43 percent of their power from utilities, 39 percent from Federal power projects and generate 18 percent.

The Colorado-Ute case is only the latest in a series of recent setbacks for REA. Senator HOLLAND, Democrat of Florida, chairman of a Senate Appropriations subcommittee, criticized REA this month for failing to follow special directives Congress placed on generating and transmitting loans in 1963. President Johnson has clamped a \$270 million limit on REA loans in the current fiscal year, and recommended a cut to \$220 million for fiscal 1967. And Congress has been critical of co-ops that invest or lend at higher interest rates part of the 2-percent money they get from REA.

REA could also be in more hot water in Indiana, where litigation is pending before the State supreme court on a \$60 million power project that's already under construction.

"But don't underrate the durability of REA," says Mr. Vennard. Noting that fewer than 70,000 U.S. farms still lack central power, he adds, "REA's a classic example of the fact that Government agencies don't fade away when their original purpose has been accomplished—they simply find something else to do."

ADAM YARMOLINSKY

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week, some uncomplimentary remarks were made on this floor concerning a gentleman who is about to become a constituent of mine by virtue of the fact that he has been appointed a professor at the Harvard Law School. I refer to Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, formerly special assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and now Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

Some remarks were also made about Harvard University which belittled the important contributions members of that university have made to this country over many years.

Mr. Yarmolinsky has given distinguished and patriotic service to our Government over the last 5 years. Our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, had sufficient confidence in him to make him one of the key members of the group that sought out talented men to staff the highest levels of government. After completing this assignment for the President, Mr. Yarmolinsky was appointed to one of these important and sensitive positions himself as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense. In this position, he was involved in projects vital to the defense of the United States, and acquitted himself with distinction. He advised the Secretary of Defense on critical aspects of the situation in Cuba during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. He was responsible for the primary stages of the reorganization of our civil defense program at a time when there was great concern over the inadequacy of civil defense preparations during the Berlin crisis of 1962. He also

served as chief of the U.S. emergency relief mission to the Dominican Republic in 1965—a mission which made a significant contribution to restoring a measure of stability in that island after American troops were sent there.

President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara would not have given Mr. Yarmolinsky these and other delicate assignments unless they had the utmost confidence in his loyalty and patriotism, his ability and judgment. Mr. Yarmolinsky performed these assignments in a manner that justified their trusts.

His other contributions to the country have been valuable and wide-ranging. Eleven years ago, he headed a study of the Government security system which was highly praised in many quarters and which illustrated his personal commitment to a strong, fair, and effective loyalty and security program. More recently, he worked in the task force that set up the antipoverty program and was a key architect of many of the important innovations in that field.

Mr. Yarmolinsky will be leaving Government this summer, at his own request, to spend some time in academic life. I am personally delighted that he is becoming a constituent of mine. I think the Republic owes him a debt of gratitude. He was one of that group of young men of great talent and love of country who worked night and day to make the administration over the last 5 years a success.

At Harvard Law School he will join many other distinguished men including the former Solicitor General of the United States, Archibald Cox, former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Robert Bowie, and the former legal adviser to the State Department, Abram Chayes, former counsel to the Department of State. All these men are terrifically able and loyal.

It is easy to repeat old canards about Harvard University. I prefer to recount its actual contributions. This university, through its superbly talented faculty, has continually performed important work for the country as well as turning out future leaders of the Nation.

I know there are many Members who join me in wishing Mr. Yarmolinsky well and in hoping that he will be able to continue to advance the security and welfare of the Nation in his new position as he did so outstandingly over the last 5 years.

LIBERAL PENSIONS FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, WORLD WAR II, AND KOREAN CONFLICT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced four measures calling for more liberal pensions for certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their survivors.

We have seen to it that the cost of living increase over the years has been

taken care of in increased payments for those people dependent upon social security and there is now legislation before the Congress to adjust the pension payments of railroad retirees. We have adjusted the pay of Government employees and those receiving welfare assistance. We have adjusted the pay of those men now serving in our Armed Forces. Private industry has taken care of its employees by and large. But nothing has been done for many veterans who are dependent upon pension payments. Their cost of living has increased but their pensions have remained static. I feel that it is necessary for us to remember the veterans who gave so much when called upon to defend this country.

I have also introduced a measure calling for a special pension for the veterans of World War I, the passage of which, I feel, is imperative if we are to provide for these veterans, and their survivors, a decent, dignified existence in return for what they have done for their country. Those men were thrown into battle, in many cases ill equipped and poorly trained, and they did a yeoman's job in stemming the tide of the German armies in France. We will always remember the battles they fought. Let us not forget the men that fought them.

As these men grow older—the average age of the veterans of World War I is now 72—they become less and less able to provide for themselves and their families. If we do not at least start paying off the tremendous debt we owe these men we will soon find that it is too late.

U.S. COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for U.S. participation in the International Year for Human Rights to be observed in 1968.

This legislation is a direct outgrowth of a report made by the Committee on Human Rights to the White House Conference on International Cooperation which was held last November. This ad hoc group of distinguished private citizens suggested a number of ways in which the United States could take action to further universal respect for the rule of law.

The year 1968 was selected for International Human Rights Year by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on July 28, 1965, and commemorates the 20th anniversary of the covenant: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Following passage of the United Nations' resolution, the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva, Switzerland, announced that a worldwide campaign would be undertaken and

urged that 11 nations plan organized activity to explore the status of human rights and suggest ways to strengthen adherence to them.

In conjunction with the United Nations resolution, the U.S. Committee on Human Rights would be responsible for formulating effective programs for this country's meaningful participation in the efforts to advance international human rights. To accomplish this, the Committee would be authorized to conduct hearings and seminars, and enlist the cooperation of all departments of Government which might be involved. A final report would be submitted to the President not later than July 1967.

Action is needed now, at this session, because planning must be done sufficiently in advance of the start of the observance to insure the United States an active role and a place of leadership in the events of this important year.

My bill would provide for a committee of 11 members, 4 chosen from the legislative branch—2 from the House and 2 from the Senate—and 7 private citizens appointed by the President. The members would be representative of all sectors of American life, and some should be knowledgeable in international law.

In joining in International Human Rights Year, this Nation will be reaffirming a commitment to inherent universal human or individual rights which was made in our earliest days, and which remains the framework in which our laws are drawn and enforced.

Although we have on occasion, in some areas of our national life, neglected this concept, and have, for instance, delayed acting on several pending international human rights conventions, it is nevertheless the idea which prevails in all our pronouncements of the hope which we hold for the world's development.

Involvement in International Human Rights Year will afford us the opportunity to reassert our belief in the fundamental worth of the individual and his importance before the law. It will also enable us to help disseminate this idea to other parts of the world, particularly to the less developed nations, who sometimes tend to put this concept aside in favor of more immediate achievement and progress in the material sense.

I cannot suggest strongly enough that we act at this session to establish the U.S. Committee on Human Rights, and I am happy to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York, Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, in supporting this measure.

I include a copy of the bill:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SECTION 1. That, in order to provide for effective and coordinated preparation for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968, designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as "International Human Rights Year", there is hereby established an advisory and coordinating committee, to be known as the "United States Committee on Human Rights" (herein referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. (a) The Committee shall consist of eleven members, as follows:

(1) Two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each political party, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two Members of the Senate, one from each political party, appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(3) Seven members appointed from private life by the President of the United States.

(b) The Committee shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) The Committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

(e) Members of the Committee each shall be entitled to receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of the powers and duties of the Committee, including travel time, and may receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 3. The Committee is authorized and directed to conduct studies and formulate plans for effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year". In the conduct of its activities, the Committee is authorized to—

(1) conduct studies, seminars, and meetings with appropriate parties in order to provide for effective participation in the observance of International Human Rights Year at the Federal, State, and local levels of government in the United States;

(2) explore the role of the United States in defining, expressing, and expanding the application of human rights principles in the United States and throughout the world;

(3) review past and present policies of the United States with respect to the universal application and preservation of human rights principles; and

(4) take such other action and conduct such other activities as may be appropriate to provide a basis for the observance by the United States of International Human Rights Year.

COOPERATION WITH COMMITTEE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

SEC. 4. (a) The Committee is authorized to request any department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government to furnish suggestions and information to the Committee in carrying out the functions of the Committee under this Act. The head of each such department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such suggestions and information to the Committee upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(b) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government shall otherwise cooperate with the Committee in the performance of the functions of the Committee and shall provide the Committee with such additional assistance and services as may be available.

STAFF OF COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Committee shall appoint an executive secretary without regard to the civil service laws, prescribe his duties, and fix his compensation at a rate not to exceed

the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (79 Stat. 1111, 5 U.S.C. 1113(b)).

(b) The Committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, and fix the compensation, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of such personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee may procure, in accordance with section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 55a), the temporary or intermittent services of experts and consultants. Individuals so employed shall be paid compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Committee but not in excess of \$100 per diem, including travel time and, while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b-2), for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

REPORT AND TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. (a) The Committee shall submit to the President, not later than July 1, 1967, for transmittal to the Congress, a report of the activities of the Committee under this Act, together with its recommendations, including recommendations as to the manner in which the most effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" may be accomplished and including recommendations as to the means by which the United States may contribute most effectively to the acceptance, observance, practice, and enforcement of the principles of human rights throughout the world in "International Human Rights Year" and thereafter.

(b) From and after the submission of its report to the President under subsection (a), the Committee shall, under the direction of the President, continue as an informational and coordinating clearinghouse and center of United States participation in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" and, to carry out such purpose, shall perform such additional duties as the President may impose upon it.

(c) The Committee shall cease to exist at the close of December 31, 1968.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and accomplish the purposes of this Act.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 28 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives joined Congressman ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont, and me in a statement calling for a full-scale congressional investigation of the Selective Service System.

The 28 Members who joined with us on that statement are Representatives JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois; MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota; JAMES F. BATTIN, of Montana; ALPHONZO BELL, of California; LAURENCE J. BURTON, of

Utah; WILLIAM T. CAHILL, of New Jersey; BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of New York; THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey; CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York; WILLIAM H. HARSHA, of Ohio; FRANK HORTON, of New York; HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts; THEODORE KUPFERMAN, of New York; CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, of California; CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland; JOSEPH M. McDADE, of Pennsylvania; CHESTER L. MIZE, of Kansas; F. BRADFORD MORSE, of Massachusetts; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; OGDEN R. REID, of New York; HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, of Illinois; HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; and J. WILLIAM STANTON, of Ohio.

Chairman RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee, has announced that the Director of the Selective Service, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, will shortly be asked to appear before his committee, and that on the basis of General Hershey's testimony the committee will be able to decide whether a full-scale congressional investigation should be undertaken.

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the broad popular support for our proposal to undertake a congressional investigation of the draft. The proposal has received almost uniform endorsement by daily newspapers across the country.

Under unanimous consent I insert at this place in the RECORD selected editorials to this effect from 31 separate newspapers:

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

DEMAND DRAFT PROBE

Thirty Republican Congressmen made out a pretty strong case in demanding an investigation of Selective Service.

Among their charges: The Pentagon is "not making maximum efficient use" of present personnel—for instance 9,000 enlisted men holding jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. Nearly 280,000 men classified 1-A are not available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline."

The GOP Congressmen cited several other reasons. But those two alone seem to bear out their contention there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the draft system—certainly enough to warrant a prompt and thorough investigation.

[From the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette, Mar. 3, 1966]

PRELIMINARY PROBE

The request of 30 Republican Members of the House of Representatives for an investigation of the Selective Service System and its contribution to the war effort has been taken under advisement by the House Armed Services Committee. Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, the chairman, said the committee will hear Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey and then decide whether to investigate the military draft.

Hearing Hershey is itself an investigation of the draft, for he has been head of the service for a quarter of a century. He has directed the draft of 13 million young men—for World War II, Korea, and now Vietnam.

He has pledged his cooperation to the committee, should it decide on a full investigation.

His ideas on the draft are well known. He is intolerant toward those who deliberately break the draft law—misguided adolescents who should be spanked, or maybe inducted. He fears that to most Americans, the Vietnam war is distant and dim and about unfamiliar people—much like the Korean war, with similar problems.

No doubt Hershey can clear up any questions about the workings of the draft. That it is essential and will be continued, there is no question.

[From the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald, Mar. 9, 1966]

DRAFT DISCRIMINATION CRY MISSES THE MARK

Rising draft quotas have led recently to growing pressures for congressional scrutiny of the Selective Service System. There are even suggestions that Gen. Lewis Hershey, who symbolizes Selective Service as J. Edgar Hoover symbolizes the FBI, might be asked to retire.

A close look at the draft and the way it is working certainly seems valid. There do seem to be problems of redtape gumming up the efficiency of the System.

Yet some of the criticisms are contradictory. One kick is that General Hershey has too much power to set draft policy, but another gripe is that inequities result from the fact that local boards are independent. A man drafted in one city might have been deferred in another.

It has become fashionable recently to bemoan the alleged fact that the draft favors the young men from families financially better off, since they can afford college and thus be deferred. The poor are "discriminated against," according to this theory, because they can't afford to go to college and get student deferment.

Andrew Tully indulges in this soft-headed sophistry in his National Whirligig column today. It's a classic in muddleheaded generalization, in our opinion.

Let's overlook the fact that plenty of college students are getting their education on a shoestring created by their own efforts. College attendance is no proof of family affluence, nor is spending the day in a pool hall evidence that a fellow is disadvantaged and therefore shouldn't be drafted.

OK, forget the note on economics. But let's not forget the fact that college deferment until graduation do not necessarily let a young man off the hook forever. When he graduates, he is susceptible to drafting or callup if in a Reserve officer program.

But why should being called up for service in a time of national need be considered punishment, anyway? Actually, it's an opportunity—particularly for those underprivileged youths who have two strikes against them in civilian life. Now that a cold war GI bill is on its way, those who want an education after their service tour is done will have it financed by the Government.

And for many young men who haven't worked out a useful civilian niche for themselves, the military offers a lifetime career that can provide advancement, acceptance of responsibility, security, and satisfaction. Are we to believe it is a hardship for a young man to be snatched out of the slums of Harlem or the depressed villages of Appalachia, issued a uniform, given three square meals a day, trained to be a self-reliant soldier, and given a sense of pride and purpose?

True, the prudent man would not choose to place himself in position to be shot by Communists if any honorable alternative existed. Nor is the pay, in terms of dollars or plasters, adequate to compensate for long jungle marches. The pay in personal pride is something else.

And despite the tragedy and brutality of combat, by far the greater number will come back in better physical and mental condition than they went in. They will have won new self-respect from a sense of having contributed to something important.

[From the Binghamton (N.Y.) Press, Mar. 3, 1966]

A GAME OF DRAFTS

The call of 30 Republican Representatives, including HOWARD W. ROBISON, of Owego, for a congressional inquiry into the workings of selective service appears to be timely, and well justified by the widespread misgivings about the system.

The GOP contingent denies partisan intent and we hope it is possible to start a nonpartisan, searching examination of how military manpower needs should be filled.

The problem boils down to this: The burden of performing military service should be shared as fairly as possible, but the business of drafting some young men and not others of the same age and qualifications is clearly unfair.

The critical Representatives stress the inequities of selective service, in asking for an investigation by the House Armed Services Committee.

This is a good time to look into the matter. In peacetime, the draft is little thought about because relatively few are taken and those that are, put in a quiet couple of years before discharge.

In an all-out war, just about everyone has to go into service anyway. In this period of undeclared, limited warfare, however, everybody is thinking about the draft and the related possibility of combat service even while many escape being called.

It is important, for the sake of public confidence in the Government, for the Selective Service System to operate with scrupulous fairness according to well-understood rules.

At present, too much is left to chance (bureaucratic and geographical) and to the whims of local draft boards. The GOP House Members said that, of almost 550,000 young men classified 1-A in the draft, nearly 400,000 either have not yet been examined or are considered not available because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline.

Knowledge that this is the way it works does not help the morale of the young man on his way to Vietnam, whose draft board saw to it that he was examined and his papers were not "stalled."

In Broome County, the month-to-month draft quotas have fluctuated wildly, with no apparent relation to national draft figures, since the start of the Vietnam buildup last summer. (The Broome quota was 31 in December, 92 in January, 23 in February.) This has never been explained fully, but apparently results in part from the numbers examined and "available" to be called in a given month.

Mr. ROBISON and his colleagues apparently have a point in complaining about a lack of clear priorities in drawing on various pools of manpower. There can be arguments about whether a specific group of young men should be drafted or not, but surely the rules that govern this should be spelled out clearly and applied nationally.

The statement of Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, national Selective Service Director, that "absolute equity has never been attained," does not reduce the need for improving the draft system. The whole idea is to get a little closer to "absolute equity."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American, Mar. 5, 1966]

INVESTIGATING THE DRAFT

The House Armed Services Committee Monday opens regular hearings on the Nation's military posture. This time the in-

quiry will take in, among other things, charges by 30 Republican committee members that Selective Service is being run in a haphazard, inefficient manner and is seriously bogged down in redtape. The charges certainly merit a careful scrutiny.

In a statement issued this week, the Congressmen charged that more than half the men between 19 and 26 now classified 1-A are "not available" for the draft because "their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

The Republican members also questioned plans to reexamine present deferments, arguing that enough men would be available now to meet induction and enlistment quotas if present procedures were used efficiently.

They pointed to a report by the Comptroller General's Office which said the Army, Navy, and Air Force were using about 9,000 enlisted personnel to work in officers' clubs, hobby shops, golf courses, and similar jobs, rather than hiring civilians for them. This report, they emphasized, considered only the most flagrant inefficiencies in the use of manpower; there are undoubtedly many more instances. Said the Republican members:

"It is ridiculous for the Department of Defense to insist upon drafting young men to be hurried into combat when it is not making maximum efficient use of the trained personnel it already has."

Presumably Selective Service officials will have some answers to these charges when they testify before the committee. But the charges obviously call for a thorough hearing that is also nonpartisan.

We hope the fact that these charges came from Republican Congressmen doesn't mean the Democrats will feel constrained to belittle them—or that the draft will become the center of a new hawks-versus-doves controversy.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 2, 1966]

DRAFT NEEDS RE-STUDY

Congress Democrats and the administration should heed the demand of 30 House Republicans for an early investigation into the draft. It is an issue close to the hearts of the American people, and discontent is rising.

To charges that hundreds of thousands of potentially useful young men are escaping the draft through poorly drawn regulations, the Congressmen have added a sharply worded charge of bureaucratic bungling. Their statement declared: "According to figures supplied by General Hershey there are 545,000 men between 19 and 25 now classified 1-A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are not available for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

Granting that draft officials should take time to be as fair as possible to the individual, the half-million men in 1-A would more than fill the manpower requirements for the next year. Congress will be justified in inquiring why fresh reclassifications have been set at such a high level when this reservoir exists.

Congress should also review Draft Director Hershey's proposed new program for massive interruption of college careers.

The philosophy prevailing until now has been that college students earnestly and successfully working for degrees were a special kind of national asset in an era when demands for highly educated manpower are skyrocketing. If the military needs are judged to be sufficiently great, the students should be drafted as needed, of course. But the public deserves a clear showing that the need is valid, and not created by bungling in selective service.

We believe that General Hershey, President Johnson, and Congress should bear in mind that today's circumstances are far different psychologically from the circumstances of December 1941.

Now there is no declared war, no manifest threat to the homeland, no clear connection between an all-out war effort and the avoidance of national calamity.

In these circumstances the public is likely to measure its sacrifices more carefully, and demand a clearer showing of need and of equity for such sacrifices as are asked. In the particular case of the draft, criticism has been building up—increasingly insistent and increasingly pointed as to alleged inequities and faults in administration. Now, as the manpower buildup gets underway, is the time for the faults to be brought into the open, studied, and remedied.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, Mar. 2, 1966]

ABOUT THE DRAFT

The present Selective Service System "is haphazard and mired in a jungle of redtape"—at least that's what 30 Republicans in the House of Representatives are claiming.

For most of a quarter century, the draft has been in force. Although it was accepted as a "necessary evil" during World War II, the System was under constant attack as new classifications were called up. In 1948, the System was revived and proved its worth during the Korean action. Afterwards, when the calls fell to a trickle, there were few complaints, however, revisions were made as needed.

Escalation of the Vietnam war has resulted in large draft calls. Now, as the available pool of 19 to 26 year olds is being drained, other groups hitherto deferred are feeling a hot wind on their necks. Howls are heard and charges are hurled.

The GOP House Members have responded with four major complaints:

1. The Defense Department is using qualified fighting men in recreational and commissary jobs. (What this has to do with the Selective Service System is not clear.)

2. Nearly 280,000 men have been classified 1-A without being called because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline." (The draft is designed to call men orderly, fairly, and as needed—not to grab everyone in sight at one time. It is quite likely that many in this group are the very ones fighting the hardest now to stay out.)

3. "There does not appear to be a clear order of priority," say the Congressmen. (A quick glance at the World Almanac refutes this. The framework is clear and local draft boards, made up of honorable citizens in thankless volunteer work, consider each case on its merits.)

4. Tests to determine deferments of college students discriminate, it is claimed, favoring those in courses of possible later military value. (If this is true, it still makes sense to develop these, rather than let college be a haven for those who attend solely to skirt the draft.)

Drafts always have been and probably will be unpopular—especially when the individual sees his name nearing the top of the list.

It is hoped here that the Republican Congressmen are truly sincere, rather than attacking an unpopular cause for political reasons.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) News, Mar. 4, 1966]

DRAFT LAW NEEDS NEW LOOK, MULLER SAYS
(By Will Muller)

A group of House Members, unfortunately partisan in composition, is urging a congressional restudy of the military draft law and the fairness of its impact.

Stripped of political connotations—it is proposed by Republicans—the idea has ob-

vious merit. The present Selective Service Act expires July 1, 1967.

The present act will either be extended—the easy way out of the past—or replaced.

The intervening 16 months is a short time in which to formulate and enact a military conscription policy for a changing world.

Daily, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Selective Service Director, is battered by criticism, direct or implied. Some of it comes from his own Government, some from the Congress which wrote the draft formula he has administered so faithfully for so many years.

Asked whether he thought Selective Service should be reorganized, General Hershey replied, "No. You would not do something to something that's working."

This country owes much to General Hershey. He won its trust in World War II and has held it in the intervening years. One thing the country owes him is an updated draft law recognizing both equity and the altered requirements of limited wars.

The inclination of the military to retain old ways is axiomatic. It explains retention of U.S. cavalry units up to World War II even though the horse had met the machine-gun in World War I.

The conscription system has been little changed from the total war conception of World War II, even though the one-handed, business-as-usual Korean fighting intervened. There remains unanswered the nagging question of how fairly to spread the limited manpower demands of limited war over all available as is done in all-out emergency.

The conviction prevailed from the Civil War to recent years that money and influence protected the privileged. Now arises the contention that membership in an intellectual aristocracy is the new refuge.

Late in December, the Selective Service said those volunteering for the Peace Corps or to train others in the war against poverty probably would not be drafted. But not exempted would be the less fortunate undergoing poverty war training. This is an odd ethic for teachers.

Selective Services concedes there are 2.2 million under educational deferment. It is proposed that the military fall back on Korean war precedent, draft those in the bottom bracket of scholastic standings.

Some are in the bottom bracket because they must both study and earn, some because their preparatory schools were inadequate. Some are slow learners. This raises the ethical question of whether the poor, the underprivileged and the C student are to be marked for the bullet by birth and circumstance.

Critics say that the present Selective Service Administration favors the science student over the liberal arts student for exemption. It is a greater catastrophe to send a promising nuclear student to die than another Alan Seeger, Joyce Kilmer, or Rupert Brooke? Is that what Congress intends?

Follow the philosophy of exempting the student to its ultimate end. Then our wars would be fought by school dropouts, by young men either unwilling or unable to go to college, or by those who have completed college and just started their careers. That, too, seems an odd formula.

For generations, this country has avoided universal military training, in peace or war. It has avoided the universal draft in wartime through a system of privileged, as well as obvious, exemptions. Though a more just system, that plan of universal conscription of manpower is hardly required in limited wars.

Discussion of the draft law's inequities by present social standards is almost universal in the land. It is a good time for Congress to wrestle with it in preparation for tomorrow.

It is the responsibility of Congress to declare wars, although some argue that re-

sponsibility has now been abdicated. It is the equal responsibility of Congress to decide beforehand as fair and sure a formula as humanly possible to decide who will fight them.

[From the Fairmont (W. Va.) West Virginian, Mar. 5, 1966]

INVESTIGATING THE DRAFT

Holding that operation of the Selective Service System is neither "equitable nor efficient," a group of House Republicans have called for a congressional investigation. The point is well taken. The investigation should start with professional athletes who can take the heavy punishments of sports but who are allegedly physically disqualified for military service.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Mar. 3, 1966]

DRAFT REVIEW

Continued hassling over the Selective Service System can be expected until Congress finally gets around to making the System much more equitable.

No one likes a draft law, or the necessity for such a law. As long as the Government feels we need one, however, strenuous efforts should be made to have it as fair as possible.

We realize there will always be some inequities and there will always be those who are extremely unhappy about being called to active military service.

Nevertheless, there should be provisions in the System whereby everyone goes into some type of military obligation as soon as he reaches 18 or graduates from high school.

Putting every young man in the country into a program of active military training as soon as he graduates from high school or reaches 18 would, of course, put more men into the camps than the service is geared to handle. It could also cause a huge increase in the money required by the Armed Forces.

To put each young man into some type of active reserve duty, however, even if he did not go into full-time duty, would be more equitable than the system now in use.

The greatest inequities at the moment involve college students, including those who must maintain certain grades if they hope to finish their educations. What might be an "A" at one school, for instance, might bring only "C" at a school with higher standards. Keeping these young men on edge throughout their college studies is not going to do them or their schools any good.

Congress should accede to the wishes of those who would like to see a full-scale review of our current draft system.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald Dispatch, Mar. 4, 1966]

GOP DEMANDS PROBE OF DRAFT

There was never much doubt that Congress would approve the \$4.8 billion requested by the administration for the Vietnam war. Only four House Members and two Senators—all Democrats—voted against the appropriation bill.

However, a sharp debate preceded passage of the bill in the House when Republicans demanded an investigation of draft procedures and said they wanted to determine what the administration is doing to obtain combat as well as noncombat manpower contributions from allied countries.

The Republican contingent said there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency in the Selective Service System and Defense Department administration of the draft."

Specifically, what Republicans would like to know is whether a redtape jungle has delayed the examination of more than 300,000 men classified as 1-A, or has stalled the transmission of their papers from local draft boards to induction centers.

They want to know whether it is necessary to reexamine numerous men who have been

deferred but might be found to meet 1-A draft requirements. They ask what priorities have been established for calling various manpower groups for service and if such procedures are equitable in filling the 1-A pool.

They are curious about regulations which determine the availability of college students for drafting and demand to know when, if ever, the Defense Department plans to release results of a study of the Selective Service System which it began in 1964.

We believe the Republicans have asked questions which are in the minds of many people. They should, and no doubt will, insist on getting some straight answers.

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, Mar. 8, 1966]

DRAFT PROBE IN ORDER NOW

From all indications, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey intends to give little aid to any congressional investigation of the Selective Service System as proposed the other day in the House of Representatives. In fact, the long-time draft director took time out to go before television cameras and laugh off claims that the draft system is showing "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency."

There are others in the Government who would delay any investigation at the present time because of our involvement in the Vietnam war, claiming that now is not the time to delve into an operation which is performing the vital function of providing needed manpower for stepped-up military operations.

It seems to this newspaper that the opposite is true. Now, when the Selective Service System is operating at a stepped-up pace is the best time to determine if its methods are efficient and if it is performing in the best interests of all involved. Evidence that has come to light in the past few weeks would indicate that the Selective Service operation leaves something to be desired.

According to some Members of the House of Representatives, papers of thousands of draft age men are bottled up in a bureaucratic pipeline. This, if so, indicates that there is clear basis for claims of inefficiency on an administrative level.

Another situation which needs further explaining is the need to reexamine previously disqualified men when draft officials admit that nearly 445,000 men known to be physically and mentally qualified will be available through June 30. General Hershey's only answer to this is, "There does not appear to be a clear order of priority in which the administration is considering calling the various manpower groups for service."

One of the most valid points in favor of investigating the draft at this time is the charge that present procedures foster unfair treatment to certain individuals and groups. An example is the set of tests designed by the Selective Service System to aid local draft boards in deciding whether a college student should receive a deferment. General Hershey, himself, admits that these tests are easier for science students than for those taking liberal arts courses. Why, we would like to know, should draft tests be "loaded" in favor of a select group of students?

It is also difficult to understand the reasoning employed by Selective Service when it drafted a Midwest doctor who is the father of seven children. If this country was involved in all-out war with military manpower needs at a critical peak, then such an action would be understandable. At the present no such condition exists. In fact, there is ample evidence that the military is wasting a great deal of the manpower it already has.

A recent report by the General Accounting Office disclosed that the services were employing about 9,000 enlisted men in such nonmilitary activities as clerking in supermarkets and bowling alleys and tending bar,

and waiting on tables in officers' clubs. Add to this many more thousands of highly trained specialists who are still required by the military to take time off from duties they were trained for to perform such menial tasks as kitchen police. While they are on KP, of course, their regular duties must be performed by equally highly trained specialists. This is efficiency?

Nearly 2 years ago President Johnson directed Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the Selective Service System and offer recommendations to improve it. The Pentagon claims that the study has been completed, but General Hershey says he has never seen it. Even if he had seen it, it is doubtful that the draft director would voluntarily make changes in "his" system without prodding from Congress.

Members of Congress have ample reason to believe that many Selective Service procedures are inefficient and in need of change. The time to investigate and implement needed changes is now, not some future year when, hopefully, it returns to its between-war limbo status and is all but forgotten until need for it arises again.

[From the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, Mar. 1, 1966]

HOW ABOUT A CHECK?

If Republican congressional charges about selective service inefficiency are soundly based, the Johnson administration owes it to the American public to make some changes promptly.

Twenty-seven GOP Members of Congress, with Lawrence's ROBERT ELLSWORTH as spokesman, have outlined three "bones of contention" about what they consider inefficiencies and inequities in the draft system. ELLSWORTH first announced the step during a visit to Lawrence Monday and that matter was aired nationally at a press conference today in Washington.

The three points stressed by the GOP group:

While the Selective Service System talks about reclassification plans and increased draft calls, there appear to be some 279,000 men in 1-A classification whose papers are bogged down between their boards and their induction centers.

"This means 279,000 men are available right now if we can cut the inefficiency," ELLSWORTH said.

On December 31, 1965, the Comptroller General of the United States reported to Congress that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have over 9,000 enlisted men working at non-military jobs like running officers' clubs, bowling alleys, golf courses, and such.

Except for South Korea, Australia, and New Zealand, none of the U.S. allies have any combat troops in South Vietnam and our European allies haven't even met their manpower commitments in Western Europe.

The most immediately disturbing of the three points to most Americans right now is the first—the charge that some 279,000 draft eligible young men already are snarled in Federal redtape while at the same time there are plans to ensnarl even more, probably at great cost and inconvenience.

Military service is a fact of life for virtually all young American males in this so-called "cold war" period, and it follows that everyone has to expect a certain amount of inconvenience, risk, and disruption of plans and timetables in the interest of defense and public welfare. But the Government owes it to the citizenry that pays the bills and supplies the men to minimize all this just as much as possible, with fair and efficient operation of the draft system.

Selective Service bungling, as charged by the Republican group, touches many lives in many frustrating ways.

Takes the student who is trying to complete his education; the young husband-father trying to get established on a new

job; the businessman trying to keep a sound employee force. These are just a few of the examples. In a dangerous time of national emergency, all such people have to expect to make sacrifices of varying natures, but the Government owes it to them to keep the incidence as low as humanly possible.

Suppose there are as many 1-A young men available, as the Ellsworth group charges. Why not get maximum mileage from this group, with greater efficiency in Selective Service operations, before going into costly and inconveniencing reclassification and needless call-ups that waste manpower?

It would seem that such a 1-A pool could meet manpower needs for a long time to come, even with the Vietnam escalation, or at least until more thorough studies can be made to see just what needs will be. This could well be a case of the all-too-typical Government policy of using a shotgun to do the job of a rifle—of howling for far more than is necessary to make sure you get enough.

It will be interesting to see how the Johnson administration responds to these latest charges about the Selective Service setup.

Just about anyone who has been closely connected with administration of military bases and installations will admit that efficiency is not normally a long suit of such an agency. It stands to reason, then, that there are quite a few personnel in non-military jobs such as the GOP group cites in its charges. However, there are a number of instances where such nonmilitary duties can be justified, particularly where base recreation programs are involved.

As for displeasure over the fact that allies have not responded in helping American efforts in places like Vietnam and Europe, that is understandable. This is a valid criticism. Chances are nobody would like to remedy this more than President Johnson. It is well to keep him aware that people want something done, but there are so many uncontrollable elements involved that it is unrealistic to expect miracles which will bring drastic changes.

The most vulnerable spot in the Johnson armor in this case would seem to be inefficiency and inequity in operation of the Selective Service System. If, as the GOP Congressmen say, there are problems due to mismanagement and red tape, the administration should swallow its pride and get something done in a hurry.

Selective service participants and their families can vote, too.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Mar. 3, 1966]

IMPROVING THE DRAFT

The war in Vietnam has brought to the front many questions about the fairness and efficiency of the Selective Service. Republicans in Congress have decided to make this a congressional issue.

These Republicans are demanding that Congress open an immediate investigation of the draft. This probably is past due but in an election year such an investigation holds the danger of lowering national morale and becoming a political football. Certainly this would have to be guarded against.

Not only are there questionable rulings in the Selective Service System but there is a wide variance in the interpretation by the local boards.

The System came under attack when students who took part in protest activities lost their student exemption. At issue is freedom of speech and protest, and that the Selective Service should not use the draft as a weapon against constitutional freedoms.

Now much criticism is being lodged against the procedures for determining the draft status of college students. Present standards call for the drafting of students in the lower levels of academic achievement.

This can be measured, according to Selective Service regulations, by grades. But this is neither fair nor accurate. Students receiving lower grades in more discriminating schools might have more academic potential than some in higher levels of schools with lower standards.

Moreover, as some professors have pointed out, this is a use of the grading system that was never intended. Quite literally, it could give a professor, who grades a student, a life and death influence over the destiny of that student.

Our economic and educational systems already have put an almost intolerable pressure on high school students to make high grades lest they fall to get into the college of their choice. Fear of the draft should not be added to the pressure for high grades.

Much preferable is the standardized testing of college students to determine the lower levels who would be drafted. Even this is not infallible, however. Complaints are made that, as the tests are geared, science students have an edge on those in the humanities. Students with educationally disadvantaged backgrounds could be penalized by the tests, as they are by grades.

The overriding unfairness of any educational deferments in the draft is that it tends to put the weight of war on the poor while others, who can afford it, can avoid or at least defer military service by prolonged schooling.

This is an aspect of the draft which can stand official examination and public discussion. Whether the system can be made any more fair, while still providing an educated citizenry, is by no means certain. But the effort should be made.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) Democrat, Mar. 2, 1966]

SUBJECTS FOR INQUIRY

Much has been said recently regarding the inefficiency of the Selective Service program and we agree that steps should be taken to make the draft as equitable as possible. A group of 30 Congressmen have signed a statement calling for a congressional investigation of this matter, pointing out some glaring deficiencies.

One criticism refers to the redtape jungle which we don't doubt for a moment exists. The lawmakers declare that there are now 545,000 men between 19 and 26 classified 1-A, and of this number, 117,000 have not yet been examined and another 279,000 can't be put in uniform because their papers are stalled in "bureaucratic pipelines."

The draft system will always be the target of criticism, but this criticism cannot be lightly tossed aside. We think an inquiry is not out of order, and since a congressional investigation is the most effective tool of the lawmakers, that's the obvious solution.

However, the 30 Congressmen stepped into deep water when they asked that a congressional investigation also be held to examine the methods used to persuade our allies to supply manpower to Vietnam.

This sort of thing is best left in the hands of the diplomats and the President, who should deal directly with the heads of countries now standing on the sidelines. A congressional inquiry might rankle and irritate foreign statesmen, who might yet be persuaded to do as much for us as the gallant little nation of Korea is doing. An inquiry would only make sparks where genuine diplomatic heat is needed to get our allies to help us uphold our high ideals in southeast Asia by expanding their contributions.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Mar. 9, 1966]

A DRAFT RESTUDY

Congress and the administration should heed the demand of 30 Republicans, including Representative MORSE, of Lowell, for an investigation into the draft. It is an

issue close to the hearts of the American people and discontent is rising across the Nation.

To charges that hundreds of thousands of potentially useful young men are escaping the draft through poorly drawn regulations, the Congressmen have added a sharply worded charge of bureaucratic bungling. Their statement declared: "According to figures supplied by General Hershey there are 545,000 men between 19 and 25 now classified 1-A. Of these, 117,825 have not yet been examined and another 279,676 are not available for the draft because their papers are stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline between local draft boards and Army induction centers."

Granting that draft officials should take time to be as fair as possible to the individual, the half-million men in 1-A would more than fill the manpower requirements for the next year. Congress will be justified in inquiring why fresh reclassifications have been set at such a high level when this reservoir exists.

Congress should also review Draft Director Hershey's proposed new program for massive interruption of college careers. The philosophy prevailing until now has been that college students earnestly and successfully working for degrees were a special kind of national asset in an era when demands for highly educated manpower are skyrocketing. If the military needs are judged to be sufficiently great, the students should be drafted as needed, of course. But the public deserves a clear showing that the need is valid, and not created by bungling in selective service.

We believe that General Hershey, President Johnson, and Congress should bear in mind that today's circumstances are far different psychologically from the circumstances of December 1941. Now there is no declared war, no manifest threat to the United States.

Criticism of the draft has been building up—increasingly insistent and increasingly pointed as to alleged inequities and faults in administration. Now is the time for the faults to be brought into the open, studied, and remedied.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Mar. 8, 1966]

FAIR DRAFT POLICY

The selective service program is a difficult one to administer because a "selective" plan by its very definition means that some will be called and others will be exempt from military service.

There are some who maintain a system of universal military service would be more fair, more efficient and would reduce the uncertainty in the minds of all those who are of military service age. But the selective type of service is the one which Congress has chosen and it is up to those in charge to make it work just as fairly and efficiently as possible.

A group of Republican Representatives has issued a statement expressing concern that the present system is not being run efficiently and that discrimination is developing in its operation.

The strongest point in the group's statement is the one which points out that President Johnson almost 2 years ago directed Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the system and to offer recommendations for improving it. The Representatives say the Pentagon reports the study has been completed but draft director Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey says he has never seen it.

An explanation of what has happened in this tangle of bureaucratic redtape is the least that is due Members of Congress and the men of military age who live under this program.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mar. 4, 1966]

DRAFTING STUDENTS

Criticism, much of it justified, is being heard about the inequitable, inefficient and seemingly haphazard way in which the military draft is being applied. Latest comes from a group of 30 Republican Congressmen who have called for an investigation.

By way of response, Selective Service Director Hershey has come forth with a batch of platitudes about the unpopularity of war in an alien land, the effects of soft living in America, and a warning about trying to overhaul military conscription in a time of crisis.

General Hershey's remarks are wide of the mark. Needed instead of platitudes is evidence of determination to administer selective service equitably.

Presently there are more than 10 million young men in the draft-eligible 19 to 26 age bracket. Under present standards of selection, less than half are likely to see any form of military service.

More than 2 million are at the bottom of the callup list, classified 1-Y, because they're not quite up to present mental and physical standards. Others are deferred for occupational reasons, a very loose category under prevailing conditions. Marriage before last August also is generally considered insurance against service. Bona fide college and graduate students generally are deferred until they complete their courses.

It is General Hershey's stated intention of dipping into the student category that is arousing much of the protest. Obviously educational deferments should not provide an escape hatch for those seeking to avoid military service. But care should be taken to avoid disrupting the academic schedules of young men whose brainpower and leadership will be needed in the future.

On the basis of experience in the Cuban and Berlin crises, Defense Secretary McNamara now recognizes the disruptive effects that a reserve callup can have on the Nation. The same measured judgment should be applied to cutting into the college manpower pool. Especially if, as the Congressmen allege, nearly 300,000 young are stalled in the selective service pipeline by "a jungle of bureaucratic redtape."

[From the National Observer, Mar. 7, 1966]

GENERAL HERSHEY: LIKE A PITCHER ON THE DIAMOND—DRAFT INEQUITIES STIR PEOPLE AND POLITICIANS

(By James Meagher)

When 30 House Republicans opened fire on the military draft last week, they had hit on a way to take political advantage of the public's uneasiness over the war in Vietnam.

The issue is quite legitimate—and, in the politicians' view, a natural. Voters may grow weary and confused from debates about enclave strategy, containment of China, and coalition governments. But they can easily grasp what a lawmaker talks about when he refers to "inefficiency and inequity" in the Nation's Selective Service System. In addition, attacking foulups in the draft needn't diminish the support Republicans have generally given President Johnson's Vietnam policy. Nor will the attack interfere with foreign-policy squabbles among Democrats—squabbles that Republicans have concluded can be nothing but beneficial to the GOP.

Until last week most criticism of the draft came from opponents of the Vietnam war itself, exemplified in the extreme by draft-card burners. Some civil rights leaders, too, had complained that the poor—mostly Negroes—were bearing the burden of the war; college students are deferred,

they argued, and college students come generally from middle- and upper-income families.

THEY SEEK ONLY AN INQUIRY

But the 30 Republicans have taken a much broader approach. The inequities they cite touch a wide segment of the population. So far they have merely raised questions; they have wisely proposed no alternatives to the present system—not yet. Their proposal so far is for an inquiry.

"There should be an immediate congressional investigation of the draft," their statement proclaimed, "and the methods used to persuade our allies to supply manpower to Vietnam and southeast Asia."

Among their specific complaints: Of the 545,902 men ages 19 to 26 classified 1-A, 117,825 haven't been examined yet, and 279,676 aren't available for service now because their papers are tied up in redtape between local draft boards and induction centers.

The Johnson administration has announced no priority for the filling of the 1-A pool. For example, as the need for draftees grows, will college students be reclassified ahead of nonstudents previously determined unfit because they fell slightly below physical and mental standards?

Some 9,000 enlisted men are now being used in nonmilitary activities, such as waiting tables in officers' clubs.

In April 1964, Mr. Johnson ordered Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to make a study of the draft and to advise the Chief Executive on whether a better way to meet the Nation's defense-manpower needs could be devised. The study has been completed, but the public hasn't seen it. Nor, for that matter, has the Director of Selective Service, retired Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

And in a complaint that is even now being echoed by students and parents everywhere, the optional deferment test to be made available to college students this May will inevitably favor math and science majors, an admission from General Hershey himself. The test will provide local draft boards an alternative to class rankings as a guide to deferring students.

NO TIME FOR TINKERING

One or two of the complaints are vulnerable. The McNamara study on the draft, for example, was to provide a long-range recommendation in how the draft could eventually be overhauled, or even eliminated. The administration could argue that now is no time for major tinkering. In addition, a certain amount of administrative confusion is inevitable until the draft system catches up with the armed services' increased requirements.

Yet the main thrust of the GOP attack is likely to draw little resistance from congressional Democrats, many of whom have individually voiced misgivings about the way the draft is administered. The Republicans' demand for an investigation, in fact, was unnecessary; Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, already had planned to summon General Hershey before his panel with a view to considering changes in the current Selective Service Act. The law is substantially the same as it was when enacted in 1940.

In addition, a House Education and Labor subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Oregon Democrat EDITH GREEN, has been holding hearings on a very narrow aspect of the draft: Whether stepped-up calls of college students will result in dangerous shortages over the next several years in key civilian professions. Among the witnesses called so far was General Hershey, and the questions fired at him indicate that the attack on the draft could run much deeper than the complaints listed in the Republican statement.

WHAT THE QUESTIONS ARE

Why should professors and college administrators, through the grading system, be compelled, in effect, to decide which students go to the Army?

Are the unpaid members of local draft boards, many of them from the upper crust of their communities, the best ones to judge who should be drafted and who should stay home?

Is the method of appointing draft board members—upon recommendation of Governors—open to political abuses?

Does the cherished independence of local boards contribute to inequities? A man drafted in San Bernardino, Calif., for example, might be deferred if he lived in Lexington, N.C.

Does the scarcity of Negroes on southern draft boards give rise to discrimination?

HE IS A DURABLE GENERAL

Is too much authority for setting draft policy vested in the 72-year-old Hershey? Changes in regulations generally come by Presidential order, but those orders usually are drafted by General Hershey, who has shown a remarkable degree of independence and durability during his 25-year tenure.

So far, General Hershey has taken criticism in stride. In his appearance before the Green subcommittee, he was a man who had heard it all before.

"Unfortunately," he good humoredly told the lawmakers, "I am a little like the pitcher out on the diamond, and the umpire says 'Play ball.' There is not a thing in the world I can throw to the batter that he won't hit out of the lot."

He maintains that there must always be inequity in a system that carries the word "selective" in its title. Maybe so. But, many a young man and many a parent might ask, if it isn't possible to eliminate inequity, isn't it possible to reduce it? The politicians already are asking that question.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, Mar. 7, 1966]

BLAST AT THE DRAFT

If there is "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the selective service, as a group of House Republicans has charged, then certainly it should be investigated by Congress.

Inequities in the draft, coupled with unnecessary delays in procurement of manpower, are unthinkable, particularly in the present war situation.

But at the moment, the GOP statement of criticism appears to have produced mixed reactions. The substance of these is that the draft system has its faults, but there is serious question as to whether they can be eliminated.

Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey, far from being irritated by the GOP call for inquiry, said it is Congress' business to "look into how well the laws they pass are being carried out." Hershey declared he, too, is not satisfied with the time it takes to run men through the manpower pipeline. He also said it was necessary to have about six times as many men in the pipeline at any one time as may be needed to fill the next monthly draft call.

This seems reasonable in view of the high rate of rejects, both mental and physical, which draft boards have reported ever since World War II days. These very rejections constituted the springboard for better education and physical fitness programs during the Kennedy administration.

Hershey also concedes inequities exist but insists, probably reasonably, that "absolute equity has never been attained." He supports the Justice Department finding that the draft should not be used as punishment against those who "defy the law." He believes most deferments for education are justified; declares "no one can show" that any man has been drafted because of his

ideas, and affirmed the right of appeal of registrants.

The draft Director also admitted tests designed to aid local draft boards in deciding whether a college student should be deferred are easier for science students than for those taking liberal arts courses. It is, frankly, difficult to see how this could be otherwise since basically the difference between the specific and the abstract are involved and since scientists on the home-front are more essential to arsenal building than are poets. This may be a tragedy of our civilization, but it is truth.

Thus, how much there is to be investigated remains to be seen, at least until General Hershey testifies before the House Armed Services Committee, which he was going to do anyway.

Two more comments might be made. The protesting Republicans sought, and were refused, copies of a study ordered by President Johnson in 1964, which concluded the draft could not be abandoned, and may have suggested some changes. If national security isn't involved, it ought to be made available, at least to Congress.

Lastly, the leader of the Republican group, Representative ELLSWORTH, Republican, of Kansas, wasn't very convincing when asked why no Democrats had been asked to join the draft protest. According to the New York Times, Mr. ELLSWORTH denied the statement was issued for political reasons, but said there had not been time enough to enlist anyone outside the GOP.

If the Republicans really think a draft inquiry is needed, it might have been a lot more effective in a Democratic-controlled Congress if they had found time to make the protest bipartisan.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHO DOES THE FIGHTING?

The 30 House Republicans who are calling for a congressional investigation of the draft and the overall problem of recruiting military manpower have opened a different side to the Vietnam debate. Its gist is not whether or how we fight, but who does the fighting.

The Congressmen urged that the war be prosecuted—it must be. But they are also saying that it can be prosecuted most feasibly and effectively with a broad base of international support for the South Vietnamese and, in America, by elimination of the anxiety-causing confusion and inequities of our present manpower procurement policies.

Whether we are doing all we can to persuade allies to provide troops, technicians, and economic assistance is a delicate matter of diplomacy best investigated in closed sessions. However, Congress can properly ask the question.

Domestically, any investigation of manpower procurement should start with the draft. Selective Service System Director Gen. Lewis B. Hershey defends the operations of his agency, but the statistics which describe the inefficiency of the draft (which, in fairness, includes the Army's operation of induction centers) are right out of his own office. In any case, an independent survey of conditions in the draft process could be profitably undertaken by Congress.

But the draft, so long ignored by Congress, is just one part of the manpower procurement problem. Indeed, the other parts—policies affecting regulars and reservists, and such as poverty program and Peace Corps personnel—usually have been treated apart from one another, and there is need for coordination. Inefficient utilization of the 3 million men already in uniform may seem at a tolerable level to the eyes of a particular military service, but if it means more draftees—married men or students, as

examples—it should be a matter of high-level concern. The Reserves may worry solely over their responsibilities in case of activation, but if an incentive program for individual reservists to volunteer for Vietnam is feasible, it, too—as a prospect for relieving the manpower strain—is a proper interest of higher authority. Congress, until the manpower policies are reformed, should exercise that authority.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram and Sun, Mar. 3, 1966]

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE DRAFT?

The above question is one to which a band of 30 Republican Congressmen would like a congressional investigation to find answers.

The 30 lawmakers feel they know some of the answers already.

They cite a redtape jungle that makes hundreds of thousands of 1-A's "unavailable," inequity in apportionment of draft quotas among the States, misuse of the draft as punishment for political dissent and misuse of trained GI's for civilian-type chores at bowling alleys, golf courses, PX's and the like.

By and large, we don't believe that local draft boards and their members can be blamed for the draft's defects and abuses. Theirs are difficult, thankless jobs. Few critics of the draft could perform them better or even nearly as well.

The trouble is somewhere in the policy-making bureaucratic attitudes of the Defense Department and the draft system.

At any rate, inequity, inconsistency, inefficiency, and confusion cannot possibly help a war effort or engender the respect a democratic draft setup must command.

A congressional investigation—or, to put it positively, a constructive inquiry—appears amply justified.

[From the Niagara Falls (N.Y.) Gazette, Mar. 8, 1966]

MAKE DRAFT FAIR

Thirty Republican Congressmen, charging redtape and unfairness in the Selective Service System, have called for a full-scale investigation. They have some well documented evidence, including these counts:

Some 9,000 enlisted men who have military skills needed in combat instead hold jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, and golf courses.

Nearly 280,000 men now classified 1-A aren't available for draft because their papers are caught in what Draft Director Lewis B. Hershey calls the paper-jammed pipeline.

Tests given to college students to help decide who will be deferred tend, by Hershey's own admission, to favor those with a scientific background.

It may be that bureaucrats view such things only as minor irritations. But to young men planning their future, uncertainties and injustices are agonizing to accept.

Fairness in the draft system is vital. No man should be thrust into uniform unless and until he is really needed.

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Independent, Mar. 3, 1966]

WASTE OF MANPOWER

If you're one who likes to figure the odds, you can prove that a man taken into military service has a much greater chance of being handed some menial assignment during his hitch than he has of being killed in Vietnam.

Not that either is desirable, of course, but it's a mathematical fact. For every two men who die in Vietnam, nine hold jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores.

Thirty Republican Members of the House of Representatives have cited these statistics to show that the Defense Department is not

making maximum efficient use of present personnel.

Their charge of gross inefficiency and red-tape jungle in the use of military manpower as well as in the Selective Service System warrants a full investigation.

Almost every man taken into service accepts the fact willingly that he must serve his country for 2, 3, 4 years or longer if necessary. Often he gives up a chance for further education, a marriage, homelife, or a chance for a good job, to do his hitch.

But then after basic training to be salted away in a hobby shop or bowling alley is an insult to his ambitions or potential. It is, to say the least, a pure waste of a man in time of national emergency.

Servicemen need recreation. That nobody denies. But do they need it to the extent that 9,000 of their buddies—the better part of a division—have to be tied down in full-time jobs supplying it?

Let's have the full story presented before a congressional committee, as the 30 House Members suggest. Most of them are veterans themselves and should know whereof they speak.

At a time when the Defense Department's budget is well up in the 60 billions of dollars, and with Congress having just acted on the administration's request for \$4.8 billion in emergency funds to support the Vietnam war, the public has a right to demand the best use of manpower by the armed services.

Guns we support. Butter, too, unless that high-priced spread is being put on too thick. It's time to find out.

[From the Pawtucket (R.I.) Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

OUR DRAFT SYSTEM IS MALODOROUS

The method being used to draft American youths for service in Vietnam is about as undemocratic, unfair, discriminatory, and unconscionable as the mind of any bureaucrat could possibly devise.

A month from now, notices will be posted in colleges, post offices, other public buildings, and draft board offices announcing a test the Government will give. It might well be headed: "Attention, all students who would like to avoid being sent to fight in Vietnam." It will tell them they may report on one of three dates in May and June to take an exam that will consist of 150 questions and be divided into four sections: reading comprehension, verbal relations, arithmetic reasoning, and data interpretation. The results will be forwarded to draft boards, and the students who do well might win deferment because, in the words of a Selective Service official, "they are more promising" than those who score lower.

In addition to this test, the Government is attempting to have local draft boards furnish the class standing of college students; this is another facet of making dropouts, duffers and the economically deprived—those who find college beyond their reach—the prime prospects for battling and perhaps dying in the far-off rice paddies.

Gradually, the utter foolishness of the present draft structure is sinking in. For example, the dean at Brandeis University condemns as "totally absurd" the idea of deferring students whose marks are high, and seven professors there say they may stop giving grades at all. The dean makes a telling point when he says "high mark deferments" are unfair to schools with strict admissions policies. A Harvard educator is rebelling to the point of not sending records to draft boards if a student asks him not to. And now 30 Republican Congressmen, calling for an A-to-Z probe of the draft, say the upcoming tests discriminate against liberal arts students and favor those majoring in sciences.

What has happened to the old concept that in a democracy all who are physically able stand as equals in a Nation's hour of

need? Every man's life is as precious to him as the next man's—be he rich or poor, an intellectual genius or a classroom plodder. Pinning price tags on human lives and sending the cheapest out to do the fighting is indefensible.

The United States is at war, albeit an undeclared one. Ignore for the moment the merits of our presence in Vietnam, and the question of "freedom" being at stake, and why other free nations don't see eye-to-eye with us on what's at stake, this fact remains: So long as this country is sending young men out to fight, they should be sent through a rigidly impartial draft system that brooks no distinction between the varied strata that make up our society.

It's time to get out the "pickle jar" and draw numbers, just as was done in World War II.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, Mar. 3, 1966]

DRAFT INVESTIGATION JUSTIFIED

The demand of 30 Republican Congressmen for an investigation of the Selective Service System is one which should be met promptly. The operation of the system is of vital interest to thousands of Americans, and there is enough controversy concerning it to justify a close look by Congress with the view to setting new and uniform standards of practice, even if the 30 Congressmen had not made their demand.

The Congressmen made these allegations:

1. That the draft system is inefficient. There are now 445,000 men classified 1-A "in the pipeline" between their local draft boards and the military services. Why, then, is it necessary to change standards to include men previously disqualified or exempted from draft calls?

2. There is no "clear order of priority" by which various groups of men will be called to service.

3. Tests which will be given this spring (for the first time since the Korean war) to college students as a basis for deciding whether they should be deferred to finish their education tend to favor students with a scientific background over those with a liberal arts background. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, selective service director, admits that this is true, and defends it on the basis that the Government would prefer the more scientifically inclined students to stay in school. At the level of education of most of these men, however, this is a very debatable basis for "loading" the tests.

4. A Defense Department study of the whole draft system, authorized 2 years ago, has been completed but never published or sent on to General Hershey. Why?

The U.S. Selective Service System has never been a very efficient operation, and its basic method of operation almost encourages inequalities in the application of standards. A local draft board is charged with producing a certain number of "warm bodies" periodically, on a quota system, and how it meets that obligation is left in very large part to its own discretion, under minimal direction on standards.

That's why draft policy seems so often to differ from city to city and district to district. It is often just a question of how many eligible men—or breathing men with two arms and two legs each—a draft board has available at a given time. If it has plenty, it can be generous with exemptions, especially when quotas are low. But when quotas go up or the available manpower pool is for some reason lower, the pressure is on the local board.

In wartime, that is excused as expediency. In peacetime, or periods of what we have called peace since 1945, it isn't much of an issue.

But under no circumstances is it a national policy. And a national policy should be what the Congress is looking for.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 2, 1966]

REDTAPE DRAFT JUNGLE

Congress should heed the call by 30 House Republicans for an immediate full-scale inquiry into this country's haphazard, inequitable, and inefficient draft system, mired in a redtape jungle—if further abuses are to be avoided.

Predicting early administration efforts to step up substantially the number of American fighting forces in southeast Asia, the group notes that some 9,000 enlisted men are working in officers' clubs, bowling alleys, hobby shops, golf courses, and commissary stores.

Nearly 280,000 classified I-A were not available for drafting because their papers were "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline," and there apparently is no "clear order of priority" in which the administration is considering calling various manpower groups into service, the Congressmen assert.

Also, the Representatives charge, liberal arts students are getting the short end of the stick in favor of science majors in tests designed to show which college students should be deferred.

Besides all this, a standby pool estimated at 444,793 men will be available to fill draft quotas through June—so why the proposed reexamination of deferments?

In addition, the House Members question the effectiveness of administration efforts to persuade our "allies" to send combat troops and other personnel to Vietnam. They urge that the Congress scrutinize that aspect of the situation and "consider and recommend new means of securing expanded allied contributions."

Representative TOM CURTIS, of Webster Groves, is one of the group, three of whom are members of the House Armed Services Committee, which plans hearings on the "authority to induct" section of the draft law.

All in all, it would appear the House group's concern over "mounting evidence of gross inefficiency" in the selective service system and the Defense Department's administration of the draft needs exhaustive scrutiny.

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Mar. 2, 1966]

THEY'RE NOT SOLOMONS

Short of making military service universal, there are bound to be certain shortcomings in the draft that can't be helped.

Since it wouldn't make sense to force everybody into service regardless of whether or not they can be used effectively or are critically needed in essential civilian pursuits, the selective service ought to remain selective.

These points need to be kept in mind as the draft comes under growing criticism from several sources.

This week, for instance, 30 Republican House Members called for an investigation of the draft on the grounds that the present system is haphazard and tangled in red-tape.

As a case in point, they cite a recent report that 9,000 enlisted men held jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. Moreover, they say nearly 280,000 men classified 1-A aren't available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline."

If true, such defects ought to be corrected immediately. On the whole, however, the Selective Service System seems to be doing a good job under difficult conditions.

There is, for example, the Selective Service System's policy of granting deferments only to those full-time college students who are doing satisfactory school work.

Although this policy has been assailed on the ground that a low-ranked student at a top school may be superior to a high-ranked

student at a mediocre school, consider the alternative. Unless at least part of the cream of the crop gets inducted, the military could end up being composed strictly of the less educated and the less affluent. In a democracy, restricting military service to a particular social class would be intolerable—even dangerous in light of the lessons taught by the fall of the ancient Roman Empire.

Meanwhile, the handwriting on the wall should be pretty clear to any student wanting to retain a deferment: Buckle down to work and hit those books.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 4, 1966]

DRAFT INVESTIGATION DESIRABLE

Investigation of the present draft system, as requested by 30 members of the House of Representatives, seems very much in order.

The Savannah Morning News for some time has been disturbed over the way our present draft system has been siphoning off the cream of America's young men for military service while many less desirables were not called.

We would not—as we never have—advocate filling the honored ranks of our military with unfits. But there are jobs that can be done by and done well by men now eluding the draft by reason of mental or physical shortcomings of present draft requirements.

In a one-two fashion, the present draft system has come under scrutiny of congressional leaders. On Tuesday, 30 Republican House Members called for an investigation charging the present system is haphazard and mired in a jungle of redtape. Wednesday, Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of the House Armed Services Committee said his committee will hear Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and then decide whether to investigate the draft.

The case set forth by the 30 House Members, if accurate, certainly seems to provide sufficient cause to prompt an investigation.

According to the group, there are at least 9,000 enlisted men holding jobs in officers' clubs, hobby shops, bowling alleys, golf courses, and commissary stores. To be sure, some of these jobs required much knowledge, but it would seem reasonable to assume that many of these posts could be filled with professional football players who happen to have a trick knee or leg injury that doesn't bar them from playing the sport and collecting thousands of dollars in salary each year, but is keeping them from being drafted.

If, as the 30 Congressmen charge, nearly 280,000 men classified I-A aren't available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline," Congress and this Nation are entitled to know why.

If, as charged, tests scheduled to help determine which college students should be given deferments discriminate against liberal arts students (or any one particular group) and favor those concentrating on science courses, the public is entitled to know. And if there is not a clear and orderly priority established which the administration will follow in calling various manpower groups for service, this too should be made public.

The young manpower of this Nation is not a trinket to be toyed with or misused. Our Nation faces hard times at present with its role in the Vietnam war. How the requirements of our Armed Forces are met is a factor that will influence the future of this Nation, for we are dealing with the lives and future of tomorrow's leaders.

So important is this issue that we believe it would be in the interest of the Nation to have some of the facts made a matter of public record. If the 30 Congressmen can prove their charges, it is apparent the Nation

has not been told all it should have been told. An investigation could correct that.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Times, Mar. 2, 1966]

PROBE OF DRAFT NEEDED

Congressmen looking for something to investigate in connection with the Vietnam war—and few, apparently, are not—could do no better than to heed the call of 30 Republican House Members for an immediate investigation of the draft.

Manifestly, uniformed service, including the workings of the draft, can never be entirely fair in any ultimate sense. As in life, itself, some young men are more fortunate than others.

But the draft can be made a good deal more fair than the present system under which the well-to-do have a better chance of escaping service than those of limited income; too many men with obvious qualifications for service escape on technicalities, and call-ups sometimes are misused as a form of punishment.

In addition, as the concerned Republican Congressmen pointed out, scores of thousands of men classified I-A are not available for the draft because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline."

There obviously is no clear order of priority for calling up various manpower groups, and this lack has resulted in unnecessary anxieties and has contributed to public uneasiness over the whole conduct of the war.

Certainly the administration should be required to reply to assertions that the tests scheduled to help determine which college students should be given deferments discriminate against liberal arts students and favor those concentrating on science courses.

Actually, what is proposed—and needed—is not just an investigation of the draft but of the entire scope of military manpower use.

We realize that any enterprise involving millions of men is going to include many sorry examples of misplaced manpower, and that war by its very nature is wasteful.

That ought not to stop Congress from trying to achieve a good deal more efficiency and equitability than now exists in the manpower pipeline leading to Vietnam.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Mar. 2, 1966]

CHECK THE DRAFT? CERTAINLY

Selective Service's 72-year-old Director, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, indicated otherwise in a luncheon talk yesterday, but the proposal by 30 House Republicans for a congressional investigation of the draft system is sound.

The organization he has headed since 1941, General Hershey says, has an "unmatched record of efficiency," and besides, "you don't reorganize something that's working."

Nobody has said anything—yet—about reorganizing the System. The point is that the Republican group raised some definite questions about the draft's efficiency and fairness (and General Hershey himself concedes some reservations on the latter)—and it is to the benefit of the draft system itself, the armed services which get manpower from the draft, and the Nation that steps be taken to clear the air.

The Republican plea was based on four points, only three of which relate directly to Selective Service. They questioned whether the Defense Department is "making maximum efficient use" of present personnel, citing a recent report of 9,000 enlisted men in recreational and sales duties.

Most important of the complaints was that there are nearly 280,000 men now classified I-A who can't be drafted because their papers are "stalled in the bureaucratic pipeline." They also charged there did not appear to be "a clear order of priority" for call-

ing up various manpower groups, and that the tests scheduled to determine college deferments favor those majoring in sciences over the liberal arts.

General Hershey, defending college exemption generally, says that for every two students deferred, five young men fall the draft's educational qualifications. He added he regretted part-time students can't be deferred, but said the law did not permit it.

The Republicans didn't go into recent complaints that General Hershey has ordered demonstrators and protesters against the draft to be put at the top of the induction rolls. But he himself yesterday said he believes Congress wants him to administer the law without reporting cases to the Justice Department any more than necessary—that is, that it's better to draft the Vietnicks than prosecute them.

We wonder whether Congress agrees, and we are certain that the armed services do not agree. Whether any changes in the Selective Service law are required or not a congressional hearing on the draft has a number of possible accomplishments:

It can clarify Congress' position on draft versus prosecution.

It can draw a clear picture of draft group priorities.

It can either prove the System is as fair as possible, or take steps to make it so.

It can determine if the administration of local board affairs is as efficient as General Hershey maintains, or if a wholesale reorganization is really needed.

Obviously, the draft will be with us for a long while yet. There's nothing wrong, though, with a congressional inquiry which can either reassure citizens the System is as good as it should be or else take steps to insure that it is.

BADLANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. 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 gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill providing for the extension in size of the Badlands National Monument in South Dakota to include a scenic area extending south through the present gunnery range area, which will increase the size of the Badlands National Monument by approximately 25 percent.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, this is a compromise bill because, under the law, when the property is declared surplus to the needs of a Government department and turned over to the General Services Administration for disposal, all Government agencies are circulated to see if they have need for this property.

In this instance the National Park Service has filed on the entire gunnery range area, which is approximately 40 miles long and about 15 miles wide, but only a strip a few miles wide, running down through the center of the gunnery range, is actually needed by them. Most of this area, however, is owned by the Oglala Sioux Tribe and title was not taken by the Government at the time of the taking of the rest of the land during World War II.

The Park Service had planned to exchange the grazing land in the area with

the tribe for their badlands. However, there is much more value in the land not needed by the Park Service than in the land which they wish to obtain by trade and exchange.

With this gunnery range area was taken over by the Army during World War II it was primarily Indian-owned land, it was all in the northern part of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and the owners, feeling that by doing so, they were serving a patriotic purpose, let the Government take the land at a very nominal figure. Not a single landowner went into court under condemnation proceedings. It was their understanding that the Government was buying it even at this nominal price to use so long as it was necessary for military training purposes and when it was no longer needed that they would be privileged to buy it back.

Down through the years the Indians have expected that when this land was surplus by the Air Force that they would buy their land back at approximately the same figure the Government paid when it was taken.

For a number of years now the Air Force has had little or no use for this land for gunnery range purposes and I have introduced in each session a bill which would authorize the repurchase by the former owners at the price the Government paid the Indian owner, plus interest at a reasonable rate, and plus a reasonable carrying charge. However, this legislation is being opposed by the Park Service because they feel this is an opportunity for them to extend the Badlands National Monument with little or no Government cash outlay to pay for such extension.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is a compromise bill extending the Park Service and, at the same time, authorizing the original former owner, or his direct heir, to repurchase the land if he so wishes. It is my feeling that there will be ample land unredeemed for the Park Service to exchange with the tribe to get all the land they need for park extension.

CURRENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, four closely related events here in Washington yesterday clearly illustrate that our current economic situation, in its relation to our involvement in Vietnam, is in utter confusion and approaching complete chaos.

Yesterday, the very day the latest cost-of-living increase was announced, the President strongly hinted that taxes would have to be increased again. The self-same day, however, the Congress passed his urgent request to fund the rent subsidy, the Federal Teachers Corps, and several other multimillion-dollar new domestic spending programs. Also,

that same day, the Defense Department indicated that more spending money may be needed in Vietnam.

I say that we do not have to endanger ourselves and our country with the runaway inflation these new programs, operating in the face of mounting war spending, will surely cause. Neither do we have to flatten ourselves out under the burden of confiscatory tax increases. Much, if not all, of the additional money required for the war effort can be assembled without raising taxes for the second time this year if we eliminate or delay some of our more nonessential domestic programs. In other words, instead of raising the people's taxes again and again, the Government itself should first try a little self-denial and a little self-imposed austerity in its domestic spending budget.

NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized that the reason we are compelled to spend large amounts of money for national defense programs is to prepare ourselves to deal with and protect against aggressive decisions and actions by the Communist world, which is headed by the Soviet Union.

It is also known that the Kremlin is providing to North Vietnam a wide range of weapons, equipment, and supplies to support Communist North Vietnam aggression, which results in the loss of American lives.

Is it logical and sound reasoning, then, for a U.S. Defense research publication to contain an abstract of its contents printed in Russian for the convenience of the Soviets?

It seems too incredible to be true but it is. The abstract appears in an Air Force aerospace research paper relating to temperature determinations in the upper atmosphere.

This study resulting in the report was originated and sponsored by the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, L. G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass. It relates to upper atmosphere physics, temperatures, and related matters.

The cover of the report, besides containing the scientific title of the study, identifies it as a product of the Office of Aerospace Research, U.S. Air Force. The report contains various pages of text, including scientific charts and data, followed by a listing of 152 environmental research papers. On the last page of the report's text, at the bottom of the page, appears an abstract giving a summary of the document's contents. The abstract, unbelievable as it may seem, is printed in Russian.

Mr. Speaker, this raises serious and far-reaching questions as to the philosophy and thinking of the people whose

task it is to help provide for our national security.

Just what conceivable purpose could be served by the inclusion of a Russian language abstract in such an U.S. Air Force report?

Certainly this could help facilitate research on the part of the Soviets, allowing their agents to review documents such as this speedily and easily to see if the subject covered is of interest to the Soviet military and industrial intelligence organizations.

But can anyone reasonably claim that it is in our national interest to provide a summary in Russian of the U.S. Air Force Office of Aerospace research publication?

The answer must be an emphatic "no." Certainly things have not reached such a point where we "deal in" the Soviets on research projects such as this. Actions such as this require a full and complete explanation to the Congress and American people.

MORE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS NEEDED

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined with several Members of Congress in the introduction of a resolution to call upon the National Science Foundation to make a study of the available scientific resources in this country and to come up with a plan by which we can have a more equitable distribution of Federal research and development funds.

Coming as I do from the Midwest, I naturally do not subscribe to the proposition that the bulk of our scientific know-how and capabilities are confined to a few geographical areas on the east and west coasts while the rest of the country remains a vast wasteland in the eyes of those who decide where research and development should be done.

Today, Federal research and development funds total between \$15 and \$20 billion. With all of the emphasis upon scientific advancements in what we call the space age, the totals for research and development are going to grow. I would hate to see the imbalance created by pouring the major portion of these funds into one, two or three areas, grow in direct proportion to the amount of the funds available.

Those who will take the trouble to look will find "centers of excellence" in the vast heartland of America. They will find fewer of the problems of overcrowding, over-pollution, over-taxation and over-discrimination that plague the areas where funds for research and development are now being concentrated.

So that none can say he was not aware of what we have, my State of Kansas has joined with a dozen other States in the formation of the Midwest

Resources Association, a bipartisan entity designed to point out our facilities, capabilities and resources of our region and promote its economic welfare.

We have facts and figures available through the association to prove our capability to handle a fair share of Federal research and development. We can present these to the National Science Foundation or any other agency interested in looking beyond the complexes on the east coast and west coast where a disproportionate share of the work is now being done.

It is appropriate, I feel, for the study proposed in the resolution to be made by the National Science Foundation and for the Congress to be prepared to act upon the recommendations. If a more equitable distribution of the research and development funds results, then I am certain the country will be the beneficiary of more scientific breakthroughs and a better balance of scientific knowledge.

FOOD TO INDIA PROGRAM DOES NOT FEED DESTITUTE

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President is today asking the Congress to express by resolution its approval of an additional \$1 billion, perhaps more, in emergency food aid to India.

The food shortage in India is real and the American people must respond. In the past 5 years we have shipped about 19 million tons of grain to India on terms which are tantamount to donation. Of this only 5 percent has been distributed without charge to the destitute people of India. The rest has been sold through Government-operated local markets.

Unfortunately, there is no indication that even a single bushel of the additional 3.5 million bushels the President now proposes to send will be distributed without charge to poor people.

Up to now, our food to India has not been the feed-the-destitute program many people believe it to be.

It would be appropriate and helpful for the Congress, and the President, to stipulate that as much of this new shipment as possible be distributed without charge to needy people.

PULLOUT FROM FRANCE OF NATO OFFICES WOULD BE ILL TIMED

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, news reports today indicate the United States will soon demand that NATO political offices be withdrawn from France. I hope the reports were unfounded. If the proposal should come up for review, it should be rejected.

This action would be ill timed to say the least. It would further isolate France from the others in the alliance, harden opposing positions, add new fuel to rising anti-French fires and make reconciliation more difficult. It can hardly be argued that military necessity dictates this action. The Standing Group, which is officially the highest military authority in NATO, has been located for years in Washington, separated by more than 5,000 miles from political offices in Paris.

President de Gaulle has stated repeatedly France's desire to stay in the alliance, even though he finds the present military structure unacceptable. If we demand that the NATO Council and Secretariat be removed from France, would this not suggest a stubborn our-way-or-else attitude? Certainly it would be unbecoming of the alliance's ex officio leader.

I hope the President, as leader of the alliance, will not only reject this negative approach but step in personally with affirmative action to bridge the growing chasm between these historic friends before it is too late.

SHOE PRICE HIKE DEMONSTRATES FOLLY OF CATTLE HIDE EXPORT CONTROLS

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, press dispatches in last night's newspapers reported shoe price increases of about 4½ percent by two of the Nation's large shoe companies.

On March 16, 1966, I joined with several of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House in protesting the sudden imposition of export controls on the domestic cattle hide industry.

Two days later the White House took note of my opposition to the export controls on American hides and sent me a memorandum from the Council of Economic advisers, dated March 17, 1966, defending the action.

I would like to quote a few of the highlights of this memorandum:

This action will prevent a substantial rise in shoe prices.

Increases in hide and leather prices would have forced an increase in shoe prices of 5 percent or more.

Export controls were imposed just before the time at which the shoe producers have to set prices for the fall season.

Shoe producers assured us they would cooperate in holding down prices.

Asking hide producers to forgo a temporary windfall in order to hold down a rise in shoe prices is fully justified.

Yesterday's announcement of shoe price increases demonstrates the folly of the Commerce Department's action of March 11 in imposing export controls on U.S. cattle hides.

It should now be obvious that the price of leather had little, if anything, to do with the plans of the shoe industry to increase the price of a pair of shoes. In fact, a 1965 study by the Department of Agriculture, revealed that on the average a \$10 pair of shoes included only 68 cents worth of cured hides. This is another reason why the rollback of hide prices makes relatively little sense as a brake on inflation.

The Commerce Department, and others in the administration, should reconsider immediately its action of March 11. At the same time, I believe the Congress has a responsibility to study the procedures under which export controls are instituted.

In this regard, I fully concur with the statement of the distinguished representative from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], who yesterday in the House pointed to the need for congressional review. He stated, in part:

I would like to point out that the manner in which Congress has allowed controls to be placed on exports is in direct contradiction to the way the Congress controls imports. The raising and lowering of tariffs on foreign goods requires legislative approval. No such action can be taken without fullest public consideration. Why should not controls on U.S. exports, which can have the same depressive stimulative effects on sectors of the U.S. economy be subject to at least a modicum of public consideration?

DISTRIBUTION OF FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS AMONG THE STATES

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a resolution the object of which is to achieve a better geographical distribution of the research and development funds that are granted, loaned, or otherwise made available by departments or agencies of the Government to institutions of higher learning for scientific or educational purposes.

There is no doubt in my mind that more equitable distribution of the almost \$16 billion for research and development by the several Federal agencies can and must be made.

In the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, on which it is my privilege to serve, I have come to know the importance of many of these research activities. No one challenges the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. There are vast frontiers yet to conquer.

The Congress has a responsibility of knowing whether or not these programs are being funded wisely and adequately;

and whether the full potential of the Nation's scientific and technological brains are being properly utilized.

No State, no region of the country has a corner on the ability to produce brainpower. We cannot afford intellectual underdevelopment in any part of our Nation. We must take steps to insure a more equitable distribution of the Federal funds for research and development which have become an integral part of maintaining academic excellence.

There is substantial evidence that a large percentage of the research grants awarded by several Federal agencies have gone to higher educational institutions in the East, Northeast, and west coast.

The resolution which I am introducing designates the National Science Foundation as the competent Federal agency to make a study and appraisal of our scientific resources and report to the Congress a feasible plan for equitable distribution of Federal research and development funds.

I urge that early consideration be given this legislation.

MINORITY ECONOMIC COUNCIL PROPOSAL ENDORSED BY SAN DIEGO UNION

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with economic matters of concern to every American represented by all Members of Congress, the state of the Nation's economy is a matter of personal interest to us all. At the present time, the ever-increasing cost of living and the danger of runaway spending concern thoughtful taxpayers and their families. Therefore, the suggestion made by Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS, St. Louis County Republican, senior House member on the House-Senate Joint Economic Committee, and jointly introduced by him and Congressman WIDNALL, second ranking member of that committee, to establish a Minority Council of Economic Advisers to service the Congress deserves support and serious study.

It is interesting to note that economists and consultants who have served under Democratic administrations agree with scholars and economic experts who have worked both in Republican and Democratic administrations that whichever party is the minority in Congress needs a Council of Economic Advisers to help promote sounder scholarship in the economic field rather than abdication this largely to downtown. The San Diego Union, one of the chief papers of the Copley chain, has said:

Congressman CURTIS has made an excellent suggestion that could lend checks and balances to the present problem of runaway economic ideas.

I join thoughtful students who seek to build a stronger and better American

economic system and who are both Republicans and Democrats in supporting this constructive proposal and in helping implement it by Congress to serve Congressmen more effectively regardless of which party is in the majority in Congress. The complete text of the editorial of March 12, 1966, from the San Diego Union follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Mar. 12, 1966]
FISCAL CURB IS NEEDED—DANGER IN RUNAWAY
SPENDING

It is one of the paradoxes of modern times that in a peak of prosperity the U.S. Government and the people of our Nation are going more deeply into debt.

Granted it is not always possible for the Government or for a family to have a balanced budget. Extraordinary circumstances in a given year can lead to exceptions.

On the other hand, it is also true that the extraordinary spending that produces deficits must be an exception rather than a rule. No nation and no individual can continue to go into debt year after year without reaching a breaking point.

Logic dictates that the time to balance budgets and perhaps even pay off some of the past debts is in times of prosperity, such as we are having now. The present course, unfortunately, is just the opposite.

Paychecks are fatter than ever, but rising prices and taxes have pushed personal indebtedness of people in the United States from \$272 billion in 1955 to \$320 billion today. Inflation threatens to continue the trend.

Government indebtedness has reached a peak of \$328 billion with \$12 billion of the proposed budget for next year earmarked just for payment of interest. The Federal Government has had deficits in 30 of the last 35 annual budgets, and another is proposed next year.

It is clearly a time for the Nation to pause and take stock so the trend can be reversed. Instead the prescription of the administration is a continuation of the Keynesian economics that fuels the boom through Federal deficits in spite of the clearly marked shoals ahead.

Clearly, some new thinking on the subject is needed. An excellent idea has been proposed by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri. He suggests Congress establish a "little" council of economic advisers to help the party out of power focus dissent on economic issues.

Properly constituted such a council would serve the Nation well if the dissent were constructive. Individual minority leaders who have sought to focus constructive dissent unfortunately do not have the weight and public attention to accomplish the goals. Within the Federal Administrative structure there has been no courageous dissent with the exception of the Federal Reserve Board.

Constructive opposition such as the "little" council of economic advisers could bring might, sharpen administration thinking by presenting another side of issues, have the stature and weight to focus public pressure, to correct mistaken thinking, and speak with studied authority.

One of the biggest benefits it could bring would be a year-round continuing and profound study of economic factors instead of a reaction to a given proposal.

Representative CURTIS has made an excellent suggestion that could lend checks and balances to the present problem of runaway economic ideas.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON]

may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, today, there are over twice as many people on relief as there are unemployed. There are 3,200,000 now unemployed according to the Department of Labor, and there are about 7,800,000 on relief.

This is a costly business for the American taxpayer. Since 1963, when this administration took over, the cost of Federal, State, and local relief has gone up 37 percent—from \$4.6 billion a year to \$6½ billion.

The cold facts are these: there was a drop in the number of unemployed between February 1963 and February 1966 of 1,100,000 persons, according to Labor Department statistics.

Between 1963 and fiscal year 1967, those on relief increased by exactly the same number, 1,100,000.

The New Deal went in for work relief to give people jobs in a great depression; that is, to create jobs for the millions who were out of work. The Great Society is providing work relief when the Secretary of Labor informs us there is a shortage of manpower and when the President urges private business not to expand plant facilities.

The result of overspending in boom times is a squeeze for our people. The housewife is confronted with skyrocketing food costs and taxes are going spiraling up, too, right after this fall's elections.

CONTROLS ON FOREIGN PRIVATE INVESTMENT DO MORE HARM THAN GOOD

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an impressive study by the National Industrial Conference Board makes clear the dangers involved in the administration's controls on the outflow of U.S. investment capital. The principal conclusion of the study is the program is self-defeating because a reduction in new foreign investment is likely to cause earnings from abroad not only to cease to grow but actually to decline.

The study points out how the restraints on investment may actually cause a reduction in U.S. exports. Among the various regions of the world, those where U.S. investments have grown the most rapidly have tended to be those to which exports have expanded the fastest.

We may already be getting some depressing effect on U.S. exports from the investment controls. Exports last year rose only slightly, compared to a sharp jump in imports. The result was a \$1.9 billion decline in the trade surplus.

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Wall Street Journal of March 28, 1966, by George Shea, which discusses the National Industrial Conference Board study be included in the RECORD at this point.

THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS
IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

The United States may be nearing the limit of what can be done to improve its balance of payments through voluntary restrictions on capital investment abroad. But the forces of the free market may take over the task of helping U.S. cash inflow and outflow to come closer to a balance following years of substantial deficits.

The difficulty of improving the balance of payments by cutting new investment abroad is discussed in a new book—"U.S. Production Abroad and the Balance of Payments"—by staff members of the National Industrial Conference Board, a nonprofit business-supported organization engaged in economic research. The work, reflecting a study of 100 corporations, was undertaken because the U.S. Government has been trying to get business here to invest less abroad and bring back more earnings from old investments outside the country. This Government effort began mildly as far back as 1963 but early in 1965 took on the more serious aspect of formal guidelines.

The principal conclusion of the study is that in the long run the Government's double effort is self-conflicting. It suggests that any substantial reduction in the pace of new investment abroad is likely to cause earnings from abroad not only to cease to grow but actually to decline. Broadly speaking, the reason is simply that no enterprise can aim to remain static; it must seek to grow or it is likely to shrink.

There are no figures available as yet to support this thought with regard to investment abroad, because the reduction in such outlays is too recent. Indeed, the earnings from abroad are probably still benefiting from the expansion in such spending in recent years, and particularly in late 1964 and early 1965, before the program of restriction was formalized.

New direct investment of dollars in foreign facilities grew from \$1.4 billion in 1959 to \$2.4 billion in 1964, there being an increase each year but one. And the annual rate, adjusted seasonally, increased further to \$3.3 billion in the fourth quarter of 1964 and to \$4.6 billion in the first quarter of 1965.

The drop resulting from the restrictions showed up after last year's first quarter, with declines to annual rates of \$3.6 billion and \$2.1 billion in the second and third quarters. Even these figures are relatively high by the standards of any year prior to 1963, so that the testing period of possible depressing effect on earnings still lies ahead.

Aside from this point, the National Industrial Conference Board study suggests that also in several other ways restrictions on foreign investing are likely to end up by being self-defeating in their aim of ending or even slimming the U.S. deficit. For instance, the study takes up the frequent argument that production abroad replaces goods that might otherwise be exported from here. The survey found that often production was begun abroad in order to avoid losing exports that were threatened with local competition or local import barriers of some kind.

The businesses surveyed also said that in several ways investment abroad actually stimulates exports. The most direct way in which this happens is through the export of equipment needed to set up the foreign facility.

In addition, the survey found exports are stimulated through the shipment of new raw materials, parts and even finished goods,

much as continuing sales of blades result when a safety razor has been sold. Also, the production of goods by newly established U.S.-owned facilities in foreign places may call attention to U.S. goods generally, spurring exports that may be seemingly unrelated. Finally, the success of new enterprises abroad spurs economic growth there, enhancing demand for goods from everywhere including the United States.

An indication that these suppositions are correct is furnished in a table offered in the book, showing that among the various regions of the world those where U.S. investments have grown the most rapidly have tended to be also those to which exports have expanded the fastest. For instance, U.S. investments in Europe from 1950 to 1964 grew 13.8 percent yearly while in Latin America the growth was only 5.1 percent yearly. Similarly, exports to Europe in the same period expanded 7.9 percent yearly while to Latin America the growth was only 2.1 percent annually.

But though the deficit-cutting effects of the restrictions on new investment seem likely to wane in the future, a new force tending to cut the balance-of-payments deficit has come into play. It is the rise in interest rates resulting from the fact that new borrowings in this country are running ahead of new savings.

For years interest rates lower here than abroad have tended to encourage capital to gravitate to foreign shores to seek the greater available returns. This differential has provided a form of unrelenting pressure tending to cause otherwise uncommitted funds to flow out of this country.

Now that rates here have climbed to a level generally the highest in 40 years, the differential between rates here and abroad has narrowed considerably. At least this one pressure tending to perpetuate the deficit in the balance of payments has moderated. How long this condition may last depends in part on how long the business boom lasts, for once business growth slows down interest rates are likely to slip back. But in the meantime the goal of reduction in the deficit may be approached more closely through the working of the forces of the market rather than through a formal program handed down in Washington.

THE BIG MONEY IS IN POVERTY

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, in March of 1964, Mr. Sargent Shriver appeared before our Committee on Education and Labor to argue for approval of President Johnson's war on poverty. He told us:

It is also a prudent program. It is financially prudent * * *. It is prudently planned in that every dollar allocated will be spent to help the poor. There will be no leakage. There is no contemplated huge new bureaucracy * * *. I think that most people in the executive branch would state that I am not one who likes a lot of bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to report a fantastic leakage in funds intended to help the poor—a leakage of funds to a huge new bureaucracy. According to President Johnson's 1967 budget, it will take 6,484 permanent Federal employees to run Mr. Shriver's burgeoning bureauc-

racy—a poverty empire costing \$53,489,000 in salaries alone.

The word has gotten around among civil servants in Washington that the big money is in poverty. Few know how big it is.

The 1,557 permanent Federal poverty employees will make \$10,619 or more; another 1,032 community action workers will be paid \$10,000 or more from Federal funds; an undetermined number of contract employees in 15 privately run Job Corps establishments will be paid over \$10,000.

We have over 200,000 gallant men in South Vietnam, but we can be sure that there are not as many as 2,500 drawing \$10,000 a year—the basic pay of an Army colonel with over 14 years' service. The poverty warrior-bureaucrats include at least 25 individuals who will be paid more than the base pay of General Westmoreland himself.

Astronaut Neil A. Armstrong, who with Lt. Col. David R. Scott heroically flew our most recent and most dangerous space mission, is a Federal civil servant grade GS-16. His job is one of incredible difficulty and danger, for which only a handful of men in the whole world are qualified. Yet 25 of Mr. Shriver's high-flying bureaucrats are budgeted for GS-16 positions; and 36 others are budgeted for even higher pay grades. Mr. Speaker, who would think that OEO had any jobs more demanding and difficult than that of Astronaut Armstrong?

Mr. Speaker, there are 2,350 permanent Federal employees budgeted for the Washington and regional offices of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This is the high-salaried palace guard of the Poverty czar. Nearly half—1,006—of this elite force will get \$10,619 or more; at least 521 will be paid over \$14,600; at least 54 will get over \$19,600; 24 get over \$25,000; and 6 will get between \$26,000—the pay of the U.S. Commissioner of Education—and \$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder so little gets done at the Office of Economic Opportunity? They have so many chiefs and so few Indians. They have more GS-15's than they have GS-9's; more GS-14's than GS-4's; more GS-13's than GS-7's, and exactly as many GS-16's at a base pay of \$19,619 as they have GS-2's at a base pay of \$3,814. The total salary bill for this palace guard next year will be \$21,739,000.

Outside this inner circle at "poverty" headquarters there are 4,134 other permanent Federal employees budgeted at \$31,750,000. They are to do the hard work farmed out to other Federal agencies, such as running the Job Corps camps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the adult education program, agricultural loans, and so forth. Only 551 of these unfortunates will be paid over \$10,600 a year, of which at least 112 will get over \$14,600. However, these 4,134 positions, listed in the budget under "Allocation accounts" do not include those who are paid by private contractors to run 15 of the 97 Job Corps establishments.

Incidentally, administration costs in the Job Corps are so high that the annual cost per enrollee now runs above

\$9,000, enough to send two boys to Harvard. Even the budgeted cost next year is \$7,880 per enrollee.

But, Mr. Speaker, not all the high salaries in poverty are accounted for by permanent Federal employees or employees of private contractors working on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. Federal funds also pay for the salaries of employees of local antipoverty agencies, and 1,032 of these employees now make \$10,000 or more a year, of which 200 make \$15,000 or more per year.

On the basis of the exact information available, I estimate—and this can only be an educated guess—that nearly 3,000 individuals are paid \$10,000 a year or more from Federal antipoverty funds.

We do not know how many, if any, poor people have been helped to get out of poverty by Mr. Shriver's high-priced agents, but it is pretty obvious that thousands of employees have been kept out of poverty. Among these undoubtedly are many dedicated and able people, but we know all too well that the ranks also include a plentitude of political hacks.

Mr. Speaker, this is a scandal. It is nothing less than a scandal. And it is a scandal that Mr. Sargent Shriver defended before the Education and Labor Committee with the bland boast that his organization was only one-fiftieth the size of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I compared one part of HEW—the U.S. Office of Education—with the Office of Economic Opportunity. Here is the record on that.

The Office of Education is budgeted for \$3.478 billion in fiscal 1967, compared to \$1.724 billion for the Office of Economic Opportunity, yet OE will need only 2,861 permanent employees—hardly more than Shriver's palace guard—compared with OEO's 6,484 permanent employees.

If the U.S. Office of Education were administered like the Office of Economic Opportunity, it would require 12,968 employees to spend its \$3.478 billion, or 4½ time the number it has budgeted.

The comparison in high-paying jobs in these two agencies is also interesting. Five individuals in OEO are paid more than the U.S. Commissioner of Education, who gets \$26,000. In the grades GS-15 through GS-18, where the pay ranges from \$17,055 to \$25,382, the comparison looks like this:

GS grade	Salaries	OEO	OE
15	\$17,055 to \$22,365	249	125
16	\$19,619 to \$25,043	25	33
17	\$22,217 to \$25,325	17	10
18	\$25,382	13	3
	Above \$25,382	6	1
	Total	310	172

All but 37 of OEO's highest paid jobs are in Mr. Shriver's own palace guard headquarters staff of 2,350 permanent employees. These other 37 jobs with starting pay of \$17,055 or more are scattered among the 4,134 permanent employees in other Federal agencies which are running such programs as the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, adult

basic education, agricultural loans, and so forth.

I have made a chart showing the number of highest paid officials among the permanent Federal employees budgeted in fiscal 1967 for the Office of Economic Opportunity programs. It is broken down to show positions in the 2,350 strong palace guard which makes up Mr. Shriver's own administrative staff, and positions in the force of 4,134 assigned to handle major segments of the \$1.7 billion program in other Federal agencies.

Positions budgeted for OEO in fiscal 1967

GS grade	Salaries	OEO palace guard	OEO programs run by other Federal agencies
	Above \$25,382	6	0
18	\$25,382	12	1
17	\$22,217 to \$25,325	16	1
16	\$19,619 to \$25,043	20	5
15	\$17,055 to \$22,365	219	30
14	\$14,680 to \$19,252	248	75
13	\$12,510 to \$16,245	230	173
12	\$10,619 to \$13,931	255	266
	Total	1,006	551
	Grand total for OEO programs	1,557	

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of some cogent remarks of my own chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, our colleague ADAM C. POWELL. He understands the true needs of impoverished citizens better than most. On January 21 of this year in a speech in Harlem he said:

We do not need any more experimental or demonstration projects in Harlem. All we need are jobs. That's all. Jobs.

Chairman POWELL did not mean jobs for bureaucrats or jobs for politicians, but jobs for poor people. On March 8, in opening the hearings on the Economic Opportunity Act, Chairman POWELL pointed out that there are 97 people in the local Washington, D.C., poverty agency—UPO—paid over \$10,000 a year with Federal funds, and observed:

Congress appropriated this money to help the poor, not create a monolith of extravagantly paid functionaries.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with these remarks of Chairman POWELL. But despite the attempt by our committee to investigate the Office of Economic Opportunity, this administrative monstrosity goes its merry way. How far it goes and how wild it plans to become in hiring extravagantly paid functionaries is laid out in black and white—or in red ink—in the President's budget for fiscal year 1967.

In view of the facts I have presented here today, I renew my plea to the House to take action on my resolution, House Resolution 670, for a bipartisan select committee, appointed by yourself, to investigate the conduct of the war on poverty.

As I have pointed out before, if we do not take remedial action the entire anti-poverty program is going to become so discredited, and be so ineffective, as to create massive disillusionment among citizens trapped in poverty. There is still time to avoid this tragedy.

THE DEPRESSED CONDITIONS OF THE HOUSING CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time under the special order—and I will not take all of the time in the remarks I now give—to bring to the attention of the House and to the various agencies of our Government a problem that I think needs careful consideration, at a time when we are looking at our economy and are gravely concerned about how we are managing it and where it is going, with the stresses and strains that are put upon it by the events of our day.

May I urge, Mr. Speaker, that in all of our deliberations and our considerations, besides quantitative analysis we have a little qualitative analysis.

I would like to urge the Members to keep constantly in mind that averages are only things of fiction, that they can only be understood when you realize the components of the averages, and that there can exist conditions which distort a situation that is very grave simply because it is buried in an average.

I think one such situation does exist at this time, which is an anomaly. It is the situation in which we have conditions of recession in the homebuilding field at a time when we are talking about a general condition that is moving in the opposite direction.

In the West, in particular, and in other areas which my further remarks will delineate, there has been overbuilding, which has caused great expressions of concern and some movement on the part of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to try to protect against a situation that would be unhealthy in the building industry.

But, at the same time and in some instances, strangely enough, existing side by side, there are great areas of need for additional housing.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress upon our body and the other agencies that should pay attention to it the realization that for some time we have had in some areas of the building industry in our great Nation a situation in which money was the motivator of building. Money markets were leading the building activity. That is not good. That led to problems of overbuilding. But it is just as wrong to have money policies suppressing building.

When can we find a situation in which the market controls building activities? Why should the money policies control in a situation in which we talk about our free enterprise system, which is based upon market response? We look about us and see that in one instance we let the market concept go by the board and the money policies encourage building not needed. Now we turn around and do exactly the opposite thing and say that the money policy will depress the building regardless of what our needs are.

I feel this is something into which we should look with a very critical eye.

Mr. Speaker, the great era in our building business, the great boom that existed from 1945 to 1965, resembled more than anything else the Oklahoma land rush, when everyone got into the act. As will be remembered by the Members, in the Oklahoma land rush, anyone who had anything at all to ride, from a sway-back mare to a gracious coach and four took part in that great land exploitation. That was true in the building business for the last 20 years. There was so much available that everyone got into the act, whether they knew anything about building or did not. There was a great opportunity for those who followed where the dollars were, flaring their nostrils like a beagle hound on the trail of a coon. They came crashing into the building business. They became great land developers and builders.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that has happened in the slippage of the building business in 1957, and now the very critical situation that developed in 1965, and extends to today—it has shaken out of the operation these marginal builders, these promoters, the boom followers, and wildcatters, and that is not bad. I am not sorry to see that. But I hope we will see the need for continuing in a posture of performance the fine builders who over the past 20 years have done a tremendous job of meeting the challenge of both the quality and quantity of building needed, and doing a tremendous job in the face of great change.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not impose myself upon the time of our wonderful staff to further belabor this subject, but I would address the attention of my colleagues to the remainder of the remarks and the charts which will follow and which will be a part of this RECORD.

I hope that we will have the considered attention and the critical comment of both our colleagues and the people of the agencies who are involved.

Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out that "experience teaches slowly, often at the cost of mistakes." The home building industry is today suffering from a mistake that experience should long ago have alerted us to avoid.

Just recently the President's Council of Economic Advisers indicated there was the possibility of our economy in 1966 surpassing the phenomenal growth rate achieved in 1965. With certain signs of inflation now appearing, it is evident that various policies of a fiscal nature must be designed that will restrain the economy while insuring a continued balance growth.

Yet, with an ever-expanding economy, recent reports indicate that the home building industry is at its most depressed state in recent years. In some areas of the country, particularly on the west coast, the home building industry has fallen to a low in building starts for 1966 not seen since the recession of 1954. How do we account for the situation now faced by the construction industry—an industry that accounts for about 3 percent of our gross national product; an industry that employs over 4 million Americans?

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that we are witnessing a reduction in demand for

housing? Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that with an expanding population, an ever-increasing number of households, and higher employment and income, that Americans are somehow not interested in buying homes or in renting apartments? No. Demand, although a factor in a few areas, is not the primary reason for the sad state of the housing construction industry. Later I will show that the potential demand for housing is increasing.

What then is the reason? In opening this speech, I alluded to a mistake that has been made that experience should not have allowed. One major reason for the depressed state of America's housing construction industry is the paradoxical and almost ludicrous situation that restricted the availability of mortgage money in an expanding economy. The Federal Reserve's decision late last year to raise interest rates in order to curb inflation has resulted in continued expansion with no significant restraint on inflation while the tight money situation has caused serious depression in housing construction.

Today, just a few short months after the Federal Reserve's interest rate hike, the consequences of such a shortsighted policy are becoming abundantly evident. Inflation is becoming a more critical problem, and the interest rate hike is unfairly forcing an important segment of our economy to compete on an ever-tightening money market.

What is the current status of the home building industry? Nationally, the seasonally adjusted total for February of 1966 indicates that housing construction starts are off by more than 12 percent. Last year at this time annual construction starts were adjusted to an estimate of 1,482,000. February of 1966 calls for an adjusted annual figure of 1,318,000 starts, or a drop of some 164,000. See table No. 1.

My own State of California, where the homebuilding industry amounted to close to \$2 billion in 1965, is faced with a 39 percent decrease in housing starts in February of 1966 when compared with February of 1965. This decrease represents the lowest annual adjusted rate of housing starts in California since 1954. February of this year saw a decrease of 85,392 housing starts in an adjusted annual figure, falling from 219,024 starts to 133,632 starts. See table No. 2.

Los Angeles, the largest city in California, seasonally adjusted total for February is 34 to 37 percent below the 1965 figure for the same month, and the San Francisco Bay area is off some 31 percent in single family dwelling starts when compared with the annual seasonal total for February of 1965.

In my congressional district, we may expect a 28 percent reduction in housing starts for the first quarter of 1966 when compared with the first quarter of 1965. The Sanford R. Goodkin Research Corp. estimates that during the first quarter of 1966, Orange County can expect a 5-percent reduction in the annual seasonal total for single family units and a 65-percent reduction in multiple family units.

The thought that immediately arises is that California is overbuilt, and the reduction in housing starts is a normal reaction to allow demand to catch up with availability. This was true for part of 1965, but the latest information available from the Real Estate Research Bureau, and the Stanford Research Institute, indicates that demand has just about caught up, and the serious decline in present housing starts in California is due to a combination of factors—nearing the top of the list is the scarcity of mortgage money causing high down payments, high interests rates, and high monthly payments.

California is not the only area where the building industry has been seriously affected as a result of tight money. The entire western region in general has a seriously depressed housing construction industry. Housing starts in the West are down 22 percent when the adjusted annual total of February 1966 is compared with February of 1965. The February 1966 figures indicate a total of 234,000 housing starts, down 69,000 compared to the 303,000 starts estimated in February of 1965.

Interestingly enough, however, is that the West is not as bad off as the north-east region of the United States which is down some 24 percent in February of 1966 compared to 1965. The north-central region of the United States, while showing an increase for February of 1966, nevertheless, is down an alarming 48 percent in seasonally adjusted annual housing starts between December of 1965, and January of 1966. The great drop in the north-central area is particularly bad in that it represents a serious seasonal decline in starts that was not picked up in the usually normal increase in housing starts during the first quarter of 1966. The southern region of the United States is suffering from a 9-percent decrease in housing starts.

New Orleans, La., faces a 33-percent reduction in the first quarter, and Baltimore can expect a loss of 16 percent of housing construction activity. Atlanta, Ga., is faced with a 14-percent reduction in activity, while Newark, N.J., will suffer a 28-percent reduction. Philadelphia, Pa., will be off 25 percent, and Flint, Mich., can expect a 29-percent reduction in homebuilding activity during the first quarter of 1966. See table No. 3.

Couple the nationwide reduction in building activity with the following facts and we have a problem of national consequence. The University of California at Los Angeles' School of Business and Finance estimates that the employment multiplier factor in the construction industry is 2.57. In other words, for each person directly employed in construction, there are an additional 2½ persons employed as an indirect result of the industry. The President's economic report indicates there are some 4 million people in the construction industry, meaning that there are approximately 10 million other people whose jobs are indirectly connected with the industry. People in the area of lumber production,

home furnishings, major household appliances—refrigerators, ranges, and so forth—and many other segments of our economy, may soon begin to feel the pinch now being felt by the homebuilding industry.

The industry is feeling pinched because of the present tight money situation. The market is available, the money is not.

There are a number of factors working in favor of housing demand. First, and most obvious is the rise in our population. But even more significant is the middle 1940's baby boom. The Bureau of the Census indicates that the housing market can expect to begin to feel the impact of the "baby boom" in 1967-68. At this point, we may expect there will be great demand, first, for lower cost housing, and then substantially increasing as the mid-1940's generation becomes older and more affluent. It is estimated there will be a significant demand for more expensive housing beginning in 1970.

For the past 10 years, the Census Bureau reports, households in the United States have been growing at the rate of about 800,000 a year. However, it is predicted the growth rate of households will average over 1 million a year from 1966 through 1970. The Stanford Research Institute points up the corollary that the larger the number of households, the smaller the population per household. In other words, according to the Stanford Research Institute, the stronger the influence of those factors tending to increase the desire and ability of persons to occupy separate living quarters, the smaller the average number of persons per household. The history of our national trend in this area is toward smaller households. In 1910 the average per household was 4.6, falling all the way to 3.3 in 1960. Couple the trend in smaller numbers in a household thereby increasing the number of households with the avalanche ready to break over us from the mid-1940's baby boom and the question of demand for future housing becomes academic.

Other factors working in concert creating housing demand are the ever-increasing demolition of existing dwelling units. Urban renewal, the need for recreational areas, and freeways have been removing existing housing at an astounding rate. A second factor is the increasing mobility of our citizens. Internal migration is creating new demand while not seriously affecting the vacancy factor of many areas. Evidently mobility is so cross-replenished no one area suffers from any great loss of people that would substantially raise the availability of housing. See table No. 4.

A third very obvious factor is that with an expanding economy, and more affluence, there is the desire to move up to better housing. As our standard of living increases so too will our demand for even more quality living quarters. This will especially be true when the postwar "baby boom" generation, weened on affluence, demands the best.

Fourth, the U.S. Government, with the Housing Acts of 1961, 1964, and the rent supplement program just passed in

the House yesterday, is creating housing demand. Add to this a fifth factor of better transportation facilities encouraging more and more people to begin housekeeping on their own, as well as creating easy access to new areas, and we have another significant element in creating housing demand.

Probably one of the most significant factors in facilitating demand is the availability of the necessary money to finance new mortgages. If this money is not available, no matter how great the demand for housing, the home buyer and builder is reluctant to go ahead if the borrowing costs are too high, the downpayments too large, the mortgage financing unavailable, monthly payments prohibitive, and credit costs increasing.

The irony of our present situation has prompted my remarks today. In a market where the demand is high for housing, we find the homebuilding industry of America stagnating partly because of means of translating the consumer demand for housing into housing has been restricted.

The tight-money situation created by the Federal Reserve's interest rate hike is resulting in a shortage of funds for home mortgages. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board estimates that total funds for home mortgages in 1966 will be \$14.5 billion, down some \$1.5 billion when compared with 1965. Yet the demands for new mortgage capital will approach the \$17 billion mark creating a shortage of anywhere from 5 to 10 percent in mortgage money. See table No. 5.

Yet, because of restrictive policies, the primary mortgage lenders, the savings and loan institutions, have been facing a reduction in the inflow of money. Savings and loans had to face up to a substantial reduction in their net gains on savings. Commercial banks on the other hand saw an increase in their net flow of money in 1965, putting the homebuilding industry at a definite disadvantage since commercial banks lend only a very small percentage of mortgage money.

Additional problems caused by money restrictions resulted in a rise of one-half of 1 percent on interest rates for construction loans, while the limit a builder can draw money as a percentage of the value has declined. Interest rates for construction loans are as high as 6½ percent in many instances.

Federally guaranteed mortgage insurance administered under the auspices of FHA has long been a peculiar problem to the homebuilding industry. The March edition of the Savings Bank Journal pointed out that, although "February 7 brought the long expected adjustment in the FHA contract rate—from 5¼ to 5½ percent—the action also brought a chorus of comments from builders, realtors, mortgage bankers and investors that the new rate was still far out of line with market realities. These observers uniformly pointed to 5¾ percent as the more realistic rate in the present circumstances."

The Bank Journal went on to say: Given the far out-of-line 5¼-percent rate formerly in effect, discounts on FHA loans

zoomed as high as six points, and averaging five points. These stiff discounts brought protests from builders, and reports that homeowners began to balk on putting their homes on the open market for resale with FHA financing.

Jack Justice, president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, pointed out that the raise in the FHA rate "would not rectify the problem in the West, where discounts are ranging up to six points," while MBA President Ewart Goodwin commented that the "belated adjustment of the maximum permissive rate on FHA-insured mortgages announced on February 7 was disappointing to everyone who is familiar with market conditions today."

Couple the FHA rate problem with rising conventional loan rates, about one-half of 1 percent increase since September of 1965, and higher conventional loan downpayments and you begin to get an idea of what is causing the depressed state in the homebuilding industry.

With rising construction interest rates, tight money making mortgage financing unavailable, an unrealistic FHA rate, and rising consumer interest costs and down payments, we have a segment of our expanding economy that is being restricted and discriminated against—not purposefully, but from ignorance.

Congress and the responsible housing and home financing agents must be made to realize that this very important element of our economy cannot continue under the present conditions. At the opening of this speech I pointed out that we are bound to suffer mistakes in the course of events. This, however, is a mistake that can and must be rectified quickly.

Experience, though it is slow, has taught us to act quickly when we discover a mistake. The homebuilding industry is being stifled because of shortsightedness on the part of those who attempted to overcome an evident problem in our economy. If we are to restore the building industry to its vital role in the economy, we must act with considered dispatch.

TABLE No. 1.—1965-66 comparison of seasonally adjusted annual housing starts on a regional basis

	[In thousands of housing units]				
	Nation	West	North-east	South	North Central
February 1965....	1,482	303	326	574	279
February 1966....	1,318	234	246	532	306
Percent change...	-12	-22	-24	-9	+8

¹ This percentage does not reflect the difference in housing starts between December of 1965 and January of 1966, during which time there was a net reduction in starts of 48 percent that was not picked up during the normal increase in activity for the 1st quarter.

TABLE No. 2.—Housing authorizations, seasonally adjusted annual rates, California

	1964	1965	1966
January.....	322,980	195,048	154,884
February.....	310,116	219,024	133,632

TABLE No. 2.—Housing authorizations, seasonally adjusted annual rates, California—Continued

LOS ANGELES			
	1965	1966	Percent change
January.....	9,535	7,351	-23
February.....	10,650	7,009	-34
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA			
January.....	3,293	2,293	-25
February.....	1,722	966	-31

¹ -39 percent when compared to 1965—the lowest annual rate since 1954.

² Information on single-family dwelling units only.

TABLE 3.—Some metropolitan areas expected to have a reduction in housing construction for the 1st quarter of 1966 when compared with the 1st quarter of 1965

	Percentage of reduction
Anahelm—Santa Ana, Calif.....	-28
Atlanta, Ga.....	-14
Baltimore, Md.....	-16
Boston, Mass.....	-5
Columbia, S.C.....	-8
Columbus, Ohio.....	-14
Denver, Colo.....	-3
Flint, Mich.....	-29
Fort Worth, Tex.....	-10
Lexington, Ky.....	-17
Little Rock, Ark.....	-30
Los Angeles—Long Beach, Calif.....	-37
San Diego, Calif.....	-9
Tucson, Ariz.....	-15
Newark, N.J.....	-28
New Orleans, La.....	-33
New York, N.Y.....	-4
Philadelphia, Pa.....	-25

TABLE No. 4.—Vacancy information for 1965

	Percent of vacancies	
	Single family	Multiple family
Los Angeles.....	2.3	7.9
Orange County.....	4.6	20.8
Denver.....	3.6	3.6
Great Falls, Mont.....	3.3	5.0
Albuquerque.....	3.3	15.3
Houston.....	3.6	18.2
Casper, Wyo.....	4.3	11.5
Buffalo.....	1.4	4.3
Newark, N.J.....	1.0	1.8
Chicago.....	1.9	2.5
Honolulu.....	2.0	2.9
Charlotte.....	3.4	8.7
Charleston.....	2.3	7.0
Cincinnati.....	2.2	7.6

NOTE.—Information prepared by the Federal Housing Administration indicates that the vacancy factor in single unit dwellings has remained constant over the past 3 years, and there has been an actual decline in vacancies in multiple dwelling units.

TABLE No. 5.—Home mortgage holdings for 1965 and 1966 estimated by the Federal home loan bank board

[In billions of dollars]		
	1965	1966
Savings and loans.....	7.8	7.0
Mutual savings banks.....	2.8	2.5
Insurance companies.....	1.6	1.5
Banks.....	2.6	2.0
Individuals.....	1.2	1.5
Total funds for home mortgages.....	16.0	14.5

NOTE.—Demands for new capital, \$16,000,000,000 to \$17,000,000,000.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANNA. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] for his excellent and timely presentation today. I too have been gravely concerned about the sharp downturn in home construction in California. The 89th Congress has shown great concern about national housing problems; only yesterday this body voted to fund the beginnings of a rent supplement program. Yet, at this time of great congressional concern and action, my own State faces its most serious housing crisis in many years.

I would like to supplement Mr. HANNA's presentation with further information about the housing slump in the San Francisco Bay area. I will also discuss how this home construction crisis in California relates to the economic issues which have been debated for the past weeks.

As 1965 drew to a close, predictions of a continued national building boom were easy to find. In December, the trade journal Building Construction editorialized that "1966 may well go down in the history of the building construction industry as the year of the dollar" because times "have been so good for so long." Construction Review, the Department of Commerce publication, reported in November that "new construction expenditures in 1966 should continue the steady climb that has prevailed since 1960," increasing by 6 percent above 1965's record high.

This statement, of course, came before the Federal Reserve Board acted to raise the discount rate. Yet even that action did not dim the enthusiasm of the builders. House & Home, which calls itself the management publication of the housing industry, explained that financial experts are right: The Federal Reserve Board's action raising the discount rate will not restrict the availability of mortgage money for builders. It will just make the money more expensive.

But optimism and cries for patience cannot hide what has been happening since the beginning of this year in my own district and elsewhere in the San Francisco Bay area. The figures before me show a decline of 25 percent in residential building permits in January 1966—compared with January 1965—and a decline in February 1966—compared with February 1965—which approaches 48 percent.

Employment figures in the building trades unions bear out the slump. Unemployment in the four-county San Francisco Bay area averaged approximately 22 percent, with the increases from the same period last year ranging from 10 to 35 percent. Nonresidential construction has kept out-of-work lists slightly behind the sharper decline in residential starts. But it remains the worst slump in several years. The building trades in Alameda County just completed a survey of their locals which showed an overall unemployment rate of 16 to 18 percent, with the plasterers local up at 40 percent and the cement masons close to 25 percent. Figures for

Santa Clara County unions and crafts also reveal sharp declines:

Unions and crafts	Total membership	Unemployed	Normal employment
Painters Local 507.....	1,100	200	1,300
Plasterers.....	250	90	350
Hodcarriers.....	300	70	460
Lathers.....	197	45	260
Painters 388 (Palo Alto) Sheet Metal Workers 309.....	420	100	550
.....	450	75	600
Carpenters.....	6,700	1,100	(1)
Electricians.....	1,074	200	(1)
Construction Laborers Union 270.....	2,700	600	3,000
Plumbers 393.....	1,350	250	1,400

¹ Not available.

These figures tell only part of the story. The cold figures cannot express the frustrations and fears of builders, workers, and buyers alike. This excerpt from recent correspondence from a developer in my district will illustrate the concern of people in the bay area:

The recent increase in the allowable VA and FHA interest rate has failed to improve the supply of mortgage money. In fact, the situation is so confused and uncertain that we are unable to get commitments for future loan deliveries at any price. The constant worsening of the money situation, typified by yesterday's increase in the prime rate, has kept the mortgage money market reeling.

Unless something is stabilized in the next few weeks we may be forced, along with others in the industry, to evaluate whether we should build any more homes, even if they are presold.

It appears to us that the opening of Pandora's box by the change in the rediscount rate late last year has brought about the most critical mortgage money situation in history. Some mortgage men claim that even if Brownstein raises the FHA rate another quarter to five and three quarters that the situation would scarcely improve.

Mr. Speaker, conditions in California and in my home district have made me listen closely to the many arguments about the state of our economy. Debate on the floor of this House in past weeks has focused frequently on the problems of inflation and the rediscount rate hike of the Federal Reserve Board. At this time, I cannot but conclude that the Federal Reserve Board's December action, done in the name of stability, has in fact been a major cause of our inflationary conditions today. Only intelligent economic action by this administration can prevent the Federal Reserve Board's action from going down in history with the Smoot-Hawley Tariff of 1930 as a monument to economic illiteracy.

Both builders and building unionists in my district feel that the Federal Reserve Board action was responsible for present slump conditions. This is however only partly true. For what is most interesting about the housing construction situation in California is that it has already been in a slump for 2 years. New home starts have been declining. Thus the Federal Reserve Board is not responsible for the decline itself. But the Board is responsible for maintaining and accelerating the decline. And, worst of all, the Board acted in the name of in-

flation to curb an industry which in fact was not inflating.

House & Home, in December 1965, surveyed market trends in 21 cities, and gave statistics for housing starts in these cities from 1961 to 1965. When added together, these figures show:

Total housing starts, 21 cities

1961	484, 538
1962	561, 221
1963	585, 433
1964	504, 940
1965	459, 770

Thus housing starts in 1965 in 21 key cities hit a 5-year low.

The Associated Home Builders of the Greater Eastbay prepared these figures for housing starts in the nine-county bay area:

Year	Total housing starts	Percent decline
1963	67, 516	
1964	58, 497	14.4
1965	45, 934	21.5
January 1966	2, 503	24.0

Thus the Federal Reserve Board action has continued a 2-year downturn in the bay area as well.

This 2-year decline in homebuilding in California and in the Nation aggravated the economic problems of California builders. Mortgage money has always been in great demand in California. This demand gave rise to the extensive network of savings and loan associations which attract savers throughout the Nation by high-interest insured accounts. The Federal Reserve Board interest rate hike has made California mortgages less attractive to investors. Now, reading of newspapers in California reveals almost daily hikes in interest payments by individual banks and savings and loans. The Board action has produced a dangerous spiral: a spiral in the cost of money which may prove difficult to stop.

What we are seeing is this: people with money are getting paid more for it. As a result, people without money must pay more to get it. Credit costs more; installment buyers pay more; investors earn more. This, I would think, is inflation. Yet it is a product of a government action taken in the name of stopping inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly distressed because the recession-breeding inflation which we are seeing today is so serious in the housing field. No field of economic activity has been of greater concern to this Congress since the end of World War II. The Housing Act of 1949, supported by a bipartisan coalition that included Senators ELLENDER, LONG, PEPPER, Taft, and Lodge, made a declaration which is law today:

The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, the elimination of substandard and other inadequate housing through the clearance of slums and blighted areas, and the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing to the development

and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation.

And this declaration has moved closer to reality through the actions of our own 89th Congress. We cannot at the same time stand silent while our actions are drained of meaning. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I must note that our war in Vietnam hangs over this issue as well. The Federal Reserve Board action, the FHA/VA interest hike—all are interrelated in a complex of causal factors. The war in Vietnam is, unfortunately, also one of those factors. The December 1965 House & Home cites a discussion by Senior Vice President Proctor H. Barnett, of the Prudential Insurance Co., of a change in investor psychology triggered by the Vietnamese war. Barnett says:

The typical investor has abandoned his fears of a slower rate of economic growth. The changed psychological climate—call it expectations—has contributed to marking up the mortgage rates.

Thus investors in this country are awaiting a new war boom. Profits from investing in the goods of a war economy are higher than the profits of the conventional economy. The men who develop, who build, and who work in peacetime must now wait for the cautious investors who are seeking a bigger killing.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] concluded, "Congress and the responsible housing and home financing agencies must be made to realize" that the home building industry "cannot continue under present conditions." We in California are waiting for signs that will allow us to proceed with confidence to build the Great Society. I am pleased to join the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] in stressing that such signs must come immediately.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL] 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. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to compliment my colleague from California for calling the House's attention to a serious problem affecting our homebuilders in particular and our economy in general. Nearly all Americans want better housing. The House voted on a phase of this matter yesterday. Yet the homebuilding industry continues to suffer from extreme fluctuations between supply and demand. The phasing out of defense facilities has been a contributing factor.

The gentleman is representing Orange County; which like my own San Bernardino County right now is a comparatively bright spot in the dark picture of southern California building permits.

The Los Angeles Times advises that Orange and San Bernardino Counties are two major areas which showed a gain in the first month of this year over the previous year but a 1- or 2-month gain is not indicative of continuation. The comparison between January 1965 and January 1966 shows multiples down 51.7 percent and singles down 34.3 per-

cent and valuations are off 11.9 percent. The weakness which is evident in the other counties will effect us and continue the pattern of fluctuation.

I am pleased that he has emphasized the unavailability of mortgage money in an expanding economy. He is to be commended and I support and concur with the arguments he has made.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian and a concerned member of the Education and Labor Committee, I want to bring to the attention of the House an unfortunate and shocking employment situation resulting directly from the faltering condition of the construction industry in California.

While the rest of the Nation rejoices with an overall unemployment rate that has crept to a seasonally adjusted 3.7-percent low, California's building industry is reporting the highest unemployment rate in years.

My own county, Los Angeles, is reporting a jobless rate of 17 percent. That rate has not been exceeded in the past decade. At the current rate of unemployment this means that the jobless are losing \$4,420,000 per week, according to a special study carried out by the Los Angeles Building Trades Council which is described in excerpts of an article from the Los Angeles Times which I will incorporate into the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, California and her neighboring States are faced with a unique problem that requires special attention. I would hope that some of the suggestions we have heard here today may be implemented to rifle in on this critical situation.

The excerpts referred to above follow:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Jan. 23, 1966]

JOBLESS RATE REACHES PEAK OF 17 PERCENT IN BUILDING TRADES—CONSTRUCTION UNEMPLOYMENT IN COUNTY EQUALS WORST OF DECADE

(By Harry Bernstein)

Los Angeles building trades workers today are plagued by a jobless rate matched only twice in the last decade.

Unemployment among 130,000 construction workers in the county totals 17 percent, a peak which some union leaders say has been more prolonged than in either 1958 or 1961 when the rate was about the same as today.

The rate is nearly 4 percent above last year, a union study showed.

Part of the problem has been the weather which knocked out several construction jobs.

Herb Smith, of the Associated General Contractors, said overall the building industry in the area is in good health. But estimates on the employment situation among building tradesmen were made in a special study by the Los Angeles Building Trades Council, headed by John Cinquemani, and he is much less optimistic.

LABORERS HARD HIT

Cinquemani said the highest jobless rate is among laborers, where 42 percent or about

6,000, of the union members are without jobs.

Fewer starts in the homebuilding industry and new building techniques were blamed, along with the weather, for the high rate of unemployment.

While other industries have been gaining in total employment, the building industry in Los Angeles dropped by 5.3 percent between 1964 and 1965, according to State Department of Employment Researcher Gaylord Pitts.

RISE IN COUNTY

Overall in the county, total employment is up 2.4 percent over last year.

The State's population is going up nearly 600,000 a year, and the resulting pressure is helping to keep the overall jobless rate high.

Unemployment in California last month was 5.7 percent of the work force, or 39 percent above the 4.1 percent rate for the Nation as a whole.

In Los Angeles, the rate is 5.4 percent, down somewhat from last year's 5.9 percent, but showing no improvement of the kind seen on the national level where joblessness is the lowest since 1957.

The total employment in Los Angeles is now up to 2.9 million, and when the 148,700 jobless is added, it gives the area a total labor force of over 3 million for the first time in history.

MANY CARPENTERS OUT

The union survey showed that 16 percent of the area's carpenters are out of work, 14 percent of the cement masons, 10 percent of the plumbers, and 11 percent of the ironworkers.

The average wage, not including fringe benefits or overtime, is \$4.93 an hour for building trades workers here, and this means the jobless are losing \$4,420,000 a week at the current rate of unemployment.

Carpenters last year worked an average 31.2 weeks; asbestos workers, 41.8 weeks; operating engineers, 42 weeks; ironworkers, 42 weeks; painters, 35 weeks.

Bollermakers worked 8 months on the average; bricklayers and stonemasons 7 months; elevator constructors, 10 months, glaziers, 11.5 months.

Plasterers and cement masons worked 9.5 months of the year; marble masons, 9 months, lathers, 11 months, and laborers, who have the highest jobless rate of all the crafts, worked only 7.5 months.

CCC POLICY HURTS FARMERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest yet another action of the Commodity Credit Corporation, whose actions of late have run invariably counter to the best interests of the American farm community. CCC has created untold havoc among country grain elevator operators and farm livestock feeding operations by preparing to sell off all the CCC corn in country elevators across the entire upper Midwest. In other words, it will remove farmers' primary local source of extra feed and farmers will have to incur much greater expense to haul in feed from terminal markets. Paradoxically, the grain that farmers will have to haul in will be the very same grain that CCC intends to ship out of the local elevators, and the farmer will end up having to pay freight charges both ways on the corn he hauls in. Yet CCC refuses to allow elevator operators to buy enough grain

before shipment to meet local needs in the spring and summer months. If ever there was inefficient, unfair treatment of farmers and their suppliers, it has been demonstrated by the CCC in this action. I wish to explain the situation more fully so that my colleagues can see exactly how the CCC has burdened the local farmers with higher costs in this action:

The Government supports the price of corn by buying large amounts in times of low demand. It does this through its purchasing arm, the Commodity Credit Corporation—CCC—which also has the right, within certain limitations, to dispose of these holdings according to various disposal programs and established patterns. Corn is stored in country elevators. These local warehouses are equipped for efficient and mechanized handling of the grain and are well disposed to load and unload the corn from both rail and truck transport facilities on a first-in first-out basis. If the amount of corn exceeds the capacity of the local warehouses, the Government has in many instances assembled bin sites, or temporary storage facilities, not so well equipped for loading and handling, and often less accessible to transportation.

In many local warehouses, the entire contents of the elevators are owned by the CCC. As local farmers need extra corn to feed livestock, as many of them do, they go to the local warehouse for that corn. The warehouse owner, who may be the farmers of a co-op, then buys the grain from the CCC and sells it to the local farmer. Plainly it is to the advantage of local warehouse operators to allow most of the corn to remain in the ownership of the CCC until they need it, since that way he can collect storage fees. This is simply good business, and CCC has not discouraged it since it is in the interest of the local farmers and farm communities. In the past, the warehousemen have been able to purchase the grain they expected to need if loading orders were forthcoming.

Two weeks ago the CCC sent notices to all the warehouse operators in the upper Midwest, saying that they would not be allowed to purchase any more grain from the Government, in effect freezing the holdings in many thousands of elevators across the midcontinent. CCC said that it was sending shipping notices to all warehouses, and that the grain must be moved as soon as possible, presumably to terminals in Minneapolis, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, and so on, and to port terminals such as Duluth. Their reason for doing this is that they have been very busy in recent months dumping their holdings on the market in paper form, and were now being called upon to deliver. Much of the corn will be going to foreign markets, much to large terminal operations. And all of it will be at the direct expense of the local farmers for many reasons.

First. By freezing the local warehouse supplies of corn, the CCC has virtually eliminated the only local source of extra feed grain for hundreds of thousands of livestock feeders across the Midwest. This has been done totally without regard for the conditions of local regions. Minnesota has not been able to produce

a good feed crop for the last 2 years, and last year many portions were declared disaster areas by the President for that very reason.

Second. The CCC action will have the effect of directly increasing farm costs at a time when the gap between farm prices and farm costs has been increasing rather than narrowing. This is because the local farmers will have to get their corn from the terminals or the bin sites, and either way they do it they will have to pay the transportation and handling charges. Those charges will represent not only the cost of bringing in the grain from Minneapolis or Kansas City, but will also include the cost to the terminal operation of bringing the corn in from the local warehouses in the first place. If the charge one way is 7 cents per bushel, the cost of grain to the farmer in the locality where the corn originally rested will be 14 cents plus any additional commission made by the terminal operation. This seems flagrantly inefficient.

Third. The railroads are already heavily overburdened, and are not able to meet their commitments as it is. The inefficient transport of grain to terminal and back will simply add to this load, and will mean that in many cases farmers will not have the corn they need when they need it. It simply does not make sense to force warehouses to ship out 100 percent of their holdings.

If the warehouses had been warned that upon a certain date they would be refused any further opportunity to purchase Government-owned grain, they would have purchased for their own stock enough grain to meet the demands of local farmers in the coming months. The CCC, however, chose to spring this decision on the warehouses, thereby making it impossible for them to take this precautionary step.

Some of the corn is being sold by CCC on a "to arrive" basis at less than it would bring if sold to the local elevator operator, thus putting CCC actively in the grain market in competition with the local elevators in spite of the CCC charter which requires CCC to use "the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade." It is in some cases being sold for less than it would bring locally, which represents an additional expense to the taxpayer, and is not in the interest of sound economy.

Further complications arise in the CCC demand that the corn be shipped out immediately. This poses problems to elevators which have promised delivery of previous commitments, as available boxcar space will now have even greater pressure than before, and will necessitate certain delays in deliveries. Another problem is that many Minnesota elevators are in the midst of crucial shelling and drying operations, which are essential if the wet and immature 1965 corn crop that plagued Minnesota is to be saved.

Increasing the hardships on local farmers, the CCC has made the further mistake of discriminating against crop disaster areas. Areas such as Dakota County, just south of the Twin Cities in Minnesota, were hard hit last year, and

produced a poor corn crop. As a result, CCC estimated that these elevators would be needing the grain locally this winter, and did not place January and February orders in Dakota County elevators to meet early commitments. Out-state elevators were given 40-percent orders at that time, enabling local warehouses in some cases to buy enough corn to meet local needs through the spring. Meanwhile, demand in Dakota County was low, and the corn remained in the warehouses. When CCC ordered 100 percent of its holdings out of local elevators in March, however, it did not take Dakota County into consideration, and ordered 100 percent of its holdings there out just as in all other areas, corn deficit or not. This discriminated against farmers in the hard-hit county more than against the farmers in outlying counties, whose elevators at least had a chance to retain 40 percent on orders in January and February. What sense does it make to send Federal aid and relief funds into a disaster area, and then turn around and pull the rug out from underneath that same area with action like this? In agriculture, a disaster is a long-range thing; it is not over a day or a week after it occurs. The effects are far reaching, and extend well into the next year, if not longer. The CCC in its shortsightedness, has in effect undone many of the beneficial effects of the disaster relief funds of last year. Other counties have had similar experiences.

I have written to Secretary Freeman, asking him to reconsider this patently unfair and discriminatory decision by CCC, urging him to pay more attention to the welfare of the farmer.

The text of my letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ORVILLE: Out in the Midwest in the rural areas like the ones I represent, the farmers depend on their country elevators for an adequate source of feed grains after the corn which they raised on their own farms has been depleted. In response to correspondence and telephone calls from elevators in my district, protesting the recent CCC orders to ship all warehouse corn immediately, I contacted the Department of Agriculture and spoke by phone to Mr. C. H. Moseley, Assistant Department Administrator for Commodity Operations of ASCS. I was informed by Mr. Moseley that all the corn in the local warehouses in the entire upper Midwest has in effect been frozen without forewarning, pending the distribution by CCC of loading orders for 100 percent of the grain in the local warehouses.

I asked him what local farmers who had previously depended on the warehouse corn to supplement spring and summer feed shortages were expected to do this year. I was told that they would be afforded an opportunity to purchase feed on a weekly quota basis from the bin sites. This ignores the fact however, that many of the bin sites in Minnesota are empty, due to the recent bad crop years, and that sizable carrying charges would be required for farmers to bring in feed from remote bin sites or terminal operations.

As you know, 1964 was a drought year in southern Minnesota. A great deal of the

local carryover of corn was used by the farmers in that locale. Last year, as you know, the corn kept extremely high moisture—some of it so bad that it could not be run through a dryer. It has to be fed up during the cold months of the year and a great deal of it spoiled and therefore had less feeding value. The country elevators knew of this of course, but did not purchase corn in their warehouses since it is naturally prudent to draw storage feeds from the Government until it was actually needed. In previous years, it has been a custom to permit local warehousemen to buy the corn in this warehouse prior to their receipt of loading orders. While I realize that you have every legal right to act as you have, I would point out that local warehouse operations could hardly have been expected to anticipate your action and purchase a reserve for local use. Had you notified warehouses that you intended to extract a certain percentage of your warehouse holdings each month, or even that you intended to extract 100 percent on a given date, they would have had a chance to lay aside reserves for local use.

I cannot see the wisdom of a farm policy that not only punishes the farmer by dumping corn to depress prices, but then forces the farmer to increase his farm costs by removing his primary local source of feed, forcing him to pay heavy transportation charges to bring back corn from remote terminals that had originally rested in local warehouses. Your policy of requiring that 100 percent of the local reserves be shipped out represents little more than bad business sense, and shows little concern for the welfare of the farmer. At the same time, it puts extra pressure on the already overburdened rail facilities that have been hard put to meet shipping deadlines in recent months.

Since I contacted Mr. Moseley, telephone calls, telegrams, and letters continue to pour in. Therefore, I take this more formal method of strongly urging that you reconsider your harsh decision before the grain is moved out of all the local warehouses, and allow local country elevators to buy the stored grain so it might remain in the local areas for feed purposes. This will amount to a great savings to farm feeders throughout the Midwest.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point 2 of the 10 major resolutions passed at the last convention of the Farmers' Elevator Association of Minnesota. I wish to call special attention to the first, in which it is pointed out that the CCC is acting in violation of the intent of Congress by bypassing the stipulation in the CCC charter which requires CCC to use the normal channels of trade:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has recently issued loading orders for moving corn from binsites in Minnesota with instructions that such corn cannot be sold to the local warehousemen; and

Whereas some of the corn is moved to terminal markets and sold on track for less than it would bring locally, which obviously is not in the interests of the taxpayers of the United States; and

Whereas some of this corn is being sold by CCC on a "to arrive" basis at less than it would bring if sold to the local elevator operator, thus putting CCC actively in the grain market in competition with the local elevators in spite of the CCC charter which requires CCC to use "the usual and customary channels, facilities and arrangements of trade": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Elevator Association of Minnesota, in convention assembled

this 9th day of February 1966, does hereby request that CCC immediately stop making such sales and that they return to the principle of using the normal channels of trade by introducing their grain into the channels of marketing as close to the point of production as possible; namely, the country elevator level.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas the contract under which elevators store grain for the Commodity Credit Corporation—the uniform grain storage agreement—provide that a country elevator that ships grain of lesser quality than the loading orders call for must pay in cash for any deficiency in quality; and

Whereas this same contract provides that CCC will not pay in cash for better quality grain received but will establish a credit to the elevators account which can only be recovered by subsequently shipping lower quality grain; and

Whereas during the past year, CCC has made requests of storing elevators to ship high quality grain, even though they had credits on the books which would expire if not used: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Farmers Elevator Association of Minnesota, in convention assembled this 9th day of February 1966, does hereby go on record requesting CCC to change the uniform grain storage agreement and pay cash premiums for the quality grain they receive in the future, as they charge for cash discounts of grain they now receive.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a sample of letters from elevator operators in my district who have written to explain why the CCC decision is counter to any wise agricultural policy, and how it affects the welfare of local farmers and warehousemen. Each letter points out some specific problems, and each demonstrates the ill effects that will befall the local corn buyer once the local elevators have been emptied:

THE MINNEAPOLIS GRAIN
COMMISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 22, 1966.

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Members of the Minneapolis Commission Merchant's Association are terminal representatives for several hundred cooperative and independent elevators throughout the four States of Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana, and as representatives of these elevators and their owners, we vigorously protest the manner in which the recent sale of about 50 million bushels of corn, from elevators and bin sites, was made by the Department of Agriculture.

We understand this sale was made for unrestricted use and not necessarily for export. It was also publicly stated by one of their men that, under terms of the sale, it would be possible for corn moved out of a country position to be resold by the buyer at the terminal market and trucked back to the original starting point.

No advance warning was given to country elevators nor were they given a chance to buy any of this corn nor can they buy it now. A large number of elevators would have bought this grain had they known that the corn in their elevators, and that much of the corn in the bin site, was to be moved out as quickly as possible on loading orders which are presently in the process of being issued.

Many of these areas are deficit areas and the corn is badly needed in the local communities.

The price at which this grain was offered to terminals would also have appealed to these country elevators as contrasted with prices they had paid earlier on the purchase of CCC corn.

At the present time there is considerable grain in the country position which must be delivered against sales to arrive which carry penalties for late delivery.

This enormous volume of corn which was sold is to be moved as quickly as possible by both rail and truck and is going to seriously aggravate an already very serious transportation problem in our area.

This grain will be moved by both rail and truck and that portion to be moved out of bin site direct to terminals will bypass the country elevator, thereby denying warehouseman earnings which supplement the meager payments for services performed under the bin site service contract.

If country elevators permit the movement of warehouse grain by truck, they will lose the right to Federal appeal of the original grade.

Directing grain to the terminal and bypassing the country, is contrary to the charter under which the Commodity Credit Corporation operates as it specifies that the customary and usual channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce shall be used wherever possible.

A large proportion of the elevators of our area have cash grain on hand which was purchased before Commodity made their large sale of corn and much of that cash grain on hand was sold to arrive in the market place with specified deliver, dates and which now are going to be very difficult to meet with this additional drain on these transportation facilities available.

This cash grain on hand in elevators has been paid for with borrowed money at the rate of 7 percent plus insurance costs and the longer this grain is obliged to remain in the country elevator, the less opportunity the country elevator man is going to have for realizing any profit whatever.

CCC simply specifies that regardless of these previous purchases by the country, they will, on receipt of loading orders, have to deliver car for car if they wish to obtain extensions on their storage termination dates.

We urge you to protest the manner in which this sale was made and the problems it provides for the country and we urge you to take whatever action is necessary to protect your constituents from any similar trades being developed.

Very truly yours,

RICHARD J. SUNDBERG,
Secretary-Treasurer.

GIL'S FARM SERVICE,
Farmington, Minn., March 22, 1966.

HON. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: I know in your district there has been considerable loading orders issued for corn. Today, we received our loading order for 100 percent of our corn that we have in storage. I think that all the other elevators in our immediate area received the same. A year ago, I wrote you regarding our disaster area which of course you know in our immediate area we have not received a decent crop in the past 2 years. Furthermore, our binsites have been emptied and sold so that Dakota County has no more CCC binsites. In referring to binsites, I am referring to Government-owned binsites. The buildings have been sold and the area has been returned to the original lessee.

Now, as a result of the present loading order, there will be no surplus corn available in Dakota County in any way, shape, or form except what small quantities that are remaining on the farm and over the past 2 years, a lot of farmers have purchased this back and what little is left really amounts to an insignificant amount. Now, furthermore, our corn crop of course has to be moved before the warm weather hits and in

fact, it is being moved very rapidly right now. Coming next June, July, August, and September, we will not have any corn available in our area to supply large stock feeders who have been buying corn continually for quite a number of years. In our territory, we have been gradually moving into livestock numbers such as turkeys, hogs, and beef cattle.

The question comes up: Does this appear to you to be good business, from the standpoint of the Government, selling all of this corn into the terminals, making it available to terminal operations and they, in turn, sell it back out into the country again. This would add at least a freight rate of 7 cents per bushel to Minneapolis and it would be 7 cents per bushel back out which immediately adds 14 cents per bushel to the consumer's price. The other alternative would be to truck corn in from other areas. Of course, in Minnesota, all the Government corn is being sold out of the elevators and the only corn that would be available would be available in binsites throughout the territory. None of this, of course, would be available in our immediate area because the binsites have been dismantled. Now if this appears to you to be a practical approach in service to the best interests of agriculture, I am sure that I am not seeing the complete picture.

I just got through telephoning the man in charge of the CCC Office in Minneapolis, Minn., who is merely a branch man and does not have any real authority, indicating this was not their decision but the decision of Washington. I appreciate that you cannot be thinking about individual cases, but I merely point out that this situation could create a very serious corn shortage in our territory.

Now it would appear to me if the Government is insisting on reducing their inventory stocks of corn in areas where we have had very poor crops, where we have been labeled as a "disaster area" and if our 1966 crop appears to be better than it has in the past, the Government during the course of the summer, could give percentage loading orders such as 15 percent in June, 25 percent in July, etc., by new crop time the corn would be gone. We in turn, would be able to sell this out to local consumers and purchase it on a local level such as we have been able to do in the past rather than to put it into one centrally located spot like in this case, Minneapolis, Minn., when it is needed in the country it comes from.

I would appreciate your investigation of this situation immediately as I have my loading order now and I have to make some effort to start moving this corn in the next 4 or 5 days. This situation in my opinion is most urgent and time for acting becomes very short. I hate to burden you with these problems, but at the same time you are our Representative and it appears that we do not know where else to turn.

Sincerely yours,

GIL'S FARM SERVICE,
ELWOOD GILBERTSON.

MARCH 22, 1966.

HON. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN QUIE: Today in Dakota County the CCC issued loading orders to all country elevators for 100 percent of their warehouse-stored corn. We here at Castle Rock, Minn., were among those in Dakota County to receive such an order. I would like at this time to acquaint you with the problem that this order may pose on agriculture in Dakota County for the summer months of 1966.

In 1964 our county was severely hit by drought, and by fall it was declared a disaster area by the Federal Government. At this time all country elevators in our county

were called upon to disburse CCC-owned corn to drought stricken farmers. This program was successful and beneficial to the area farmers. When we looked at the crop for 1965, we see first the makings of a bumper crop and by harvest time we ended up with a wet, immature crop with little feed value. Because of the quality of this crop it has been necessary to dispose of it rapidly before the warm spring weather sets in. Very little of this corn can be carried through the spring and into the summer for feed. In the meantime the CCC started disposing of its own binsite corn, and has now completed this task.

After having a complete crop failure in 1964, a near failure in 1965, and the disposal of all CCC binsite corn we faced with the severe problem of no corn in our area for the months of June, July, August, and September. Normally the farmer could turn to his local country elevator for his feed supply, but with the loading out of 100 percent of his CCC corn we are no longer in a position to purchase this corn, and are therefore out of the corn business. If, instead, we could have orderly marketing of this corn through the summer months, I believe it would do a much greater service to agriculture.

With our supply of corn completely exhausted we in the country elevator must go to the grain terminals or somewhere else out of our area and have this corn hauled in. The corn we would purchase from the terminal would probably be the same corn which we loaded out for CCC this spring. Does this seem to be sound business, by first paying to have this corn hauled out of our area, then paying a commission, and then pay to have the corn hauled back into the same area in which it was grown. We do not believe that this is in the best interest of agriculture.

A secondary problem with this loading order, is the time in which the corn must be loaded and shipped. This comes at a time when we are trying to save what 1965 corn we can by drying. In order to fulfill the wishes of CCC, it will be necessary to stop all shelling and drying operations to meet the completion date set by CCC. Another problem this will pose on the farmer is the cleaning of grain for seed. The country elevator cannot perform this service and also load corn, due to the contaminating of the seed grain with corn, which cannot be removed with grain cleaning equipment. This could be a detriment to the farmer for his 1966 crop.

We would appreciate your immediate attention on this matter as there is little time and we must start loading out this corn. We are respectfully waiting your reply. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

FARMERS MILL & ELEVATOR,
CARROLL AUGER,
WILFRED AUGER.

CASTLE ROCK, MINN.

ROSEMOUNT, MINN.,
March 25, 1966.

HON. ALBERT QUIE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Just recently all country elevators in Dakota County, were issued loading orders on their warehouse stored CCC corn; 100 percent to be shipped out of our area. Here at Smith Grain Co., Rosemount, Minn., we also received orders.

Letting this corn leave our area, would cause many hardships on our area farmers; we had almost a complete crop failure in 1964, and what corn we raised in 1965 is immature and has to be used up fast. With warm weather it is rotting in the cribs. We have been shelling and drying, trying to conserve what we can, but the weather set in; also with the early thaws, road restrictions prevent us from hauling the wet corn in from

the farms and returning the dry. What corn is still on farms will be used up by another 2 months.

We were relying on the CCC corn to help fill the gaps in the summer months. Shipping it out will force us to haul corn in from farther away areas or by complete feeds from feed manufacturers, which means they buy the CCC corn, put it into complete rations and sell it back to us at a considerable increase in cost to the feeder; this I am sure the Government farm program was not set up to do. This does not seem like good business, in trying to help the farmer.

All of our area binsites have been emptied and dispersed, leaving only what little corn is in country warehouses and some on the farm storage. This will all be needed here in Dakota County and still more has to be shipped in.

We would appreciate your immediate attention, as little time is left to stop this loading out. We also would appreciate a reply in this most serious matter.

Respectfully,

SMITH GRAIN CO.

THE JURY SELECTION ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this has been called an historic Congress. Not only have we begun to recognize the challenge of poverty, and urban blight, but we have at last passed legislation which will help to make democracy a reality for all Americans. We have good reason to be proud of the Voting Rights Act which we passed last August.

But the scope of our legislative achievements last year in no way diminishes the magnitude of the challenges which continue to confront this Congress and this Nation. At last all Americans may now be able to participate in the political process. But how many Americans are kept out of the judicial process?

Mr. Speaker, on September 27, 1789, George Washington wrote Edmond Randolph:

The administration of justice is the firmest pillar of government.

Yet as civil rights cases in the last year have illustrated, in some sections of the country the temple of good government has no judicial pillar at all.

In a special report published in October 1965, the Southern Regional Council analyzed the state of Southern justice. Noting that widespread publicity had dramatized the lack of justice in civil rights cases, the report concluded:

The danger today is not that the public will fail to know about the double standard of justice, but that the public will think it limited only to civil rights cases, or will fail to act.

As the report makes clear, the failure of justice in well publicized civil rights cases is an illustration—not the embodiment—of the breakdown of justice in the South.

The Southern Regional Council pointed out that in this dual system of justice, "much of the problem is the selection of jurors. In almost no courts are jurors picked by thoroughly objective means to insure a true cross section of the community."

Since few counties keep records of jury venires, it is difficult to assess the exact amount of segregation on Southern juries. But the available evidence indicates that integrated juries are about as rare as integrated polling places. In Alabama, for example, where about 30 percent of the voting age population is Negro, the council estimates that there are 5 or 6 Negroes on a typical jury panel of 110. In Arkansas, where about 20 percent of the voting age population is Negro, the council estimates that there are no more than 4 Negroes on a typical double jury panel of 50.

In an area where accurate statistics are available, the council pointed out that the 28 court clerks and the 109 jury commissioners attached to the Federal courts of the 11 States of the old Confederacy are solidly white—all appointed by the 65 white district judges.

The Southern Regional Council also cites statistics which demonstrate that a Negro convicted of a crime in the South is much more likely to be severely punished than is a white man convicted of a similar crime. For example, although more than one-half of all convicted rapists are white, 87 percent of all the persons executed for rape between 1930 and 1963 were Negroes convicted and sentenced by southern courts. Similarly, of 34 persons convicted and sentenced to death for nighttime burglaries and robberies, between 1930 and 1961, 28 were Negroes.

Nor does this unequal system of justice only affect Negroes who are convicted of major crimes. It also affects Negroes who are convicted of misdemeanors. In the 12 month period ending in June, 1962, 2,341 persons served terms in Georgia's State prison system for their inability to pay small fines. Seventy percent of these were Negro.

Mr. Speaker, the framers of the Constitution knew that the right to trial by jury is a cornerstone of democracy. In article III of the Constitution the framers wrote:

The trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be by Jury.

When they added the Bill of Rights, 4 years after drafting the Constitution, our forefathers again addressed themselves to equal justice, lest anyone mistake their intent. Four of these 10 amendments deal with equal justice. They insure a trial by jury in suits at common law and in criminal prosecutions.

Mr. Speaker, let me read the language of the sixth amendment.

In all criminal prosecution—

It says—

the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed.

Let me underline those words once again, Mr. Speaker. The Constitution promises each citizen a public trial by an impartial jury. How well have we kept the faith?

Lest anyone should doubt the intent of the Founding Fathers, let me read another familiar quotation to this House:

Freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person under the protection of

habeas corpus; and the trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us.

Those words, of course, are the words of Thomas Jefferson, speaking in his first inaugural address. One of the stars that guided our Founding Fathers, he reminds us, was the right to a "trial by juries impartially selected."

Mr. Speaker, we have a great challenge before us this session. We again have the opportunity to fulfill the promise of the Constitution. Two years ago, responding to the great confrontation of the civil rights movement in Birmingham and elsewhere, the Members of this House constructed a Civil Rights Act which tried to insure all Americans equal access to public accommodations, equal educational opportunities, and equal employment opportunities. Last year, responding in part to the Mississippi summer project of 1964 and the Selma march of 1965, we enacted the historic Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, today, I am asking my colleagues who have done so much to help fulfill the promise of America to join in supporting legislation to insure the desegregation of the third great branch of government. Yesterday our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON], and I cosponsored a bill to end discrimination in the juries of this great land. At the same time our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK], introduced a similar bill.

Mr. Speaker, once we have decided that this Congress shall seize the opportunity to desegregate juries, we must still decide upon the quickest and fairest way to accomplish this task. Happily, several formulas for the desegregation of Federal and State courts have already been proposed, and it seems likely that there will be more suggestions to come. We should, of course, welcome them all, for diversity is the father of legislative genius.

H.R. 14111, which I have introduced, is patterned after the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It is consciously not patterned after the voting rights provisions of 1957 and 1960. It tries to learn from their failures and to fashion a formula which—like the Voting Rights Act of 1965—will work quickly and fairly.

The Members of this House are, of course, familiar with the reasons for the failure of the early voting rights laws, and the reasons why last year's act was passed. Chief Justice Warren summarized the experience of the earlier laws in an introduction to the Supreme Court's unanimous opinion upholding the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in South Carolina against Katzenbach—March 7, 1966:

The previous legislation has proved ineffective for a number of reasons—

He wrote—

Voting suits are unusually onerous to prepare, sometimes requiring as many as 6,000 man-hours spent combing through registration records in preparation for trial. Litigation has been exceedingly slow, in part because of the ample opportunities for delay afforded voting officials and others involved in the proceedings. Even when favorable decisions have finally been obtained, some of the States affected have merely switched to discriminatory devices not covered by the

Federal decrees or have enacted difficult new tests designed to prolong the existing disparity between white and Negro registration. Alternatively, certain local officials have defied and evaded court orders or have simply closed their registration offices to freeze the voting rolls.

Mr. Speaker, the House report on the bill made the same point:

Four years (to press a voting suit) is too long—

It said—

The burden is too heavy—the wrong to our citizens is too serious, the damage to our national conscience is too great not to adopt more effective measures than exist today. Such is the essential justification for the pending bill.

In short, the early laws did not work because they required individual suits in each of the counties charged with discrimination. The same situation exists in proceedings dealing with jury selection. Suits are expensive to bring; they allow for endless delaying tactics; and there is no guarantee that the district judge will be more helpful than the local jury commissioner.

In order to avoid the delays and difficulties inherent in a case by case approach, I have proposed a jury bill which uses an automatic administrative trigger similar to that employed in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The bill requires that records be kept of the racial composition of all State jury venires in every State which has a nonwhite population of more than 10 percent and which either required racial segregation by law within the past 5 years or is subject to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. These records must be public and copies must be submitted to the Attorney General.

If the recordkeeping requirement is not complied with by any court, then the Attorney General must certify that court to the Civil Service Commission which will appoint one or more special Federal jury commissioners to function on behalf of the court.

Special Federal jury commissioners will also be appointed by the Civil Service Commission upon certification of the Attorney General that a certain disparity exists between the number of Negroes in a county and the number on the county's jury list. The disparity ratio is 1½ to 1 between the percentage of Negroes in the county, and the percentage of Negroes on the county's jury list.

In addition, the Attorney General is required to certify for the assignment of special Federal jury commissioners any county which discontinued or forbade the use of voter registration lists as a basis for jury venires after the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Special Federal jury commissions will also be assigned to any county in which a Federal court has found within the past 5 years that jurors have been disqualified on account of race or color.

I have enumerated the four conditions under which special Federal jury commissioners will be assigned automatically.

The bill also provides that the Attorney General or any resident of a judicial district or any party to a jury

proceeding may bring an action in the U.S. district court for the enforcement of the act.

Federal jury commissioners will compile venire lists with the assistance of the Census Bureau which would be empowered to use a sampling technique to insure a venire which is a representative cross section of the jurisdiction without regard to race, color, sex, political or religious affiliation, national origin, or economic or social status.

The venire lists compiled by the special Federal jury commissioners would be the basis for the selection by lot of jurors by State courts. The special Federal jury commissioners would be entitled to supervise this process.

The bill provides a mechanism whereby a county may move in Federal court to be relieved of its requirements.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14111 is also addressed to the problem of discrimination in Federal juries. Under title II it would set up jury commissions in each Federal district court which would put into effect a sampling plan subject to the approval of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts which would furnish a representative cross section of the population of the Federal district without exclusion on the basis of race, color, sex, religious or political affiliation, or economic or social status.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acknowledge the assistance in the preparation of this bill of Leonard M. Ross, editor in chief of the Yale Law Journal; Don B. Kates, Simon Lazarus III, and Michael Mukasey, all of the Yale Law School, who drafted the basic provisions of title I.

I certainly hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on this bill and other bills pertaining to jury discrimination as soon as possible. Instance after instance of justice denied by Southern juries makes it imperative that the Congress act now to insure impartiality in jury trials, both State and Federal, in the South.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN UNITED STATES AGAINST PRICE, AND UNITED STATES AGAINST GUEST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, no one who is concerned for the safety and freedom of our Negro citizens and civil rights workers who have gone to their assistance can miss the importance of the Supreme Court's decisions of this week in United States against Price and United States against Guest.

The first of these cases upheld indictments returned under 18 U.S.C. 241 and 242 against 18 persons who are charged with the murders of James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner. The horror of this alleged reprisal for civil rights activities as engineered by State law enforcement officers is reflected in the bare legal terminology of the indictment, and in the restrained

language of the opinion that—thankfully—allows prosecution of what the indictment portrays as a brutal conspiracy.

The Guest case sustains an indictment returned against six persons under 18 U.S.C. 241. They charged therein with the attack upon Reserve Lt. Col. Lemuel A. Penn, which resulted in his death. The asserted purpose of this act was to discourage free use by Negro citizens of State facilities and to restrict exercise of their right to travel freely in interstate commerce. Few can disagree that reinstatement of the Federal prosecution in this case is imperative to compliance with Federal civil rights laws in an important area of our country.

Mr. Speaker, as comforting as these decisions may seem on their surface and from the headlines in the press, they should not detract from the necessity for revision of Federal laws aimed at protecting individuals from violence because of their civil rights activities or belief. Careful study of the opinions reveals that grave technical difficulties must be overcome to secure justice in those cases, because of the inadequacies of present laws. Several members of the Court were sufficiently aware of and concerned by them in their opinions to forcefully suggest sweeping revisions so as more effectively to afford the legitimate Federal protection required in the tragic circumstances described in the two indictments.

The civil rights bill which I introduced together with 18 other Republican cosponsors on March 7, 1966, was designed to remedy the shortcomings of present Federal criminal laws. When placed beside these two landmark opinions, I am confident you will find our measures effectively responsive to the requirements of the situation. We ask the support of all Members of this body, by speedy enactment of these essential safeguards, to assure equal protection of the laws for all of our citizens regardless of their race and regardless of their State citizenship in our great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carried an editorial which addresses itself to this matter in a most helpful way. I commend it to all who are interested in basic justice for all our citizens.

PROTECTING CITIZENS

By virtue of some rather energetic and ingenious artificial respiration, the Supreme Court has breathed new life into the 19th century post-Civil War statutes designed to protect the rights of emancipated Negro citizens from Ku Klux Klansmen and other desperadoes. These statutes, known as section 241 and 242 of the United States Code were dismissed by two Federal district court judges as moribund—or at least as inapplicable in the case of two monstrous attacks on Negroes. The Supreme Court's rescue of them does not make them very robust or reliable. But at least it makes possible the prosecution of some thoroughly despicable characters.

One of the two cases involves the 1964 murder of three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, Michael Schwerner, James Chaney, and Andrew Goodman. The sheriff and deputy sheriff of Neshoba County and a patrolman of the Philadelphia, Miss., police department, together with 15 other men, were indicted for conspiring to arrange their release from the county jail with the purpose of intercepting them and killing them

on a public highway. Because this was a Federal, not a State, indictment, the charge was not murder but violation of section 242 forbidding the deprivation "under color of law of rights protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

The indictment was dismissed as against all but the sheriff, deputy sheriff and patrolman on the ground that the others were not acting "under color of law." Writing for a unanimous Court, however, Justice Fortas declared compellingly that "private persons, jointly engaged with State officials in the prohibited action, are acting 'under color' of law for purposes of the statute. To act 'under color' of law does not require that the accused be an officer of the State. It is enough that he is a willful participant in joint activity with the State or its agents." This seems to us unexceptionable.

The other case involved the wanton shooting of Lemuel Penn on a Georgia highway. No State officers were implicated in this heinous crime, and the indictment was for violation of section 241 which provides for a \$5,000 fine and imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, for conspiracy "to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

Though somewhat confusingly divided in its reasons, the Supreme Court held this indictment valid, too, on the ground that the killing was part of a preexisting plot to deprive Negroes of constitutional rights—particularly the right to travel on the public highways.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the Court's several opinions in these cases is the ardent invitation they extend to Congress to strengthen the existing civil rights statutes. "Viewed in its proper perspective," Justice Brennan observed pointedly, section 5 [of the 14th amendment] "appears as a positive grant of legislative power, authorizing Congress to exercise its discretion in fashioning remedies to achieve civil and political equality for all citizens."

A measure introduced recently by Representative MATHIAS and a number of Republican colleagues would sharpen the provisions and enlarge the penalties for depriving anyone of constitutional rights, whether under "color of law" or not. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS civil rights proposal would similarly correct existing defects in the law. The Department of Justice, now pondering legislation in this area, will move forthrightly, it is to be hoped, in the same direction. The cases decided by the Court involve fiendish attacks on basic rights which the Government of the United States should be able effectively to prevent or punish.

WEAK PET BILL SHOULD BE REJECTED

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the favorite pastime in Washington appears to be creating smokescreens. I am afraid that we are witnessing exactly that in the important and neglected field dealing with animal research. Where the need is overwhelming and the public interest is great, the legislation now agreed upon in answer to the glaring misconduct shown in animal trafficking by unscrupulous dealers, is weak and ineffective at best and a travesty on conscience at worst.

People throughout my district have been shocked at the abuse which has been shown in the acquisition of dogs and

other pets for sale to laboratories and experimental stations. No issue has brought any greater response from our people and it is a credit to their sense of fair play and compassion to see their indignation. Frankly, I have been glad to see it because it has often been my opinion that people lack a sense of indignation and tacitly look the other way when their obligation should be clear. In this case there has been a genuine public outcry.

However, this indignation has not been transferred into what, in my opinion, would be a good legislative proposal to curb this illicit and cruel traffic. In its February 4 issue, Life magazine put the issue in proper perspective and portrayed the miserable conditions which were all too typical in treatment of animals gathered by collectors. To call their treatment inhumane would not even adequately convey the disgusting practice. I followed the testimony before the Agriculture Committee very closely.

Witnesses before the House Subcommittee on Livestock and Feed Grains of the Committee on Agriculture, testifying on proposed legislation to regulate the sale, transportation and handling of dogs, cats and other animals, described cases of heartless theft and cruel abuse, cases in which veteran investigators of animal care organizations were sickened by the complete lack of sensitivity on the part of some animal dealers.

ABUSIVE TREATMENT SHOWN

All in all, the correction of these abuses is by no means a simple matter of Federal jurisdiction. For instance, there are generally three distinct categories of dog dealers. One, the grassroots dealer, actually collects dogs and cats in any given area. The second category is the middleman who travels throughout the country collecting animals for the large dealers. Thirdly, there is the dealer who operates on a tremendous scale involving thousands of dogs and cats yearly. It is this type of dealer who actually supplies research institutions, although he is not their only source of supply.

In the case of one dog dealer who supplied laboratories directly, his means of transportation was a horse trailer complete with a double deck to utilize as much cubic footage as possible to store animals while in transit. According to the witness before the House subcommittee who described the trailer and its contents:

There were dogs on tops of dogs that were dead, and there were pans of water, but, because of the dogs being on top of the dogs, they could not get to them.

It was estimated that approximately 120 dogs were crammed into this trailer.

Adding to the complexity of the overall problem is the transportation of animals in interstate traffic. Animals are stolen, quickly transported across State lines where they change hands very rapidly, and in some cases wind up at the animal auctions, especially those in Pennsylvania. Local law enforcement is stymied once State lines are crossed. Conversely, State laws are unable to deal effectively with the traffic in stolen animals that originates outside their borders. At present, only 11 States and approximately 30

communities have enacted laws that protect pet owners and try to guarantee an adequate supply of animals for study.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with all of those Members of this body who have demanded effective steps be taken to close the loopholes in this traffic and provide a framework for regulating those dealers who procure animals. My colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HELSROSKI] took the lead in this fight and my legislation is identical to theirs. Judging from the public response, our legislation should have the widespread support of the American people.

COMMITTEE FAILS TO RESPOND

Yet, the House Agriculture Committee has reported out a bill which is weak and ineffective and cannot help but fail in its objective. A few of the glaring weaknesses which make it unworthy are:

First, it fails to require inspection of dealers' facilities and transport.

Second, it merely assesses a token fine for dealer violations instead of providing for revocation of dealers' licenses.

Third, it permits the terrible practice of sale of animals at auction and by body weight. This was shown to be the area of greatest abuse.

Fourth, it mysteriously overlooks one of the basic thrusts behind the legislation, namely, to put the imprint of Congress on a set of humane standards which the Secretary of Agriculture and other governmental officials would be required to promulgate. Of all areas, it is the hardest to justify the lack of concern on the part of the Federal Government for what its own agencies do. If we do not set standards for the National Institutes of Health, whose Poolesville Animal Center alone spends well over \$100,000 per year for cats and dogs, it is a farce to tell any other person or laboratory what they should do.

Fifth, it fails to require bills of sale which would be one of the only sure safeguards against the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by unscrupulous dealers.

There are other objections but these are the major ones. It is argued that the bill I have introduced would virtually halt this traffic and make it very difficult to continue the operation of the dealers who now traffic in dogs and pets. To that charge, I plead guilty since it is my intent to make it impossible to continue the current practice where animals die in crates from starvation, thirst, or exposure.

The legislation which I support is severe, to be sure, but this situation calls for a quick, striking blow against this cruel and inhumane practice. My bill would license dealers only and require laboratories to purchase animals only from licensed dealers; prohibit the sale of animals at auction or by weight; protect not only dogs and cats but also other animals whose suffering is no less than that of cats and dogs; provide the legislative intent of the standards the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to promulgate to insure the humane housing, handling, and transport of animals by dealers; require

legitimate bills of sale to prevent the theft and fraudulent acquisition of animals by dealers; require Federal inspection of dealers' premises and transport of animals; require revocation of dealers' licenses for violations of the act or of the anticruelty laws of the States and calls for an adequate penalty.

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES FOR MISTREATING?

On the national level the Federal Government has subsidized, however unwittingly, the traffic in stolen animals. Through Federal loans and grants the Government has been the major financial supporter of scientific experimentations. For example, an estimated 2¼ million dogs and cats were used in 1964 at hospitals and research laboratories receiving Federal money. Between \$30 to \$50 million was spent by these institutions for these animals. One Federal agency alone, the Poolesville Animal Center of the National Institutes of Health, spends well over \$100,000 on cats and dogs.

Agencies such as the Defense Department, NASA, and the National Institutes of Health use animals for research, and NIH, for instance, has published procedures for the procurement of animals by that agency. However, what percentage stolen animals end up in Government laboratories would probably be almost impossible to ascertain in view of the varying estimates of the number of stolen animals throughout the country which are eventually used by research resources.

One market, no doubt, for stolen animals is the 1,500 research institutions of substantial size throughout the country which receive Federal funds. Although these institutions are instructed by the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to observe State and local laws in the acquisition of animals, and although the publication, *Guide for Laboratory Animals' Facilities and Care*, spells out for them the guidelines to be observed, abducted animals still end up in such laboratories due to the inadequacy of State and local laws and for want of a more rigid oversight of Federal programs by Federal agencies.

Perhaps if the Federal Government had shown as much zeal in enforcing its laboratory animal guidelines as it is presently demonstrating with its wage-price guidelines versus individual rights, the profits gleaned from this trade by some unscrupulous animal dealers might never have materialized at the outset.

COMMITTEE BILL WOULD BE LICENSED

While I have supported this direct effective approach, it would be equally obligatory that I oppose the reported bill which would do little more than license wrongdoing and give a legal cover to purveyors of mistreated animals. The bill reported out of Agriculture Committee, would, in effect, do more to protect the dealers than it would to protect the animals. Where the dealer is licensed by Federal law but inadequately regulated, how can any local authority properly enforce superior laws of the State or local government?

The reported bill is little more than an effort to scuttle all of our work and

files in the face of demonstrated public opinion. You can be sure that I will be doing everything possible to implement the mandatory provisions of the Bolton-Helstoski-Ashbrook bills which would set up standards that all animal lovers would approve.

TRIBUTE TO PROF. WILLIAM LEO HANSBERRY, LATE PIONEER IN AFRICAN STUDIES FIELD, BY RAYMOND J. SMYKE, SPECIAL ASSISTANT FOR AFRICA, WORLD CONFEDERATION OF ORGANIZATIONS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, for four decades the late Prof. William Leo Hansberry was the leading American historian on Africa. A graduate of Harvard University, Professor Hansberry came from a distinguished Negro family whose roots reach deeply into Mississippi, where his father was professor of history at Alcorn College. His late niece, Playwright Lorraine Hansberry, was the author of "Raisin in the Sun," and other famous plays for Broadway.

Having taught in his Howard University classroom, here in Washington, some of the great and outstanding African leaders of today, Professor Hansberry was very well known and esteemed abroad, but, ironically, almost unknown throughout his native land, the United States. He received honors from Ethiopia and Ghana, and the University of Nigeria named its school of African studies after him, the William Leo Hansberry School of African Studies.

Professor Hansberry was personally acquainted with and explored the leading sites of African antiquity. At the time of his death last November 3, he was working on a four-volume study of the history and prehistory of Africa, the first work of its kind by an American author.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Hansberry's contribution to both the Negro community in America and to the field of scholarship has materially affected the course of present day historical research on Africa. I include with my remarks at this point in the RECORD a testimony to Professor Hansberry, which appeared in the November 20, 1965, issue of the British publication, "West Africa," written by his devoted friend, Mr. Raymond J. Smyke, of Washington, who is the special assistant for Africa of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession. Mr. Smyke is a graduate of the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and received his master's degree in Africa studies at Boston University.

In the following tribute, Mr. Smyke points out the true greatness of Profes-

sor Hansberry as a remarkable pioneer in the field of African studies:

PIONEER AFRICANIST

(William Leo Hansberry, who died peacefully on November 3 after 71 years, was a remarkable pioneer in the field of African studies. While a young man he undertook work singularly unpopular among his contemporaries. He soon outstripped the limited body of knowledge then available on the subject and was stranded in the no man's land of scholarship where no one was qualified to pass on his work. As a result he was rejected by the academic community he served; he was maligned by his own people and effectively blocked from achieving any recognition—academic or material—until the twilight years of his life. Only during the last 5 years were honors bestowed on him, not by America but by Africa. A true victim of the adage "publish or perish," William Leo Hansberry perished in the eyes of his academic contemporaries because he never published. However, there is universal agreement that he was a great teacher, in the mold of Dr. James Emman Kwegyir Aggrey. Their lives were remarkably similar.)

Hansberry was born in Mississippi, where his father was professor of history at Alcorn College, a small Negro institution. After a year at Atlantic University he entered Harvard University. Hansberry had a single purpose at Harvard, to resolve in his own mind the conflicting questions of Africa's past. He worked under anthropologist Ernest A. Hooten, who subsequently wrote, "I am quite confident that no present-day scholar has anything like the knowledge of this field that Hansberry has developed. He has been unable to take the Ph. D. degree in his chosen subjects here or anywhere else because of lack of proper persons to supervise his thesis and because there is no university or institution, so far as I know, that has manifested a really profound interest in this subject."

In 1921, with the mark of Harvard on him, Hansberry was convinced that Africa had a past which in many respects rivaled Europe during the Middle Ages and, further, that the cradle of civilization was indeed in central Africa. He proposed and taught that one of the primary destructive agents of Africa's past was the slave traders who not only destroyed African civilizations but suppressed knowledge of them to support their contention that the institution of slavery was a civilizing factor. This in the decade of the 1920's was sheer academic heresy. For holding these views Hansberry the academician was punished in a most brutal way.

In 1921 he took a part-time lectureship at Howard University in Washington so he could do research in the Library of Congress. In June 1922, an African civilization section was founded in the department of history with Hansberry as director. On June 3, and 4, 1925, a 2-day symposium was held under Hansberry's chairmanship, with 28 papers being delivered by his advanced students. It was formally titled: "The Cultures and Civilizations of Negro Peoples in Africa."

During this period Hansberry was giving three courses enrolling 814 students: "Negro Peoples in the Cultures and Civilizations of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Times"; "Ancient Civilizations of Ethiopia," based largely on the then most recent archeological findings of the Coxe, Liverpool, Oxford, Wellcome, and Harvard-Boston expeditions; and "The Civilization of West Africa in Medieval and Early Modern Times." With no textbooks, the students kept careful notes reproducing the charts and drawings presented during the lecture. Some of these notebooks are still preserved.

But within 5 years Hansberry was formally charged by some university colleagues with teaching wrong and fallacious doctrines which were damaging the university's standing. After he explained to the board of

trustees what he was actually teaching, the board dismissed the accusers and cleared him. Shortly after this a small, clearly identifiable anti-Hansberry cult was formed which prevailed for 30 years. In 1937 his 2-year Rockefeller grant to Oxford was terminated after 1 year without explanation. A manuscript he had taken with him to be read by a colleague was published 3 years later without any mention of the real author. Debarred from promotion, Hansberry served his university as an instructor without tenure until World War II.

By 1939 a detailed outline of his proposed five-volume study on the prehistory and history of Africa was prepared and all the sources he intended to use for it were in his possession.

In 1947 he was virtually assured of a grant from the Rosenwald Fund to carry on research, strongly supported by Hooten and the renowned Egyptologist, W. F. Albright, of Johns Hopkins University, who wrote in January of that year: "Mr. Hansberry has covered the ground with extraordinary thoroughness and competence. Of course, it is humanly impossible for any one man to be a specialist in all the varied fields which are involved, including widely divergent anthropological and archeological techniques, as well as control of historical and philological methods not to overlook command of scores of languages, living and dead. But I find that Mr. Hansberry has missed virtually nothing of any relevance to his wide field, showing complete familiarity with the researches of Leakey, Dart, Broom, and Van Riet Lowe * * * Littmann, Asais * * * Reisner, Griffith, Garatant, Randall-MacIver, and many others. His judgment with regard to many highly controversial subjects proved excellent, and his knowledge of contemporary workers in the field is so thorough that he seems almost invariably able to pick out just the scholar, American or foreign, to advise him on any point. Last but not least, he shows considerable skill in writing, where he joins a vivid style and clearness and cogency." Incredibly, Hansberry did not get the Rosenwald grant.

In the postwar years he turned to counseling African students, who were then attending Howard in large numbers. From 1946 to 1959 he served as faculty adviser to foreign students. While some hold that this was a misuse of time that should have been spent on writing, it would be more accurate to look on this communion with African students as a sustaining factor. After 30 years of struggle, he was all but broken, realizing fully that he was blocked in carrying out his life's ambition. In spite of the support of his devoted and loyal wife and the students that a good teacher is rewarded with over the years, the difficulties of the three decades left him discouraged and disillusioned. His efforts to assist African students were a veritable substitute to consume his boundless energy.

At the insistence of friends he applied for a Fulbright research scholarship. Fearful of a repetition of the Rockefeller and Rosenwald experiences, he told no one outside a small circle that the application was even pending. But it was indeed awarded for the year 1953-54, which he spent visiting the antiquities he had so long lectured about. Yet 5 years later he was again dealt a shocking blow: His university, with a generous grant from the Ford Foundation, established a program of African studies, and Hansberry was not invited to participate, though he had been lecturing on Africa since 1922.

At about the same time a number of completely unexpected things occurred which in a sense caused the last 5 years of his life to be his most rewarding. In 1959 Dr. Kenneth Dike, then professor of history at University College, Ibadan, visited the United States. An arrangement was made for Dike and Hansberry to spend 45 minutes together,

which lengthened into one afternoon. Dike observed that this lifetime work must at all cost be published, if for no other reason than to stimulate controversy in the new field of African history. Dike and Hansberry then appeared together at a university African program reception, to which the latter was not invited. This single act was a turning point, for while his detractors were prepared to attack Hansberry, not one felt safe enough to question Dike's judgment. A short time later Prof. Thomas Hodgkin of Oxford spent time with Hansberry, coming to the same conclusion as Dike. The neutralization of his detractors was followed in mid-1960 by an impassioned plea from Hansberry's former student Nnamdi Azikiwe, then President of the Nigerian Senate, offering to underwrite the publication of his projected study. Appealing as this offer was, Hansberry wished to have it brought out under American auspices because he felt it to be a uniquely American contribution. Shortly thereafter, two distinguished publishers totally unconnected with the African field—Bennett Cerf and Jason Epstein of Random House—contracted with him for half a million words on African history. This multivolume work was the project Hansberry was primarily engaged in when he died.

Giant and Small Men

In addition to honorary degrees from Virginia State College and Morgan State College, he received some cherished honors from the African students he had served so well. In 1960 his friend Dr. Kwame Nkrumah offered him a professorship at the University of Ghana and invited him to publish his works there. His former student Azikiwe, by then President of Nigeria, conferred on Hansberry the University of Nigeria's second honorary degree. At the same time Azikiwe inaugurated the Hansberry School of African Studies at the university. In 1964 Hansberry was selected by the Halle Selassie Trust to receive their first prize for original work in African history, archeology and anthropology.

In 1953 he cofounded the Institute of African-American Relations, now the African-American Institute. He served as vice president and trustee. He was the prime mover in the establishment of Africa House, a student hostel in Washington, and was instrumental in founding the All-African Students Union of the Americas. He published articles and lectured frequently, gave of himself to African students and still found time to be a devoted father to his two daughters. His wife, Myrtle, has taught for many years in the public school system of the District of Columbia; but of more importance, she has been his research assistant, translator, grammarian, counselor and, during the difficult years, a source of strength.

The tragedy of Leo Hansberry is that which sometimes befalls giants surrounded by small men. His rejected views of 40 years ago are now generally accepted. His chief recognition came from Africa and Africans, not from the land of his birth. He suffered as no man should for what he felt was an accurate representation of Africa's past, and he died before his work was completed.

As to the future, a poignant statement was made by Helen Kitchen, editor of *Africa Report*: "Although Leo Hansberry received many honors from the other side of the Atlantic in his lifetime, he died before he was fully appreciated in his own country. Those of us who knew and loved him have a special responsibility: to make sure that the research to which he was so dedicated is completed and published, and that a book is written to tell his own courageous story."

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, today the task force on international education of the House Committee on Education and Labor began hearings on H.R. 12452, the International Education Act of 1966.

Because this legislation is the only major new education measure proposed by President Johnson this year, I believe it may be useful if I report to Members of the House on the opening of the hearings.

Let me say at the outset that this proposal is a result of two major addresses made in recent months by President Johnson. The first was the President's address of September 16, 1965 at the Smithsonian Institution, on the occasion of the bicentennial celebration of the Institution. The second was the President's message of February 2, 1966, on international education and health. I have unanimous consent following my remarks to insert the texts of these two addresses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The International Education Act is aimed at strengthening graduate and undergraduate programs in international studies at colleges and universities here in the United States. The bill authorizes grants to promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

Some weeks ago a task force of the House Education and Labor Committee was named by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., to hold hearings on this legislation. I have the honor to serve as chairman of the task force and its other members are my distinguished colleagues, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California; CARLTON R. SICKLES, of Maryland; WILLIAM D. FORD, of Michigan; WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, of Maine; Mrs. PATSY T. MINK, of Hawaii; WILLIAM H. AYRES, of Ohio; ALBERT H. QUIE, of Minnesota; and ALPHONZO BELL, of California.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear that the proposed International Education Act is a part of the broader program in international education which President Johnson moved to initiate with the appointment of a Presidential Task Force last fall and of which he spoke both in his Smithsonian address and his message to Congress of February 2. In his message, the President recommended some 20 new programs in health and education.

Authority for these programs is divided among several Government agencies including the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of State, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and the U.S. Information Agency.

Of the 20 points proposed by the President, 10 concern the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Three of these require new legislative authority, and they form the major portion of the

substance of the proposed International Education Act of 1966.

This act calls for three programs designed to enhance the international dimension of American college and university education by providing financial assistance in the following ways:

First, grants will be made to universities or groups of universities to organize graduate centers for international study and service. Centers may concentrate on either specific geographical areas of the world or on particular fields or on particular issues in international affairs.

Second, grants will be provided to improve undergraduate instruction in international studies through various projects and activities such as training faculty members abroad, expanding foreign-language courses and other aspects of international affairs, programs under which foreign scholars and teachers may visit American colleges and universities.

Third, the National Defense Education Act will be amended. Title VI of this act now provides some support for 98 language and area centers at 61 American colleges and universities. The National Defense Education Act would be amended to provide grants as well as contracts to the universities for the language and area centers, and the elimination of the present 50-percent matching provision. Also, support for Western European languages as well as for the presently covered uncommon non-Western languages.

These three are the principal points in the legislation before the task force.

The first witness to appear before the Task Force today was the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, himself a widely recognized authority in the field of international education. A former president of the Carnegie Corp. and author of the report, "AID and the Universities."

Secretary Gardner stressed that:

International education at home and educational relations with other nations are permanent and important aspects of our national interest, on the same level with other enduring aspects of national interest such as commercial relations with other countries.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Secretary Gardner's testimony at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN W. GARDNER BEFORE THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you in behalf of the proposed International Education Act of 1966, contained in the identical bills H.R. 12451 and H.R. 12452, introduced by the distinguished chairmen of the full committee and of this special subcommittee.

THE PRESIDENT'S SMITHSONIAN SPEECH

President Johnson emphasized the importance of international education in his remarks last September at the Bicentennial Celebration of the Smithsonian Institution. He repeated that emphasis in his Message on International Education and Health:

"Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes," the President stated in his message. "It must be at the heart of our international relations."

"Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

"Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

"The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

"The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared."

During the past 20 years, the world has moved, more fully and more awesomely, into the atomic age. We live in a world whose destruction could occur without further advances in knowledge or technology.

Perhaps half a century ago, or even a quarter of a century, the world could afford to regard international relations as an isolated and self-contained discipline, distinct from the principal domestic concerns of a nation. The results, while they might often be grave, lacked the potential of world catastrophe.

Today, however, international and domestic concerns are woven together inextricably in the fabric of life of people everywhere on earth. The nations of the world can ignore this only at their peril.

It is in this context that, during the past two decades, the United States has vastly expanded its international economic, cultural, and educational efforts, and it is in this context that the President has now proposed additional steps in the area of international education.

In his Smithsonian address, the President said that "once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins." These words state an essential lesson of two centuries of history. Over the course of these two centuries, and with great rapidity in the last 20 years, education has moved to the center of the human stage. In short, never has mankind had the capacity to accomplish so much through education, and never has the need to advance education been greater.

We recognize that American economic and educational resources are limited, as are those of other nations. Educational development must be consonant with the economic evolution of a society. It must also be consonant with the natural desire of all countries to maintain the sovereignty of their educational systems.

THE PROGRAM AND ITS PREMISES

Accordingly, the program which the President has recommended and the legislation which I am here to support do not propose that the United States undertake to educate the world. Nor do these proposals represent a crash program for an emergency, intended to solve a problem quickly and then to go out of existence.

They are, rather, based on a new premise—the premise that international education at home and educational relations with other nations are permanent and important aspects of our national interest, on the same level with other enduring aspects of national interest such as our commercial relations with other countries.

Why is this true—why must we consider international education at home and educational relations with other peoples as matters of high national interest? The reason becomes plain when we think about the enemy we seek to conquer. That enemy is ignorance, inadequate skills, parochialism, and lack of sensitivity as to why people from different cultures react and behave differently.

We are interested in conquering that enemy not only for ourselves in the United States, but for our fellows in other countries, for mankind in general. We should not shrink from acknowledging our humanitarian motives. We want the men and women of other countries to have better education—as we want our own citizens to have

it—so that they can be better people, can realize the fullest flower of their potential, and contribute the maximum of which they are capable to the progress of mankind.

But enlightened self-interest also plays a part. The United States cannot be secure in a world one-half of whose people are illiterate, totally unskilled, or inadequately trained. That is the stuff of which poverty, frustrated hopes, and political instability are built. As we know so well, the repercussions on the United States of such conditions in the world are immediate and serious. So our cooperative efforts to assist their educational development are not only just and humane, they are in line with our own best interests.

We should not assume, however, that in international education we have found a quick and easy answer to the world's ills. We certainly should not assume that we are fully prepared as a nation to go out and show the way to the less fortunate of other lands.

America, too, is a developing country. One of our areas of underdevelopment is our knowledge of other peoples and cultures, of their history and languages, of the processes of change and of economic and political growth. We must learn more about these matters—and more of us must learn about them—before we will be fully qualified to assume our end of the partnership.

Our shortcomings of understanding and skills for international education must be corrected for another reason—a reason that is almost unique in the case of the United States. We are in a very special position, possessed of awesome power yet basing our whole national being on a democratic system. If that power is to be wisely used in the world, if our responsibilities are to be exercised with compassion, it will be because we have succeeded in building on the bedrock of an educated, informed citizenry.

More than we could have imagined 20 years ago, we Americans must become a people attuned to the needs and problems of those from other traditions—and we must be aware of the cultural richness they give us. We must recognize ourselves as borrowers and learners, as well as lenders and teachers.

This, it seems to me, is what this program is all about. The essential genius of international education as one element of mankind's endless march toward our loftiest goals is its mutuality, its reciprocity. No American professor teaches abroad but that he learns and adds a new dimension to his personality. No foreign student comes to study at an American university but that he teaches us something.

PROVISIONS OF THE PROPOSED ACT

With this concept of the two-way street as the firm foundation of our efforts, the bill you have under consideration places initial emphasis on the redoubled efforts we Americans must make. The advancement of education at home is an essential step to our becoming what we must quickly become: a body of citizens prepared to handle our world responsibilities, and capable of serving effectively as partners in the compelling tasks of worldwide educational progress.

Section 2 of the bill states concisely the fundamental need which leads to the present emphasis on strengthening the international dimension of American education:

"That a knowledge of other countries is of the utmost importance in promoting mutual understanding * * * between nations; that strong American educational resources are a necessary base for strengthening our relations with other countries; that this and future generations of Americans should be assured ample opportunity to develop to the full their intellectual capacities in all areas of knowledge pertaining to other countries,

peoples, and cultures; and that it is therefore both necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to assist in the development of resources for international study and research and to assist the progress of education in developing nations, to meet the requirements of world leadership."

The International Education Act proposes three major steps to strengthen international studies and research in the United States. It would accomplish this by providing additional support under new and more flexible conditions for the work of American colleges and universities.

GRADUATE CENTERS

First, the act would authorize a program of "grants to institutions of higher education, or combinations of such institutions, for the establishment, strengthening, and operation by them of graduate centers which will be national and international resources for research and training in international studies."

The importance of this provision lies in its recognition, essentially for the first time, of the need to sustain and strengthen the institutions of learning on which we have drawn heavily in the past and will have to depend increasingly in the future. As the President stated in his message: "Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately."

Now we propose to correct this deficiency. In placing special emphasis on this provision of the bill, I wish to call your attention to certain opportunities which we believe the bill presents to us.

The first is the opportunity to use this authority for genuinely collaborative moves between the university community and the Government. The centers that will be established should indeed become "national and international resources" and the overall pattern of the centers should be influenced by calculations of national needs and priorities. But at the same time, the centers should express the particular combinations of strengths of individual institutions, the special contributions to our resources of knowledge and trained manpower which that university believes it is most capable of making. This means that the "centers" might not in every instance be a center in the conventional sense of something with physical premises, a professional staff, and a precisely defined program.

On occasion we will wish to use the opportunity opened up by this new authority to support broad universitywide programs to bring an international dimension to large parts of the institution, its faculty and students. This may take the form of developing a capacity for international work in several of the professional schools—engineering, business, law, social work, and journalism, for example—a development long overdue in American higher education. Or the greatest promise of a particular university might lie in building solid bridges between those professional fields which have been active in overseas programs, and the social sciences and humanities where most of the teaching and research in international studies have gone on.

A group of universities might wish to work together, in direct collaboration with a university abroad, to improve their capabilities with respect to some urgent world problem such as the improvement of science teaching or the development of competence in manpower planning. And there would also, of course, be centers in advanced international studies in the more conventional sense.

It is obvious that so important and complex a program must be undertaken soberly and carefully. I believe we should spend a large portion of our time and of the funds

that may be available in the first year, on the essential tasks of planning, assessing, setting priorities and encouraging the universities to examine their own individual possibilities and to develop their new programs. We would propose to make program development or "stimulation" grants available to particular universities or combinations of universities. By offering this kind of support early and by establishing a system for close working relationships between the universities and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we believe it will be possible to move carefully, effectively, and with reasonable speed toward seizing the opportunity which this new authority in the bill holds out to us.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

The second major provision of the bill makes grants available to institutions of higher education for comprehensive programs designed to strengthen undergraduate instruction in international studies. This provision will bring a new and necessary flexibility into the pattern of Federal support of undergraduate work in the international field. It will enable the colleges to find their own best way to bring a stronger international dimension into the life of the institution.

Important beginnings have been made through the recent support of undergraduate language and area studies under the National Defense Education Act. But that approach touches relatively few students and is intended to involve early those who will go on to become advanced specialists in area and language fields. It does not, even potentially, impart to significant numbers of American college students an appreciation of world affairs.

The frame needs to be broadened very considerably. Institutions of higher learning must be encouraged and supported in enabling most of their students to acquire the educated citizen's appreciation of other peoples and cultures and of the forces of change at work in the world. It is of greatest importance to American undergraduate learning that we expand from the NDEA training of specialists concept and establish a broad base in the colleges and universities for educating our young people as generalists and citizens. This is what this provision of the bill authorizes.

Projects and activities which could be supported as part of this effort include: faculty planning for the development and expansion of such programs; training faculty members in foreign countries; expansion of foreign language courses; work in the social sciences and humanities which is related to international studies; student work-study-travel programs; and programs to bring foreign teachers and scholars to American campuses.

In considering and approving grants to improve undergraduate international studies, we will give special consideration to three factors:

First, each institution would be required to plan a comprehensive program in which all of the elements were interrelated in such a way as to provide a meaningful program for both faculty and students. Although Federal grants would support a variety of specific activities and projects, these would have to be integral parts of a carefully planned program.

Second, while we would strive for an equitable geographical distribution of grants, we would give preference to institutions which most urgently needed such funds and which showed real promise of being able to use them effectively. Finally, we would expect the grants under this program to be used to supplement—and not to supplant—other funds already committed by institutions. In short, we are seeking a real expansion in undergraduate international studies, the comprehensive planning of programs, and

their wide availability in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

AMENDING THE NDEA

The third major provision of the proposed act is designed to strengthen language and area centers in institutions of higher education which are provided for under title VI of the National Defense Education Act. The amendments to strengthen title VI, which are contained in the bill, would do three things:

They would remove the requirement limiting language instruction to those languages in which instruction is not readily available in the United States; they would remove the 50-percent ceiling on Federal participation; and they would permit language and area centers to be supported by grants as well as by contracts.

These proposals have grown out of nearly 8 years of experience with the language and area centers program. The contributions of the 98 centers which have been established at 61 American colleges and universities have been impressive. What we see now is the need to increase the number of such centers and the range of languages offered.

These provisions would not only result in an increase in the number of centers, but would also permit the establishment of centers in institutions which could not afford to underwrite half of the cost. By permitting instruction in a broader range of languages, the bill would enable such centers to reflect more fully our national needs in foreign language instruction. Present requirements prohibit support of languages that are "readily available," but there are a number of such languages in which additional opportunities for instruction are urgently needed.

These are the three principal substantive provisions of the bill under consideration: the establishment of centers for advanced international studies; the strengthening of undergraduate instruction in international studies; and the expansion of language and area centers.

Taken together, these provisions will benefit both students and faculty; they will increase our capabilities in international education at both the undergraduate and graduate levels; and they will enable us more nearly to meet our national needs for competence in foreign languages. Thus the emphasis in the proposed International Education Act is on strengthening American capabilities in international education. This is where we have to begin.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

At the same time, these provisions of the proposed act would be complemented by the other proposals contained in the President's message on international education. Our total program will be strengthened by various administrative actions that can be taken under existing legislative authority, some of which the President outlined in his message. Certain of these would be carried out by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; others would be administered by other Federal agencies.

Through the provisions of the proposed bill and the actions which are planned under present legislation, we seek new knowledge and understanding, new avenues for meeting America's needs in international education at home and abroad, and new talents and dedication to enable us to travel those avenues.

In a world of great peril and great promise, the International Education Act of 1966 will help us to lessen the peril and to increase the promise—not only for our Nation but for people all over the world.

I urge your favorable consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I would be pleased to try to answer any questions you

or other members of the committee may have.

Mr. Speaker, accompanying Secretary Gardner today were the following officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Hon. Ralph K. Huit, Assistant Secretary (Legislation); Hon. Francis Keppel, Assistant Secretary (Education); Hon. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary (Health and Scientific Affairs); Hon. Shelton B. Granger, Deputy Assistant Secretary; Hon. Ralph C. M. Flynt, Associate Commissioner for International Education.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the task force will hear a number of distinguished officials of the executive branch, all of whom have an interest in international education and whose agencies will share the responsibility of forging a stronger program. Scheduled to testify are:

Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State; Hon. Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs, Department of State; Hon. Leonard H. Marks, Director, U.S. Information Agency; Hon. Warren Wiggins, Acting Director, Peace Corps.

Mr. Speaker, here are the two major addresses of President Johnson concerning international health and education:

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, SEPTEMBER 16, 1965, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, WASHINGTON, D.C., ON THE OCCASION OF THE INSTITUTION'S BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Distinguished scholars from 80 nations, amid this pomp and pageantry we have gathered to celebrate a man about whom we know very little but to whom we owe very much. James Smithson was a scientist who achieved no great distinction. He was an Englishman who never visited the United States. He never even expressed the desire to do so.

But this man became our Nation's first benefactor. He gave his entire fortune to establish this Institution which would serve "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

He had a vision which lifted him ahead of his time—or at least of some politicians of his time. One illustrious U.S. Senator argued it was beneath the dignity of the country to accept such a gift from foreigners. Congress debated 8 long years before deciding to receive Smithson's bequest.

Yet James Smithson's life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed. The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all the nations in the world.

The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in this country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways.

Finally, the Institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and the spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

These ideas have not always gained easy acceptance among those employed in my line of work. The Government official must cope with the daily disorder that he finds in the world around him.

But today, the official, the scholar, and the scientist cannot settle for limited objectives. We must pursue knowledge no matter what the consequences. We must value the tried less than the true.

To split the atom, to launch the rocket, to explore the innermost mysteries and the outermost reaches of the universe—these are your God-given chores. And even when you risk bringing fresh disorder to the politics of men and nations, these explorations still must go on.

The men who founded our country were passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

In my own life, I have had cause again and again to bless the chance events which started me as a teacher. In our country and in our time we have recognized, with new passion, that learning is basic to our hopes for America. It is the taproot which gives sustaining life to all of our purposes. And whatever we seek to do to wage the war on poverty, to set new goals for health and happiness, to curb crime, or try to bring beauty to our cities and our countryside—all of these, and more depend on education.

But the legacy we inherit from James Smithson cannot be limited to these shores. He called for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men, not just Americans, not just Anglo-Saxons, and not just the citizens of the Western World—but all men everywhere.

The world we face on his bicentennial anniversary makes that mandate much more urgent than it ever was. For we know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth: that ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace; that the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms; and that the knowledge of our citizens is the treasure which grows only when it is shared.

It would profit us little to limit the world exchange to those who can afford it. We must extend the treasure to those lands where learning is still a luxury for the few.

Today, more than 700 million adults—4 out of 10 of the world's population—dwell in darkness where they cannot read or write. Almost half the nations of this globe suffer from illiteracy among half or more of their people. And unless the world can find a way to extend the light, the forces of that darkness may ultimately engulf us all.

For our part, this Government and this Nation is prepared to join in finding the way. During recent years we have made much hopeful beginnings. But we can and we must do more. That is why I have directed a special task force within my administration to recommend a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor.

Secretary of State Rusk has accepted my request to chair this task force. Secretary John Gardner of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has agreed to serve on it. Both these men have proved, in their past careers, how great is their devotion to international education.

I intend to call on leaders in both public and private enterprise to join with us in mapping this effort.

We must move ahead on every front and every level of learning. We can support [the] dream of creating a center here at the Smithsonian where great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate. At a more junior level, we can promote the growth of the school-to-school program started under the Peace Corps auspices so that our children may learn about—and care about—each other.

We mean to show that this Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. And that it is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it.

Together we must embark on a new and a noble adventure:

First, to assist the education effort of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.

In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

By January, I intend to present such a program to the Congress.

Despite the noise of daily events, history is made by men and the ideas of men. We—and only we—can generate growing light in our universe, or we can allow the darkness to gather.

De Toqueville challenged us more than a century ago: "Men cannot remain strangers to each other, or be ignorant of what is taking place in any corner of the globe." We must banish strangeness and the ignorance.

In all we do toward one another, we must try—and try again—to live the words of the prophet: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, FEBRUARY 2, 1966

(The following is the text of the special message dealing with international education on Feb. 2, 1966.)

To the Congress of the United States:

Last year the Congress by its action declared: the Nation's No. 1 task is to improve the education and health of our people.

Today I call upon Congress to add a world dimension to this task.

I urge the passage of the International Education and Health Acts of 1966.

We would be shortsighted to confine our vision to this Nation's shorelines. The same rewards we count at home will flow from sharing in a worldwide effort to rid mankind of the slavery of ignorance and the scourge of disease.

We bear a special role in this liberating mission. Our resources will be wasted in defending freedom's frontiers if we neglect the spirit that makes men want to be free.

Half a century ago, the philosopher William James declared that mankind must seek "a moral equivalent of war."

The search continues—more urgent today than ever before in man's history.

Ours is the great opportunity to challenge all nations, friend and foe alike, to join this battle.

We have made hopeful beginnings. Many of the programs described in this message have been tested in practice. I have directed our agencies of Government to improve and enlarge the programs already authorized by Congress.

Now I am requesting Congress to give new purpose and new power to our efforts by declaring that:

Programs to advance education and health are basic building blocks to lasting peace.

They represent a long-term commitment in the national interest.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is charged with a broad authority to help strengthen our country's capacity to carry on this noble adventure.

EDUCATION

Education lies at the heart of every nation's hopes and purposes. It must be at the heart of our international relations.

We have long supported UNESCO and other multilateral and international agencies. We propose to continue these efforts with renewed vigor.

Schooled in the grief of war, we know certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

Ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

The conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

The knowledge of our citizens is one treasure which grows only when it is shared.

International education cannot be the work of one country. It is the responsibility and promise of all nations. It calls for free exchange and full collaboration. We expect to receive as much as we give, to learn as well as to teach.

Let this Nation play its part. To this end, I propose:

To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation.

To stimulate exchange with students and teachers of other lands.

To assist the progress of education in developing nations.

To build new bridges of international understanding.

I. To strengthen our capacity for international educational cooperation

Our education base in this country is strong. Our desire to work with other nations is great. But we must review and renew the purpose of our programs for international education. I propose to:

1. Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish within his Department a Center for Educational Cooperation.

This Center will be a focal point for leadership in international education. While it will not supplant other governmental agencies already conducting programs in this field, it will: Act as a channel for communication between our missions abroad and the U.S. educational community; direct programs assigned to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; assist public and private agencies conducting international education programs.

2. Appoint a Council on International Education.

Our commitment to international education must draw on the wisdom, experience, and energy of many people. This Council, to be composed of outstanding leaders of American education, business, labor, the professions, and philanthropy, will advise the Center for Educational Cooperation.

3. Create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the U.S. Foreign Service.

As education's representatives abroad, they will give sharper direction to our programs. Recruited from the ranks of outstanding educators, they will report directly to the Ambassador when serving in foreign missions.

4. Stimulate new programs in international studies for elementary and secondary schools.

No child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of American education.

I am directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to earmark funds from title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, so that our regional education laboratories can enrich the international curriculums of our elementary and secondary schools.

5. Support programs of international scope in smaller and developing colleges.

Many of our Nation's institutions have been unable to share fully in international projects. By a new program of incentive grants administered through Health, Education, and Welfare these institutions will be encouraged to play a more active role.

6. Strengthen centers of special competence in international research and training.

Over the past two decades, our universities have been a major resource in carrying on development programs around the world. We have made heavy demands upon them. But we have not supported them adequately.

I recommend to the Congress a program of incentive grants administered by Health, Education, and Welfare for universities and groups of universities—

(a) to promote centers of excellence in dealing with particular problems and particular regions of the world.

(b) to develop administrative staff and faculties adequate to maintain long-term commitments to overseas educational enterprises.

In addition, I propose that AID be given authority to provide support to American research and educational institutions, for increasing their capacity to deal with programs of economic and social development abroad.

II. To stimulate exchange with the students and teachers of other lands

Only when people know about—and care about—each other will nations learn to live together in harmony. I therefore propose that we:

1. Encourage the growth of school-to-school partnerships.

Through such partnerships, already pioneered on a small scale, a U.S. school may assist the brick-and-mortar construction of a sister school in less-developed nations. The exchange can grow to include books and equipment, teacher and student visits.

To children, it can bring deep understanding and lasting friendships.

I recommend a goal of 1,000 school-to-school partnerships.

This program will be administered by the Peace Corps, in cooperation with AID, particularly its partners of the alliance program. The chief cost will be borne by the voluntary contributions of the participating schools.

2. Establish an Exchange Peace Corps.

Our Nation has no better ambassadors than the young volunteers who serve in 46 countries in the Peace Corps. I propose that we welcome similar ambassadors to our shores. We need their special skills and understanding, just as they need ours.

These "volunteers to America" will teach their own language and culture in our schools and colleges. They will serve in community programs alongside VISTA volunteers. As our Peace Corps volunteers learn while they serve, those coming to the United States will be helped to gain training to prepare them for further service when they return home.

I propose an initial goal of 5,000 volunteers.

3. Establish an American Education Placement Service.

We have in the United States a reservoir of talent and good will not yet fully tapped: school and college teachers eager to serve abroad; professors and administrators who are retired or on sabbatical leave; Peace Corps volunteers who desire further foreign service.

To encourage these men and women to assist in the developing nations and elsewhere, I recommend that we establish an American Education Placement Service in HEW.

It will act as an international recruitment bureau for American teachers, and will provide supplemental assistance for those going to areas of special hardship.

In time, I hope this Service will lead to the development of a world teacher exchange—in which all nations may join to

bring their classrooms into closer relationships with one another.

III. To assist the progress of education in developing nations

To provide direct support for those countries struggling to improve their education standards, I propose that we:

1. Enlarge AID programs of education assistance.

In my message on foreign assistance, I directed AID to make a major effort in programs of direct educational benefit. These will emphasize teacher training—vocational and scientific education—construction of education facilities—specialized training in the U.S. for foreign students—and help in publishing badly needed textbooks.

2. Develop new techniques for teaching basic education and fighting illiteracy.

Our own research and development in the learning process can be adapted to fit the needs of other countries. Modern technology and new communications techniques have the power to multiply the resources available to a school system.

I am calling on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to support basic education research of value to the developing nations.

I am requesting AID to conduct studies and assist pilot projects for applying technology to meet critical education shortages.

3. Expand U.S. Summer Teaching Corps.

The Agency for International Development now administers programs for American teachers and professors who participate in summer workshops in less developed countries. They serve effectively to support teacher-training in these countries. They also enrich their own teaching experience.

I propose this year that AID double the number of U.S. participants in the summer teaching corps.

4. Assist the teaching of English abroad.

Many of the newer nations have a vital need to maintain English as the language of international communication and national development. We must help meet this demand even as we extend the teaching of foreign languages in our own schools.

I have directed AID, supported by other agencies, to intensify its efforts for those countries which seek our help.

5. Establish binational educational foundations.

We have at our disposal excess foreign currencies in a number of developing nations. Where conditions are favorable, I propose that significant amounts of these currencies be used to support binational educational foundations. Governed by leading citizens from the two nations, they would have opportunities much like those afforded major foundations in the United States to invest in basic educational development.

To the extent further currencies are created by our sales of agricultural commodities abroad, I propose that a portion be earmarked for educational uses, particularly to assist technical training in food production.

IV. To build new bridges of international understanding

The job of international education must extend beyond the classroom. Conferences of experts from many nations, the free flow of books and ideas, the exchange of works of science and imagination can enrich every citizen. I propose steps to:

1. Stimulate conferences of leaders and experts.

I have directed every department and agency to support a series of seminars for representatives from every discipline and every culture to seek answers to the common problems of mankind.

We are ready to serve as host to international gatherings. I have therefore called on the Secretary of State and Attorney General to explore ways to remove unnecessary

hindrances in granting visas to guests invited from abroad.

2. Increase the flow of books and other educational material.

I recommend prompt passage of legislation to implement the Florence agreement and thus stimulate the movement of books and other educational material between nations. This agreement was signed by representatives of the U.S. Government in 1959 and ratified by the Senate in 1960. This necessary congressional action is long overdue to eliminate duties and remove barriers for the importation of educational materials.

I also recommend that Congress implement the Beirut Agreement to permit duty-free entry of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, or cultural nature.

Finally, we must encourage American private enterprise to participate actively in educational exchange. I urge the Congress to amend the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 to permit improvements in the informational media guarantee program.

3. Improve the quality of U.S. schools and colleges abroad.

We have a potentially rich resource in the American elementary and secondary schools and colleges overseas assisted by the Department of State and AID.

They should be showcases for excellence in education.

They should make overseas service attractive to our own citizens.

They should provide close contact with students and teachers of the host country. I request additional support to assist those institutions which meet these standards.

4. Create special programs for future leaders studying in the United States.

There are some 90,000 foreign students now enrolled in U.S. institutions. Many of them will someday play leading roles in their own countries. We must identify and assist these potential leaders.

I recommend that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and AID provide grants to enrich their educational experience through special courses and summer institutes.

THE CHOICE WE MUST MAKE

We call on rich nations and poor nations to join with us—to help each other and to help themselves. This must be the first work of the world for generations to come.

For our part, the programs in international education and health I am recommending this year will total \$524 million: \$354 million in the foreign assistance program; \$103 million in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department program; \$11 million in the Peace Corps program; and \$56 million in the State Department cultural and education program.

As I indicated in my message on foreign assistance yesterday, these programs will be conducted in a manner consistent with our balance-of-payments policy.

We must meet these problems in ways that will strengthen free societies—and protect the individual right to freedom of choice.

Last fall, speaking to a gathering of the world's scholars at the Smithsonian Institution, I said: "We can generate growing light in our universe—or we can allow the darkness to gather."

In the few months since then, forty-four million more children have come into the world. With them come more hunger—and more hope.

Since that time the gross national product of our Nation has passed the \$700 billion mark.

The choice between light and darkness, between health and sickness, between knowledge and ignorance is not one that we can ignore.

The light we generate can be the brightest hope of history. It can illuminate the way toward a better life for all. But the dark-

ness—if we let it gather—can become the final, terrible midnight of mankind.

The International Education and Health Acts of 1966 present an opportunity to begin a great shared adventure with other nations.

I urge the Congress to act swiftly for passage of both measures.

Our national interest warrants it.

The work of peace demands it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Editorial reaction to the proposed International Education Act of 1966 has been thoughtful and favorable. I insert in the RECORD at this point three editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post which applaud the President's initiative, yet which note some of the difficulties involved in this aspect of the Nation's role as a world leader.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 3, 1966]

CALL FOR A CRUSADE

President Johnson yesterday called on the American people to begin a major crusade against the ignorance and illness that are the lot of countless millions abroad. His message to Congress on international education and health presented an omnibus collection of measures he considers vital in this area. In effect, the hitherto largely domestic objectives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are extended far beyond this Nation's shores, and a major international element is added to that Department's already homeric assignment.

The desirability of the President's objectives—and the moral obligation of this country to try to fulfill them—are beyond dispute. The practical problem is how to realize them. Here the President's program comes up against the same difficulty that has impeded earlier efforts in this direction. The United States is itself suffering from shortages of highly trained educational and medical personnel, and those possessing the skills needed abroad are under strong economic and other pressure to use their energies here.

Evidence abounds in Mr. Johnson's message that he understands how difficult the skilled manpower problem is. He gives careful attention to measures intended to increase the supply of needed educators and medical personnel for service abroad. But much of this program is likely to yield fruit only in the long run, while the needs of the developing countries are urgent now. The imaginative idea of the Exchange Peace Corps may serve as a modest offsetting factor, but its overall contribution is likely to be small.

The short-run problem of providing personnel for realizing the President's goals will be especially acute in the medical field. The country's existing shortage of doctors, nurses, and other technicians is being aggravated by the demands of the war in Vietnam. That deficit may rise much further when medicare begins in midyear. The course Mr. Johnson has charted is an admirable and inspiring one; the great question is the adequacy of the means to travel it.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 3, 1966]

NEW INITIATIVES IN AID

The President has ventured into relatively unexplored and highly promising avenues of international cooperation by providing for expanded education and health programs as part of U.S. foreign aid. In a supplemental aid message, the President elaborates on long-heralded new U.S. initiatives in aid ranging from population control and the training of more medical manpower in the developing countries to the strengthening of international affairs teaching in our own schools.

The President's plans for broadening aid efforts in the education field include creation of a corps of education officers in the Foreign Service, grants to U.S. universities to prepare them for aid responsibilities and enlarged budgets for direct U.S. help to educational institutions in the form of teacher training and the development of vocationally oriented secondary schools. These are all valuable programs, and it is encouraging that our efforts appear to be keyed mainly to indigenous educational enterprise arising out of the soil of recipient countries.

The only disquieting note in the message is a proposal for basic education research in the United States on the educational needs of the developing countries. Such research might well be employed as a guide to our own policy assessments of what others are doing. But the United States should not look on the problems of the developing countries as its own, assuming these problems as an American responsibility or mission and should focus its aid resources in those fields where local initiative has already made itself felt.

One of the most admirable elements in the President's education program is the provision of new funds for regional education laboratories designed to deepen the international affairs curriculums of American elementary and secondary schools. For as the President says, "no child should grow to manhood in America without realizing the promise and the peril of the world beyond our borders. Progress in teaching about world affairs must not lag behind progress made in other areas of American education."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1966]

EDUCATIONAL MISSION ABROAD

President Johnson's special message on international education and health sets the stage for a new concept of education's role in foreign affairs.

In the past, even the best educational work abroad has been considered an adjunct to economic aid. Consequently, the Government agencies and the universities involved in such efforts often handled them as avocations and afterthoughts. This—as John W. Gardner pointed out in his critique of such ventures more than a year before he was appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare—often corroded and corrupted the foreign educational mission of both Government and the universities.

By moving education to "the heart of our international relations" and by asking Secretary Gardner to establish within his Department a Center for International Educational Cooperation, the President has given notice that educational leadership rather than political thinking is to be at the controls. This innovation may go a long way toward allaying suspicions abroad which arise whenever a foreign government proclaims itself as the messenger of learning. American as well as foreign educators will feel far greater kinship with the education experts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare than with officials whose first concern is foreign aid.

One danger in Mr. Johnson's proposal is that it may make existing problems appear too easy to conquer. The obstacles are, in fact, formidable. Academic as well as governmental habits of thought and procedure will have to be changed. The low quality of instruction offered at many American dependents' schools abroad serves as a warning that successful international education requires high standards of personnel selection.

Domestic educational strength is indivisible from success overseas. Shortages of highly educated, competent, and committed manpower at home will continue to jeopardize the American impact in other lands. This is, of course, most dramatically shown in the fields of health and medicine. Many American hospitals are now staffed by for-

eign nurses and doctors, not for reasons of international cooperation but simply because of desperate shortages. Thus, a far greater effort will be required to raise at home, in quantity as well as in quality, the levels of the professional manpower reserve in order to meet the global promise.

AN END TO CHAOS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the House of Representatives on the vote it is about to take on daylight saving time.

Passage of this legislation, which I have supported throughout my two terms, brings to the United States a new uniformity of its time periods in place of the jumbled lack of uniformity that has plagued our Nation for so many years.

I regard this law, Mr. Speaker, as a triumph of conservation. For that is basically what it is—a conservation measure.

Lack of time uniformity has resulted directly in the waste of uncounted millions of dollars during the spring, summer and fall months. The new law will wipe out, with a stroke of the President's pen, the source of that waste.

The economic effects of the law will be measured by savings to the transportation industry because of the great simplification in timetables. The communications industry in general, and the broadcasting industry in particular, will benefit from the nationwide uniformity.

Equally important, but less easy to evaluate, will be the alleviation of the helter-skelter time zones that have driven travelers to distraction as they passed from one area to another, frantically setting and resetting their watches.

My own State of Minnesota perhaps epitomized the chaos that surrounded daylight saving time last year. The district I represent, Minneapolis, and most of Minnesota, went on fast time for about 3 months, from Memorial Day to Labor Day. But directly across the Mississippi River, in our sister city of St. Paul, daylight saving time started 2 weeks earlier and ended, along with the majority of States with daylight saving time laws, at the end of October. Several other Minnesota cities went along with St. Paul, with variations to suit the wishes of their local governments. As usual, several cities along the western border remained on central standard time in order to conform with North Dakota and South Dakota, which did not have daylight saving time. The city of Duluth, on the other hand, conformed with neighboring Wisconsin on the eastern border, and had fast time from late April through late October.

This hodgepodge may not have typified the situation in other States, but it certainly was no isolated exception. Some others, I am sure, had even more confusing difficulties.

By 1967, all this will be a thing of the past. States that vote to do so may remain on standard time, but those that do not will automatically go on daylight saving time from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in October.

This year, places that observed daylight saving time in 1965 will enjoy the benefits of uniform time from April 24 to October 30. Even those people who have opposed daylight saving time in the past will, I am sure, appreciate the countless advantages of the new uniformity.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee's Special Task Force on International Education, I have introduced a bill identical to H.R. 12451—the International Education Act of 1966. This bill is based upon President Johnson's message on international health and education, delivered to this Congress early in February.

I wholeheartedly concur with the President's suggestion that Congress add a world dimension to this Nation's outlook on education. To add this world dimension, the International Education Act of 1966 sets the following goals:

To strengthen the capacity of the United States for cooperation in international education, to stimulate exchange of students and teachers with other nations, to assist the progress of education in the world's developing nations, and to bring about a better spirit of understanding among all nations.

The act would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to American colleges and universities for the purpose of establishing and operating graduate centers for international study and research. It would authorize similar grants for undergraduate programs in the same areas.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the United States has long since cast off the concept of isolationism. In our role as a world leader, we have assumed new and vast responsibilities in widespread areas of the globe. The Federal Government, and private business concerns, have both been hampered by language barriers and inadequate knowledge of the many nations to which our international commitments have taken us.

An indication of our expanding world interests is shown in the growth of consulates and embassies abroad. Prior to World War II, the United States exchanged ambassadors with only 17 nations, and ministers with 43. Today, we have more than 100 ambassadorial posts.

The American people are joining in this expanding interest. During 1963-64, more than 18,000 students and over

4,000 teachers extended their education abroad. This is double the number of 10 years ago. The number of Americans traveling overseas, and the money they spend, also has doubled since the mid-1950s. In 1964, some 2.2 million Americans spent nearly \$3.5 billion overseas.

In 1954, some \$1.6 billion was spent by 1.1 million overseas travelers.

Congress made a significant advance in 1958, with the National Defense Education Act, which included provisions for establishing Language and Area Centers at colleges and universities. This program has helped immeasurably, but we still have a long way to go.

It is very clear that international understanding and cooperation is becoming more and more important. This can be accomplished largely through education, and that is what we hope to accomplish through the International Education Act of 1966. I urge my colleagues to give it their full support.

THE MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of us realize that every day President Johnson is subjected to tremendous pressures and problems, both domestic and foreign, that would break a lesser man. These range from the bloody conflict in Vietnam to checking the spiral of inflation here at home. Just how well President Johnson is handling these problems is clearly spelled out in an editorial entitled, "The Man in the White House" in the March 26 issue of the weekly review, America, published by Jesuits of the United States and Canada. In the midst of carping we sometimes lose sight of the big picture.

The editorial which reads as follows clearly shows how the President is facing and handling the world's most difficult problem:

THE MAN IN THE WHITE HOUSE

If the country ever doubted that the ship of state had a resolute and steady hand on the wheel, the events of the past fortnight ought to be reassuring. One after another, the problems and challenges found their way to that lonely desk in the White House, and one after another the President, bearing the heaviest load in the world, handled them with poise and confidence.

The policy on Vietnam, constantly under review, was courageously reaffirmed. If some of his fellow Americans, including some U.S. Senators, had already forgotten the terrible lesson of the 1930's—that aggression appeased leads only to disaster—he had not. This Nation had pledged that the people of South Vietnam would have a chance to freely decide their future. If the Communist aggressors in Hanoi, supported in their fraudulent war of liberation by Red China and the Soviet Union, imagined that we would weary of the brutal conflict and supinely withdraw, they were tragically wrong. The Communists could have an honorable peace any time they wanted it. All they had to do was end their

bloody aggression. Until they did, they would continue to feel the disciplined might of this Nation and its allies.

The Vietnamese war was challenge enough for any man, but the President had a major problem in the West also. To his desk came a letter from President de Gaulle telling him in substance that the sooner the United States removed its troops and installations from French soil—soil red with American blood—the better he would like it. Mr. Johnson met that exasperating démarche with precision and admirable patience. In a brief reply, he observed that since the French were really raising the larger question of the future of NATO, he would have no bilateral dickering with Paris. The 13 other nations that had a stake in the decision would have to be consulted also. The more specific problem of U.S. installations in France could be put off a while until the larger question was settled.

The President knew, of course, that he was powerless to prevent the expulsion of either NATO or the United States from France. What he sought to do in his reply, therefore, was to isolate President de Gaulle (without insulting or needlessly antagonizing him) and solidify our bonds with our remaining European allies. He appears to have done this.

Though pressing, foreign affairs were not the only worry. There was the problem of inflation at home. Business investment was headed for a big jump over last year. Scattered labor shortages appeared. In mid-February, the jobless rate tumbled to 3.7 percent, the lowest since 1954. For the second time in 3 months, banks raised the prime lending rate, and the Federal Reserve Board gave another twist to credit screws. Businessmen continued their vendetta against price restraints, and organized labor spurned the wage guideposts. Editorial warnings became almost hysterical.

The President refused to become panicky. If things started getting out of hand, he would seek heavier taxes. He was not convinced, however, that the inflationary threat was as immediate as many thought, since the evidence was by no means all on one side. And so he has stayed his hand for the time being, still hopeful that business and labor (along with the bankers) will rise superior to the law of supply and demand and help prolong the rich gains of the past 5 years.

It takes a man of steady nerves to run a risk like that. Carry on, Mr. President.

GREECE'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the 25th of March, marked the 145th anniversary of the independence of Greece from the domination of the Ottoman Empire. I know our colleagues join me in extending best wishes to the people of Greece and to their sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, relatives and friends, who have migrated to our shores, on this greatest of all holidays of the people of Greece. I am sure we are all aware of the Grecian contributions to art, literature, philosophy, science, and, indeed, to the concept of democracy which we all value so highly.

In the Fourth District of Florida—which I represent—we are most fortun-

nate in having a large group of individuals of Greek ancestry who are among the most outstanding citizens in the community. Many of these individuals are active members of the Order of Ahepa, Lodge No. 14, in Miami. For the past 43 years these dedicated people have contributed to the welfare and well-being of their fellow man both in the United States and in Greece.

The lodge numbers among its members bankers, restaurateurs, educators, attorneys, and others in business and professional life. These individuals have left their mark whenever and wherever trouble arises, whether it be a flood in Mississippi, an earthquake in Greece, or the delivery of Christmas baskets to the needy. They have assumed leadership responsibilities in carrying out untold numbers of civic and community betterment projects.

Among the outstanding projects for which these individuals are entitled to sole credit—or at least a large share of it—are the Papanicolaou Cancer Institute of Miami, collections of books for libraries in Greece, the raising of several million dollars during World War II through the sale of war bonds, assistance to the Dade County Blood Bank and, as mentioned above, the collection of food, clothing, and funds for victims of an earthquake in Greece and floods in Mississippi.

Leaders of the Greek-American community in Miami and Dade County include the current president and supreme secretary of Lodge 14, Gus Laris and Pete Kouchalakos. Mr. Kouchalakos has previously served as president and supreme president of the lodge. Still active in the organization's many activities are five other former presidents: Nick Handgis who was its first president, Judge Thomas Balikes, George Karnegis, Gregory Constantine, and John Manos.

QUOTA RESTRICTIONS ON HIDE EXPORTS NOT SUFFICIENTLY JUSTIFIED

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CULVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed by the Department of Commerce's action in placing quota restrictions on the export of American livestock hides. The Department has not, in my opinion, offered sufficient justification for this action which poses a serious threat to beef producers in Iowa and across the Nation, and I have therefore today joined the efforts of the Committee on Agriculture and a number of my colleagues in the House and Senate in urging the Secretary of Commerce to reverse the order.

It seems totally inconsistent to me that such restrictions should be placed on this commodity at the same time that the Department of Commerce is exerting every effort to stimulate foreign trade. One of the most serious economic prob-

lems we face at this time is the adverse balance of trade. Yet these quotas will reduce exports by 3 million hides and result in an estimated \$45-million increase in that adverse balance of payments.

Just last year the Department of Commerce opened an international trade office in Des Moines to increase Iowa interests in foreign markets. That interest has been stimulated and livestock hides have become a major source of Iowa exports. The quota restrictions will cost Iowa beef producers alone at least \$12 million a year in reduced live cattle prices.

The present prices of hides at 24-26 cents a pound are high only in comparison to depressed prices over the past few years, before foreign trade was stimulated. Sufficient evidence of the damaging effect of this foreign trade on the domestic supply has not been forthcoming. Much of the hide being shipped at this time is of lower quality than the high standards of our own markets demand, and there is some question that the hides which will remain in this country as a result of quota restrictions can actually be sold domestically. Further reducing the demand at home is the steadily increasing use of synthetic materials by manufacturers, particularly in the production of shoes.

The order placing quotas on exports of hides contradicts our long-standing commitment to free markets, further increases our already serious balance-of-payments problem, and suggests that we are working at cross purposes with our present efforts in the Kennedy round to remove barriers to world trade.

I have requested the Secretary of Commerce to give full consideration to the widespread impact of quota restrictions on the export of livestock hides, and urged him to take immediate action to reverse the order.

NEW HEADQUARTERS FOR THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, I was pleased and honored to participate in ceremonies marking the dedication in Chicago of the magnificent new headquarters building of the American Dental Association. The distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, delivered the keynote address, and additional remarks were made by a number of other notable leaders, including my colleague, JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island, who has made so many major contributions to the Nation's health, and the Most Reverend John P. Cody, Archbishop of Chicago.

It is a great source of pride to me that the American Dental Association's beautiful new structure is located in my dis-

tract and helps to form, together with a large medical and hospital complex and several leading professional associations, one of the world's most significant centers of health educational and professional activity.

As noted by Secretary Gardner in his address, this new building is a credit to the dental profession, to my own community, and to the entire country. The progressive attitude of American dentistry is well known; and this headquarters, permitting a marked expansion of the association's research and educational activities, is one more example of farsighted leadership. Particular tribute, I think, should be paid to those dental leaders who were especially involved in planning the new headquarters, including Dr. Maynard K. Hine, president of the association; Dr. William A. Garrett, its president-elect; Dr. Harold Hillenbrand, its secretary, and association past presidents Fritz A. Pierson, James P. Hollers, Gerald D. Timmons, and John R. Abel.

Because Secretary Gardner's remarks on this occasion were of such considerable interest, I ask unanimous consent for them to be placed in the RECORD at this point.

REMARKS BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AS DELIVERED AT THE DEDICATION OF THE AMERICAN DENTAL ASSOCIATION BUILDING, CHICAGO, ILL., FEBRUARY 27, 1966.

A dedication is a time when congratulations are in order, and I am happy to add mine to the many you have already received. This new building—the visible result of long months of planning and working—is a credit to the dental profession, to this community, and to the entire Nation.

I am impressed by the building itself, its 280,000 square feet of floorspace and its splendid equipment. But I am much more impressed by what the building stands for and how it will be used.

The dental profession has a proud record of public service. You have demonstrated an awareness of professional and social responsibility and a willingness to work for the public good. I regard this occasion as a rededication to those ideals. I see this building as a home base for research, for service, for stimulating new ideas, for standards of excellence in all of the fields related to dental health.

Because it will serve as the headquarters for so many dental groups, because it will contain laboratories for research, because of its location in this hub of professional and educational activity, this building will be a focal point for all the occupations concerned with dentistry and a center for cooperative endeavor in health.

We need these kinds of centers, these rallying points of innovation and interlocking activities. Cooperative enterprise is the keynote of our health effort today. The partnership extends through professional and voluntary groups, the university world, and individual practitioners and consumers. Government is also a partner, not as a meddler or intruder, but as a helpful ally and a source of support and stimulation.

Our efforts are interwoven in almost every aspect of health. Together we are involved in developing and maintaining well-trained manpower for the health professions. Together we are planning and building health facilities shaped to modern needs. Together we are experimenting with new methods of service and new patterns of organization designed to make better use of our existing resources.

But we continue to fall short of the need.

The revolutions—social, economic, scientific—which have so greatly enhanced and so greatly complicated our ability to provide health services require no cataloging here. You are as familiar with them as I. But I would emphasize their results: a vastly more sophisticated people, one taught, and rightly so, to seek the full benefits that progress has made possible; a people who live longer and are thus more vulnerable to disease and dependency in later life; a society in which the gap between what is possible for some and inaccessible to others has widened and deepened; a society in which our performance lags far behind our potential.

The challenges are not going unheeded. Spurred by President Johnson's vision of a Great Society, the Nation has responded with a burst of creative activity.

Part of the response has consisted of a wide-ranging series of legislative actions in human welfare. Last year the Congress generated a tidal wave of legislation. Enacted into law were 25 major pieces of legislation to improve the life of the American people. More than half of these measures involved health or health-related programs.

Some of the legislation represents a new approach to old problems, as in the regional programs for heart disease, cancer, and stroke.

Some of the legislation represents a determination to deal with problems we have never faced up to adequately before—such as the measures dealing with mental health and mental retardation.

And some of the legislation is directed against relatively new problems, such as air and water pollution.

But all of the legislation is a contemporary response to an ever-changing world. All of it demonstrates a concern for the individual and for the maintenance of his freedom and integrity.

There are several other common threads in the legislative package: the recognition of the interrelationship of our major social problems; the preoccupation with manpower to carry out the programs; and the strengthening of the Nation's social institutions.

But perhaps the most significant characteristic of the new legislation is its commitment to equality of opportunity. This applies to health and education programs as well as to civil rights.

We want every child, however poor, to have access to a good education. We want every older person, however destitute, to have access to good health care.

But the existence of a potential benefit isn't enough if it never gets into the hands of those who need it. This applies to health services which are available to people in the middle-class part of town, but not to those who live in the slums a few blocks or a few miles away. Services must be organized so that they reach everyone who can profit from them. Otherwise, equality of opportunity becomes an empty phrase.

Nor is equality possible as long as discrimination exists. There must be an end to discriminatory practices of any kind, not only against patients but within the health professions. And the pace of integration must be speeded up. If moral suasion does not do the job, it must be backed by legal action.

Considerable progress has been made toward integrating the dental profession. You have made it clear that you are not willing to tolerate even the vestiges of a practice which denies membership in a professional association solely on the basis of color. This expression of good intent must be followed by firm and swift action. In doing so, you will be affirming your belief in human dignity and conforming to the highest ideals of the dental profession.

Equal opportunity was one of the prominent themes of the White House Conference

on Health, held last November in Washington. Perhaps the most compelling statement of the problem was made by Dr. Alonzo Yerby, Commissioner of Hospitals of New York. He said: "Health care of the disadvantaged is piecemeal, often inadequate, underfinanced, poorly organized, and provided without compassion or concern for the dignity of the individual. It remains as a legacy of the poor law, little changed in concept or application, while discoveries in medicine and other health sciences have advanced with lightning speed."

Several of you here participated in the conference, which attracted more than 800 leaders from virtually every health discipline and interest. As you know, it was a free-wheeling session, designed to develop ideas for the future. No formal actions were taken. Yet I believe the following goal emerged clearly: comprehensive, continuous health services should be available to all, whenever and wherever those services are needed.

To reach this goal, the following needs were identified: the need for better, more systematic planning; the need for more manpower along the entire spectrum of health; the need for better organization and delivery of health services; the need for more services for disadvantaged groups in our society—the poor, the aged, members of minority groups.

We must now give special emphasis to these problems. I want to discuss briefly two points that are of special interest to me.

The first is planning, which I regard as an imperative for the future.

Most health services have developed in a chaotic fashion, unrelated to each other or to the reality of the need.

Some areas are rich in hospitals or clinics, but essential laboratory and supporting services may be nonexistent.

Little thought has been given to the home-bound or to the patient who needs to move freely or frequently from the hospital to the convalescent home to his own home.

Community programs are focused on disease categories instead of on people.

The result is a fragmentation of services, an inefficient use of resources and worst of all, inferior care for the individual.

Last year this Nation spent more than \$38 billion for health and medical care. An infinitesimal fraction of this amount went into planning. Perhaps we could get along with improvised services in the past. The stakes are too high today.

I believe, therefore, that steps should be taken to increase the planning capability of States, communities, regions, and institutions. State and local agencies thus would be able to meet their problems with a great deal more flexibility than is presently possible. They could work toward improved productivity, fuller use of facilities, and better use of technology. And this would mean, of course, more and better care for more people.

The second matter I wish to consider has to do with manpower. I am sure I don't have to remind you of the dimensions of the need. Shortages are chronic while the demand for services is soaring.

We are beginning to see some rays of light. Through the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, we are helping to train highly skilled professional people. And the Vocational Education Act of 1963 has greatly strengthened the training of vocational workers in health.

But we have barely begun to consider the so-called middle level health worker—the college-trained therapists, medical technologists, dental hygienists, and others. Yet their services are vital to the modern health team.

It has been estimated that we will need 1 million more health workers in this country by 1975. Most of this army will be made up

of the allied and supporting health occupations.

Physicians and dentists depend on these people almost every day. This dependence will increase in the future as health services become more complex.

In meeting the overwhelming demand of sheer numbers we cannot neglect quality of preparation. There is too much riding on the outcome—the lives and health of people—to settle for inferior or shoddy performance.

But training new health workers is only part of the answer. They must be used effectively and meaningfully. Their jobs must be made rewarding, not only financially but in terms of stature and respect. They must be given room to grow and develop. They must be a part of a flexible system which permits orderly advancement and encourages change.

For solutions to problems such as these, we must look to our schools and professional organizations. Society has always turned to professional agencies for leadership, guidance, and standard-setting. This is a time of cataclysmic change. You can guide that change in the direction of scientific and professional soundness.

We also have to increase our scientific knowledge. Research in dentistry, as you well know, offers seemingly limitless possibilities to prevent and control dental diseases. The American Dental Association has vigorously supported an expanded research effort.

The need is obvious. Dental decay is the most common physical defect found among school-age children. Americans are resigned to the fact that they will begin losing their teeth in middle age; yet the control of periodontal disease could halt this process. Mouth lesions are common, ranging from minor irritations to ulcerations that lead to cancer.

We are making headway against these problems. In fact, dental research has done a good deal of pioneering—in fluoridation, in the use of the electron microscope, in the development of germ-free animals. Dental scientists are exploring the association of bacterial infection with various dental diseases. And they are on the trail of preventive vaccines.

The research frontier is encouraging indeed. Far too many people, on the other hand, are not getting the dental care they need. Half of the children under age 15 in the United States have never been to a dentist. The ratio is much higher, of course, for children in rural or impoverished families.

It is against this backdrop of need that the American Dental Association has proposed a national dental care program for children. This proposal is in keeping with your constructive view of the role of a professional organization in modern society. This view is also reflected in your educational programs; in your innovations in continuing education for dentists; and in your leadership of dental prepayment plans.

These efforts augur well for your future. But remember that professions are subject to the same deadening forces that afflict all other human institutions—an attachment to time-honored ways, reverence for established procedures, a preoccupation with one's own vested interests, and an excessively narrow definition of what is relevant and important. In short, the future beckons, but you have to be equal to that future.

I hope that this building will be a source of growth and inspiration as you enter a new period in the profession of dentistry and in the services of your fellow man.

TRADING IN IRISH POTATO FUTURES ON COMMODITY EXCHANGES

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD an editorial which was published in the Portland Sunday Telegram on Sunday, March 13, 1966.

This editorial has reference to my bill, H.R. 6006, now before the Domestic Marketing Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee. My bill would prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges.

Futures trading is limited to potatoes grown in Maine. The following facts are clearly supported by evidence submitted to the Agriculture Subcommittee.

Prices for Maine potatoes have steadily deteriorated in relation to prices of potatoes from the areas not using futures trading.

The potato futures market has a history of price movements which in no way have reflected supply and demand factors.

Futures trading has inhibited orderly marketing and merchandising.

Futures trading has frequently resulted in the delivery of poor quality of Maine potatoes due to delay while a carload may be traded many times.

At least 90 percent of Maine's potato-growers and processors favor the elimination of futures trading on Maine potatoes. It is at their request that I submitted my bill.

The following Portland Sunday Telegram editorial briefly and clearly illustrates the opinion of most of the Maine press and, more importantly, the growers and processors directly affected.

ABOLISH SPECULATION

Maine potatoes get it in the neck when the speculators go wild on the commodity exchange. And, Congressman HATHAWAY, of Maine, rightly protests the damage that is done to the potato industry. It has long been evident that a relatively small group of speculators use the New York Mercantile Exchange to jockey the price—and since the trading is almost wholly in Maine potatoes, it is Maine that suffers.

The Congressman referred to the "frenzied" activity on the exchange a little over a week ago, when the number of contracts traded jumped nearly fourfold over the previous day and the price fluctuated widely. Such uneven activity is unhealthy for Maine potatoes, and it hardly reflects the actual supply-and-demand situation. The Maine potato needs price stability.

What is needed, of course, is passage of HATHAWAY's bill to abolish futures trading in Maine potatoes—a bill that Congressman McIntire sponsored before him. Congress still balks at the measure, but until positive action is taken to halt the speculation, Maine farmers are going to continue to be at the mercy of the speculators.

NEW SITES FOR THE AEC

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on March 22 when I rose to report on the status of the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator, I promised to continue to keep this House informed of all developments in this area.

Today I rise to introduce into the RECORD two documents that bear on the Atomic Energy Commission's considerations of a site for the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator. I ask unanimous consent that the documents I refer to be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The first document is a letter from Dr. E. R. Piore, chairman of the National Academy's Site Evaluation Committee, reporting on the Committee's considerations of existing Atomic Energy Commission sites as a possible location for this large accelerator. As pointed out in Dr. Piore's letter, only the Brookhaven National Laboratory among the AEC sites was found to possess what the National Academy considered desirable requisites. That letter was delivered to the Joint Committee on March 26.

Today the Joint Committee received an AEC announcement which states that it will select a site for the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator from among the six locations recommended last week by the National Academy of Sciences. The names of the sites and the summary of the Academy's report to the AEC were placed in the March 22 RECORD on pages 6545 and 6546.

For convenience I shall repeat the list of sites. They are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif. and South Barrington—or Weston—near Chicago, Ill.

Dr. Seaborg, Chairman of the AEC, has pointed out that "the Commission has reached the conclusion that the best site will be found among those recommended by the Academy."

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1966.

Dr. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GLENN: Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter from Dr. E. R. Piore, Chairman of the Academy's Site Evaluation Committee, concerning features of Atomic Energy Commission laboratories and facilities insofar as they relate to the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator laboratory.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK SEITZ,
President.

Enclosure.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1966.

Dr. FREDERICK SEITZ,
President, National Academy of Sciences,
National Research Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEITZ: The Atomic Energy Commission asked the site evaluation committee to consider existing AEC laboratories and facilities insofar as they relate to the proposed 200-Bev. accelerator laboratory.

The Brookhaven site is one of the sites recommended. Brookhaven is an AEC general-purpose laboratory with strong programs in low energy nuclear physics, solid state physics, medicine, biology, and chemistry as well as high energy physics. The highly competent accelerator design group already there could serve as a nucleus for the staff of the 200-Bev. facility. While the new accelerator is being built, experimental physicists would be able to use the 33-Bev. machine that is now operating. This would materially aid in the recruitment of staff since experimental physicists must continue their own research while participating in the planning of the new laboratory's facilities. The experience of operating a high energy facility with effective coupling to users is another valuable asset of Brookhaven.

Four other recommended sites can, to varying degrees, benefit from AEC facilities. The South Barrington (or Weston) site near Chicago, Ill., is close enough to Argonne National Laboratory so that beneficial interactions between the two laboratories could take place. Experimental physicists on the staff of the new accelerator laboratory would be able to do some research on the ZGS machine at Argonne during the long construction and checkout phases of the new project. This would be true also if the new laboratory were located at the Madison, Wis. site which is about 2½ hours from Argonne by car. The Sierra Foothills site, near Sacramento, Calif., is within about 2 hours' drive of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory. The high energy physicists and the facilities there could be useful to the new project.

Site proposals associated with other AEC facilities were received from Oak Ridge, Hanford, Idaho Falls, and Savannah River. The committee considered these in detail along with the other 81 proposals referred to them by the AEC. In evaluating the proposed sites the committee, after being assured that a given site had suitable physical properties, assigned paramount importance to factors which affect the recruiting of personnel for the laboratory and the participation of the Nation's high energy physicists. For reasons given in the committee report, the committee found some sites to be clearly better than others from the standpoint of staffing and participation of visiting scientists.

There are indications that the physical properties of the Oak Ridge site are unsuitable for the proposed facility. It would be difficult for users to get to this site.

The Idaho Falls, Hanford, and Savannah River sites either do not have the university strength nearby or do not possess the existing design group that is considered desirable. Moreover, they are remote from the standpoint of users. The advantages that these AEC installations might offer would be related to the utilization of already existing facilities to the extent that such facilities are in excess of present needs. The committee believes that the small economies which might be realized by using these facilities are far outweighed by the disadvantages.

Sincerely,

E. R. PORE,

Chairman, Site Evaluation Committee.

AEC TO SELECT 200-BEV. ACCELERATOR SITE FROM AMONG SIX LOCATIONS RECOMMENDED BY NAS

The Atomic Energy Commission said today it will select a site for the proposed 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator from among the six locations recommended last week by the National Academy of Sciences.

The sites are: Ann Arbor, Mich.; Brookhaven National Laboratory at Upton, Long Island, N.Y.; Chicago (South Barrington or Weston); Denver, Colo.; Madison, Wis.; and, Sierra Foothills, near Sacramento, Calif.

In a statement, Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, AEC Chairman, said:

"After a comprehensive review of the NAS report and the mass of data which was collected by the AEC, the Commission has reached the conclusion that the best site will be found among those recommended by the Academy.

"Therefore, we will proceed with whatever additional studies are necessary to enable us to make a final selection."

Initially, the AEC received 126 site proposals from 46 States. The Commission reduced the list to 85, and last September asked the NAS to evaluate the 85. On March 21, the Academy submitted its recommendations to the AEC.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED TO REMOVE BUDGET BUREAU LIMITATION ON SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE WATERSHED PLANNING AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced House Joint Resolution 994, which is aimed at removing a limitation on new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966 imposed by the Bureau of the Budget on the U.S. Soil Conservation Service.

It is my feeling that congressional action is needed now to insure the continued progress of the Soil Conservation Service watershed planning program, and also to preserve the intent of Congress with regard to fiscal year 1966 appropriations for watershed planning.

Last session, Congress appropriated \$5,721,000 to help finance the planning of watershed projects under the U.S. Soil Conservation Service program during fiscal year 1966. These funds, to be matched by about \$2.7 million from State and local sources, are needed to provide the technical assistance required in drafting plans for construction of watersheds at a future date.

In appropriating these funds, Congress said nothing about limiting the number of new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966. Instead, it was clearly the intent of Congress that Soil Conservation Service should spend these funds for the continuing progress of its watershed planning program.

Nevertheless, despite the lack of any authority from Congress, the Bureau of the Budget has imposed an arbitrary, hard-and-fast limitation on Soil Conservation Service, restricting the number of new watershed planning authorizations in fiscal year 1966 to no more than 100. This limitation appears in the fiscal year 1967 budget under the heading "1966 estimate." In fact, however, this estimate of 100 new planning authorizations is a strict limitation and Soil Conservation Service has been notified of this.

If the planning limitation for fiscal year 1966 is not removed, Soil Conservation Service will be hamstrung in pro-

viding planning assistance for worthwhile new watershed projects. According to its latest count, Soil Conservation Service has approved 90 requests for planning authorization during fiscal year 1966. Thus, if the Budget Bureau limitation remains, only 10 more new watershed projects will get planning authorization between now and June 30. Without the Budget Bureau limitation, Soil Conservation Service could approve as many as 30 new planning authorizations before the end of fiscal year 1966.

In short, the Budget Bureau limitation threatens to keep about 20 local watershed projects from receiving planning authorization this fiscal year. If these projects do not obtain planning assistance, some of them probably will never become a reality. This would be grossly unfair to the local people who have spent, on the average, about 2 or 3 years of preliminary planning for their watershed projects.

Moreover, the Budget Bureau also has imposed even more severe project limitations on the Soil Conservation Service watershed program for fiscal year 1967. These limitations, which also appear in the new budget as estimates, would restrict Soil Conservation Service to providing only 50 new planning authorizations and approving construction for only 35 new watersheds during fiscal year 1967. If these limitations are not lifted, the scope of the Soil Conservation Service watershed program would be virtually cut in half.

The fiscal year 1967 limitations can be removed by a statement of congressional intent accompanying new Soil Conservation Service appropriations, and I am hopeful that this will be done.

The most pressing problem, however, is the Budget Bureau limitation on new watershed planning authorizations for fiscal year 1966, and I feel that Congress should act as quickly as possible to remove this limitation.

The limitation can be lifted by enactment of House Joint Resolution 994, which makes clear that it is the intent of Congress that no project limitation shall be imposed on watershed planning authorizations during the current fiscal year.

The underlying purpose of House Joint Resolution 994 is to preserve a valuable and time-proven conservation program, and I urge my fellow Members to aid in this effort by lending their support to the resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 994 follows:

H.J. RES. 994

Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the intent of the Congress that the appropriations, in Public Law 89-316, of \$5,721,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for small watershed investigations and planning (in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act) shall be expended as needed for the purposes for which the appropriation was made, and that it is the intent of the Congress that, to the extent consistent with the amount of such appropriation and with amounts available from

previous fiscal years, no limitation shall be imposed on the number of watershed planning authorizations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966.

HIGHWAY SAFETY AND AUTOMOTIVE CRASH INJURY RESEARCH

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, two significant news releases have come to my attention which point up widespread interest in and concern for traffic safety.

The first expresses the attitude of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety which was established in 1959 by 3 insurance trade associations representing more than 500 auto insurance companies. The institute has carried on commendable activities to advance traffic safety and this group clearly favors a much stronger commitment of the Federal Government to first, step up spot improvement to eliminate accident-prone locations on our highways, second, increase grants-in-aid for State and local safety programs and, third, increase coordinated research as to accident causation.

The second release reports on splendid cooperation with the automotive crash injury research project of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory by the Georgia State patrol, the Georgia Hospital Association, and the Medical Association of Georgia.

Since these releases were issued just a few days ago, three fine young Georgia Tech students were killed in a Florida crash which claimed seven lives.

We must give top priority to legislation aimed at mobilizing the capabilities of the Federal Government in attacking public enemy No. 1—the traffic accident, the greatest killer of our youth.

The releases follow:

[A news release from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety]

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Russell I. Brown, president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, today said the insurance business welcomes and encourages Presidential and congressional attention to the traffic problem, as well as the support of any organization or agency wishing to prevent motor vehicle deaths, injuries, and property losses.

"The traffic accident problem is so extensive and so complex that the resources of the Federal Government are needed to supply the financial incentives required to stimulate and enable the State and local authorities to deal with it effectively," the IIHS head stated.

He said many States and many municipalities have done much for traffic safety, but no single State is employing all of the known and proved management methods to reduce traffic accidents. He said the States have as a guide, the highway safety action program that is the product of 50 years of study and experience. It embraces the major areas of laws and ordinances, traffic accident records, education, engineering, motor vehicle administration, police traffic supervision, traffic courts, public information, organized citizen support, and traffic safety research.

With reference to the Federal Government's role in traffic safety, Mr. Brown said his organization recommends the encouragement of State and local activities in the following ways:

"The Insurance Institute has a high regard for the Bureau of Public Roads' spot improvement program aimed at eliminating highway hazards at locations with high-accident rates. We urge that the States step up their participation in this program.

"The IIHS believes that the principle of dollar matching should be extended to State and local traffic safety programs, such as Federal aid to States for driver education.

"Research, especially relating to accident causes, could be stimulated by assigning to one central agency the responsibility for coordinating the Federal Government's diverse research in traffic safety fields. A comprehensive study of all traffic research should be made to determine what has been done, what is being done, what needs to be done—and what the priorities are."

Mr. Brown said the dissemination of such information would stimulate private agencies and institutions to make their research efforts more productive.

The IIHS president offered a suggestion for amplification of Federal traffic safety assistance efforts. He said there is a great need to establish a channel through which professional safety organizations can coordinate their activities with those of the Federal Government. The collective know-how of these organizations that represent the private sector have been and will continue to be of great help in expediting State programs, encouraged by Federal financing. Mr. Brown said such organizations could serve as an extension arm of the program proposed by President Johnson.

"The automobile insurance business believes that traffic accidents not only can, but, if these things are done, will be reduced," Mr. Brown said. "Although the responsibility rests upon the States, counties, and municipalities, most of these lack the finances necessary to control accidents effectively. The insurance business believes that strong, vigorous, productive traffic accident prevention programs will be developed in the State and local jurisdictions when they get the necessary financing, technical counsel, and legal authority. Some of this assistance must come from the Federal Government, because it is not available from any other source."

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety was established in 1959 by 3 insurance trade associations representing more than 500 auto insurance companies.

[A Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., news release]

(NOTE.—Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., is an independent research laboratory devoted to applied research in aeronautics, astronautics, electronics, and associated sciences. Owned by Cornell University, it is a separate, nonprofit organization operating in Buffalo, N.Y.)

BUFFALO, N.Y.—Expressions of appreciation will be extended to public officials of the State of Georgia by representatives of the Automotive Crash Injury Research project (ACIR) of Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory at a luncheon on March 23.

The independent research group, which studies auto accidents to improve safety, will honor several Georgia State organizations whose members gathered data on auto accident injuries for use by ACIR. The organizations are the Georgia State Patrol, the Georgia Department of Public Health, the Georgia Hospital Association, and the Medical Association of Georgia.

Representatives of these groups have been invited to the luncheon at the Georgia Department of Health to receive the personal thanks of ACIR officials.

Georgia recently completed its second 2-year participation in the ACIR programs which currently has counterparts in 14 other States. Some 30 States have cooperated in an ACIR project, and Georgia has been a key participant in gathering vital injury data for two separate studies. The first data collection effort by the State was during the 1957-59 period. A total of 2,600 injury-producing accidents were investigated and reported for the ACIR by the cooperating State groups.

In announcing the luncheon, Dr. B. J. Campbell, head of ACIR's accident branch, voiced high praise for the voluntary efforts of the State patrolmen, physicians, public health workers and hospital staff members. "They have contributed greatly," Dr. Campbell said, "to research which has been influential in establishing new safety concepts."

Dr. Campbell noted that, "today, as never before, there is a great deal of discussion about auto safety. Much of this new interest centers on ways of making vehicles safer, which should be a source of great satisfaction to Georgia officials who, with ACIR, have labored in the field for many years."

Referring to Georgia, Dr. Campbell said that the State, "illustrated its farsightedness by entering into an auto accident study back in 1957, long before others recognized the need for such activity. As one of the forerunners in auto safety research activities, the State of Georgia can be very proud of its role because its officials saw a need before many others did and then acted to meet that need."

Plans for increased activity by ACIR were also indicated by Dr. Campbell. "Consistent with the times," he said, "our program is expanding. We are moving into areas of intensive study of accident causation and hoping to expand greatly our coverage of auto accident factors."

ACIR entered the auto safety research field in 1953. For a number of years it was associated with the Cornell University Medical College. In 1962 it joined the Transportation Research Department at Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, a nonprofit, independent research organization owned by Cornell University. ACIR is sponsored by the U.S. Public Health Service and the Automobile Manufacturers Association.

ACIR's research procedure is to accumulate large samples of accident data through the cooperation of various State agencies. The data is then processed and analyzed by ACIR at its headquarters in Buffalo. Reports are published on the findings and disseminated to Government agencies, industry, universities, research organizations and the national press.

Throughout its first 13 years, ACIR was primarily concerned with the so-called "second-impact problem." It studied the sources of injury during an auto accident such as ejection, and striking the windshield, dash and steering wheel. ACIR has also evaluated safety door latches, seat belts, dash padding and window glass. Its findings have been used extensively by other researchers, Government agencies and industry.

Pioneering in auto safety research, ACIR with the cooperation of Georgia and other States, spent much effort in developing statistical methods to study accident injuries and in identifying areas in need of immediate investigation. According to ACIR, the accident cases which Georgia has contributed, along with data from other States, have aided in the production of over 40 technical reports on auto safety through the years.

In all reports or discussions of its work ACIR has emphasized that its program could not have existed without the dedication of thousands of volunteers in police and medical groups throughout the country.

PASSENGER RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST, OR, ARE THE PEOPLE BEING RAILROADED BY THE RAILROADS?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of passenger railroad transportation in the Southwest is one of the most serious regional problems in this area. The railroad industry should be as concerned with this problem as the passenger public. One would think that this industry which, to a large extent, is a creature of public subsidies, would acknowledge the problem, recognize the public interest in passenger transportation, and face up to its responsibilities. Unfortunately, there are persons within the industry too narrowminded to see the broad issues. To these people, passengers are a nuisance because they require some care and conveniences.

It is much easier and cheaper to haul freight. And so in many places in the Southwest and throughout the country, the people have been literally dumped off of the trains so that they may be used exclusively for freight. The railroad system has become a Frankenstein monster to a public that has given away its land for the railroads to build on and its money to support its operations.

To justify its "public be damned" attitude and its harmful actions, some railroad officials have concocted the story that the people do not want to ride trains. In the vernacular of the railroad officials, there has been a declining demand for passenger train services. This excuse for the deterioration in services was branded a fabrication and a fraud by a recent decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This decision was rendered on the application of the Southern Pacific Co. to discontinue two passenger trains between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz. Upon the filing of the proposed action by Southern Pacific with ICC, an investigation was instituted. The results of the investigation and the findings of the ICC are shocking and scandalous. They suggest that the Government's policy toward the railroads and the traveling public needs to be reexamined. For the conclusions from this case and others like it are that not only have passengers been badly neglected but their rights have been violated as well.

In the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, Southern Pacific claimed that passenger demand for train services had declined and that a loss of revenues had resulted. But an analysis of the figures presented to ICC showed that the company had misrepresented its case. The ICC concluded that the net loss claimed was greatly overstated, and suggested that an accurate and fair evaluation of the figures might even reveal a profit for the

two passenger trains involved. In the words of the ICC:

It can reasonably be concluded that the net loss claimed by the carrier is greatly overstated, if indeed a deficit exists.

At the close of my remarks, I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the ICC opinion in this case. The opinion should be read in its entirety to get the full impact of what Southern Pacific did and attempted to do to the passengers who simply wanted rail transportation on a common carrier between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz. For the record shows that in this case the railroad company while complaining of a declining demand for passenger service was actually doing everything in its power to destroy that demand.

The overt acts committed by the railroad company against the passengers make up an incredible list and constitute, in my opinion, an indictment and a guilty verdict against the Southern Pacific for offenses against the public. Here are some of the ICC's findings:

First, that the company eliminated the two trains from its published train schedules.

Second, that the company's agents deny the existence of the trains to the inquiring public.

Third, that the Los Angeles ticket office is closed 2½ hours before one of the train's departure time.

Fourth, that only one passenger coach is provided for each train.

Fifth, that when the coach is shopped—sent to the shop for repairs—passengers at Phoenix and Los Angeles are denied transportation and their fares are refunded.

Sixth, that if the coach is put out of service between Phoenix and Los Angeles, a caboose is substituted for the passengers to ride in.

Seventh, that all employees of the company and other pass-carrying passengers are prohibited from using the two trains.

Eighth, that the company's witnesses testified that if the ICC required the continuance of passenger service on the two trains, then the company's legal department would be consulted to ascertain what steps might be taken to discourage passenger use of the trains.

Mr. Speaker, this is a record of both indifference and active animosity by the Southern Pacific Co. against the passenger public. Attempts on its part to claim a decline in demand for passenger services, in the face of this record, is contemptuous of the public, the ICC, and the Congress. It is no wonder that the ICC found in this case that Southern Pacific had discouraged use of the trains by passengers and, in fact, intensified its efforts in that direction even while the proceeding was pending. The ICC opinion states:

The evidence in this proceeding makes it abundantly clear that Southern Pacific has continued to discourage use of these trains by passengers. In fact, it has intensified its efforts in that direction. Whenever it appears, as it does in this proceeding, that a carrier has deliberately downgraded its service in order to justify discontinuance of a train irrespective of the actual or potential

need of the traveling public, the Commission will order the service to be continued.

The ICC did indeed quite properly order the passenger service to continue. But there is an unhappy sequel to this story.

Under the Federal law, the ICC has jurisdiction in discontinuance cases only if the railroad company files a notice of discontinuance with the Commission. I shall have more to say about this provision of the law later. The important point for now is that even where the ICC does obtain jurisdiction over a discontinuance case, its authority and powers in the case are severely limited.

The Commission is authorized, for example, only to require continuance or restoration of service for a maximum period of 1 year. At the end of that 1 year period, the Commission has no further authority in the case unless the company files another notice of discontinuance with it. If the company decides not to file a notice with the Commission, and decides to eliminate the service after the 1 year period, it may do so. In that case the ICC is powerless to act. In other words, the Commission loses its jurisdiction over the case at the end of the 1-year period.

Thus, in the present case, after the 1-year period expires next January, it will be possible for Southern Pacific to discontinue the passenger service without notifying the Commission. In that event, the Commission will have absolutely no authority to act, despite the investigation and the findings it has made in the case.

What will Southern Pacific do next January with respect to the two passenger trains that operate between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz.? If anyone has any doubt that Southern Pacific will leap at the first opportunity to willfully and arbitrarily discontinue the passenger service, let me cite as another example of the corporate excesses and hostility against the passenger public by this railroad an even more recent case.

For many years, Texans and others have traveled on Southern Pacific's "Sunset Limited." This line has operated daily between New Orleans, La., and Los Angeles, Calif., stopping in several Texas cities along the way. It is a lengthy overnight trip from New Orleans or any of the Texas cities to Los Angeles. Pullman and dining facilities are therefore essential and necessary for the passengers, many of whom are elderly or sick and for a variety of reasons will not or cannot use any other mode of transportation. Yet, in January Southern Pacific discontinued diner service on these trains, and in February it discontinued pullman service.

Here, again, is an instance of a direct and deliberate move by the Southern Pacific to downgrade and discourage travel by rail. Now any sleeping by passengers making the long journey between New Orleans and Los Angeles will have to be done sitting up. Imagine a family with small children, or an aged couple, or a person who cannot fly or travel any other way because of a heart condition attempting this. In addition, travelers who would like to eat a decent

meal at a table will now be forced to carry sandwiches or buy potato chips and candy out of vending machines which Southern Pacific has generously provided in place of the dining cars it has eliminated.

No doubt, Southern Pacific will try to show at a later time that there has been a decline in passenger travel on these trains, that they are not profitable, and that they will therefore have to be eliminated entirely. In short, it will try to do exactly what it tried to do in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case. I have no doubt whatsoever that an investigation in this case at the present time would turn up the same shocking facts, the same unbridled attack against the passenger public by Southern Pacific as was turned up and proven in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case.

An investigation would show, for example, that at the present time the trains are usually filled and that on a recent train it was necessary to put another car on to accommodate all those who wanted to travel on it. An investigation would show that prior to their discontinuance the pullmans were usually filled. An investigation would show that it has not been unusual for many trains to be short of seats. Further, an investigation would show a tremendous demand for passenger railroad service. This is all the more striking in view of the railroad's general failure to modernize and properly equip passenger trains, and to otherwise discourage travel.

A recent newspaper story from the El Paso Times, February 26, 1966, documents these facts. This story quotes one railroad official as saying that the recent action is only the first step toward the complete discontinuance of passenger service on these trains. To quote from the newspaper story:

One crewmember, with more than 25 years service with Southern Pacific called the deletion of sleeping cars a "deliberate attempt to drive off customers and eventually eliminate all passenger service."

The official, who would not give his name for fear of company reprisals, said: "This is the beginning of the end for the Sunset Limited. In January the company removed diners from the train and replaced them with vending machine cars.

"This caused a lot of unhappy passengers. Now it's pullmans they are removing to further discourage business. Next they will cut down the number of chair cars and at the same time go running to the Government wanting to drop the whole train altogether because they are losing money hand over fist."

This railroad official went on to say that the pullmans on this train are usually filled and that on the last one the company had to add another one on.

At the close of my remarks I have unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the entire newspaper story. I will insert an editorial on the subject that appeared in the El Paso Times, February 27, 1966. In this editorial the anti-passenger policy of the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific Railroad is questioned. The editorial asks:

I wonder what would happen if the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific put on real first-class trains again, offering the best of service on pullmans and diners.

The editorial then cited this poignant example of the hardships imposed by the railroads' antipassenger policy:

One El Paso woman telephoned me and asked what she was going to do. She formerly lived in Georgia and likes to return to her home frequently. She said she had always taken the Sunset Limited to New Orleans.

I suggested she would have to fly. "I can't," she said, "I'm a heart patient." I suppose she will have to sit up all night or stay in El Paso.

One of the ironies of the situation is that the Federal Government is almost powerless to act. Earlier I referred to the section of the law that authorized the ICC to review a discontinuance of passenger service. This section of the law, 49 U.S.C. 13a, enacted by Congress in 1958, provides that a railroad company may but is not required to file a notice of discontinuance with the Commission.

As I have explained, this means that it is purely discretionary on the part of the railroad company whether or not to invoke the authority of the ICC. If the company does not file a notice of discontinuance with the ICC it may go through with the action without accounting to any Federal agency.

If the ICC cannot review the action of the railroad unless a notice of discontinuance is filed with it, the question may then be asked, why would the company ever file a notice? The answer seems to be that this provision was added to the law in 1958 for the purpose of giving the railroads an extra forum to shop around in for the relief they seek. Under the laws of some States a railroad must obtain approval from the State agency in order to discontinue passenger services.

However, under section 13a, if the railroad files its notice with the ICC, then the State law need not be complied with. Thus, the railroads have a choice of forums, the ICC or the State agency, if one exists, in each case.

It should come as no surprise then, after reading the ICC opinion in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, that Southern Pacific has not filed a notice of discontinuance with the ICC in the New Orleans-Los Angeles case. So there will be no investigation of Southern Pacific's antipassenger policies in this case—at least not by the ICC. The ICC has no jurisdiction here.

And this situation, the lack of jurisdiction by the ICC in the New Orleans-Los Angeles case, raises an issue of perhaps greater importance than any yet discussed. That issue is this, suppose one day every railroad company in the Nation decided to stop running passenger cars. What could the Federal Government do about it? The answer is, nothing.

The Federal Government and the ICC specifically, would be powerless to act. A group of railroad officials sitting in a smoke-filled private railroad car could simply agree to stop carrying all those pesky people and concentrate on freight. And there would not be a thing we could do about it on the Federal level.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD copies of the ICC

opinion in the Tucumcari-Phoenix case, and the news story and editorial from the El Paso Times, referred to in my speech:

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, Feb. 26, 1966]

SUNSET LIMITED—NO SLEEP IN PULLMAN FOR PASSENGERS
(By Jeff Berry)

Sunset will not mean much to passengers on the once crack Southern Pacific's Sunset Limited.

Any sleeping they do from now on during their long journey between Los Angeles and New Orleans will be done sitting up.

Friday afternoon the historic train pulled into Union Depot with two pullman cars. Both left an hour later as the train pulled out for New Orleans, with two pullman cars. Both left El Paso on the Sunset Limited.

For Pullman Porter Thomas Hill who was on the last train, it will mean he won't be coming through El Paso any more, after 20 years on the route.

Hill, who has 31 years with the Pullman Co. said "we used to be an all-pullman train. And even in 1950 we ran about 5 pullman cars for each train. I'm very sorry to see the cars coming off the runs," he said.

He estimated for each pullman car withdrawn from service, about 15 railroad employees would lose jobs.

Passengers appeared surprised and disappointed the service was being discontinued, and members of the train crew were bitter about the change.

ALWAYS BY TRAIN

"We've always gone by train when we take long trips," said passenger Dr. Paul San Felippo of Chicago. He and his wife had been visiting in Tucson and were returning home aboard the Golden State Limited, which is combined as part of the Sunset Limited from Los Angeles to El Paso. In El Paso, the trains divided, one going to Chicago and the other going southeast to New Orleans.

"I'd never ride a train without pullman service for any distance," Dr. San Felippo said. "Why it's 59 hours to Chicago from Los Angeles and almost as long a time to New Orleans."

The Golden State train will retain its pullman cars for the time being, railroad officials indicated last month.

Another passenger, Mrs. Jane Hubbard, said, "I will just ride the Santa Fe if they take pullman service away. I have to ride a train because I am scared to fly."

One crewmember, with more than 25 years service with Southern Pacific, called the deletion of sleeping cars a "deliberate attempt to drive off customers and eventually eliminate all passenger service."

The official, who would not give his name for fear of company reprisals, said "This is the beginning of the end for the Sunset Limited. In January the company removed diners from the train and replaced them with vending machine cars."

UNHAPPY

"This caused a lot of unhappy passengers. Now it's pullmans they are removing to further discourage business. Next they will cut down on the number of chair cars and at the same time go running to the Government wanting to drop the whole train altogether because they are losing money hand over fist."

He said that the pullmans on the Sunset Limited were usually filled and that on the last train it had been necessary to put another one on. Friday's last train had 32 pullman passengers.

Explaining further, the crew member said "the tragic feature of all this is that there is a certain class of people who are forced to ride pullman cars. These are mostly the sick

and elderly and now the service has been discontinued."

"The only thing which can be done to change this situation is to rally public opinion—and possibly bend the ear of a few Federal Judges," he said.

Southern Pacific officials stated last month they were forced to curtail pullman service on the Sunset Limited as an economy measure. This is also the reason they gave for deleting dining cars.

The Interstate Commerce Commission recently ordered Southern Pacific to continue operating for at least another year its trains 39 and 40, between Phoenix, Ariz., and Tucumcari, N. Mex.

ACCUSE RAILROAD

The Commission accused the railroad of making "drastic attempts" to discourage patronage of the two trains, and deliberately downgrading service to justify discontinuance of the trains.

John Conner, an employee of the Labor Department in Washington, D.C., who was aboard the Sunset Limited, said he had been refused roomette accommodations in Phoenix and had to settle for a pullman bedroom. The next day he had been told a mistake had been made and that no room existed on the train.

"I threatened to complain to the Government then," he said, "and suddenly they found space for me." Conner said he has written Gov. Samuel Goddard of Arizona complaining of the shabby treatment of passengers by the railroad.

"I believe the railroad tried deliberately to keep me off the train, even though they had 16 empty spaces on their pullmans," he said.

Before pulling out of union depot at 6 p.m. Friday, passengers queued up to board the "money losing" Sunset Limited. It was full. Several would-be passengers of the Golden State were turned away for lack of seats.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times, Feb. 27, 1966]

EVERYDAY EVENTS

(By W. J. Hooten)

Judging by telephone calls I have received, the Southern Pacific and the Texas & Pacific are in poor favor with the general public for taking pullmans off their trains running in and out of El Paso and downgrading those trains in other ways.

I read with a great deal of interest the news item telling of refusal by the Interstate Commerce Commission to permit the Southern Pacific to take off trains Nos. 39 and 40. Those trains, formerly known as the Imperial, were first-class trains at one time. I have ridden them.

The ICC accused the Southern Pacific of deliberately downgrading those passenger trains in an effort to make it appear the public did not want them.

I wonder what would happen if the Southern Pacific and the T. & P. would put on real first-class trains again, offering the best of service on pullmans and diners.

I have no way of knowing, of course. But I do know that many people simply will not fly and they want to travel by pullman.

One El Paso woman telephoned me and asked what she was going to do. She formerly lived in Georgia and likes to return to her former home frequently. She said she had always taken the Sunset Limited to New Orleans.

I suggested she would have to fly.

"I can't," she said. "I'm a heart patient."

I suppose she will have to sit up all night or stay in El Paso.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times]

ABOUT RAILROAD SERVICE

News that the Southern Pacific will take pullmans off the Sunset Limited brought

forth this memorandum, to which I subscribe and which I think is well worth reading:

At the time the Southern Pacific consolidated the El Paso & Southwestern Railroad with the Southern Pacific, it was represented by the Southern Pacific at a dinner held in the Paso del Norte Hotel that the consolidation would not reduce the number of railroad employees which Southern Pacific and the Southwestern had in El Paso. Mr. Scott, general manager of the Southern Pacific at Houston, made this representation. Shortly after the consolidation was made the Southern Pacific removed most of the Southwestern employees from El Paso to San Francisco and very few employees were left in the old Southern Pacific Building on North Stanton Street. Thereafter, many of the mechanical employees were moved away from El Paso and finally division headquarters were moved from El Paso to Tucson.

According to the press, the Southern Pacific plans to remove all pullmans from the Sunset Limited between Los Angeles and New Orleans on February 24. The Texas & Pacific Railroad has already removed all pullmans from its trains. As a result, it is impossible for anyone going east to Dallas or southeast to Houston or New Orleans to travel by pullman. They are required to sit up all night in day coaches if they use the train.

It is said by the railroads that they cannot afford to operate passenger trains and particularly trains with Pullmans. It is strange that the railroads like the Southern Pacific cannot maintain a train with a Pullman to the east or that a railroad like the Texas & Pacific cannot maintain a train with a Pullman to the east. These railroads are land-grant railroads. They received tremendous grants of land and it seems like they should be required to furnish passenger service and not only freight service on their lines.

It is interesting to note that the Santa Fe Railroad, the Union Pacific Railroad, the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Chicago & Burlington Railroad, and several other railroads find it profitable to operate passenger trains.

It is unfair to the people on the Southern Pacific and on the Texas & Pacific not to furnish first-class passenger service. It seems that we have two classes of people. Those who live in the Southwest are second class and cannot ride the Pullmans. Those who live in the Middle West and East are first class and can ride Pullmans.

The railroads must know that their best contact with the public for getting good will is through first-class passenger service. No effort has been made by the Southern Pacific to keep their trains in first-class shape and no effort has been made by the Texas & Pacific to keep their trains in first-class shape.

After the Southern Pacific absorbed the El Paso & Southwestern it tore up the railroad track of the Southwestern from El Paso to Douglas and left the people in that area without railroad transportation. It has been a continuous process of destruction rather than construction.

It certainly is not good for El Paso not to be able to reach El Paso on a Pullman and to have to sit up all night or ride a bus or a plane. Such action on the part of the railroads is directly hostile to the best interests of El Paso and no steps should be left untaken to prevent it.

[Interstate Commerce Commission, Finance docket No. 23800, January 28, 1966]

SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO. DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAINS NOS. 39 AND 40 BETWEEN TUCUMCARI, N. MEX., AND PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Decided January 24, 1966.

Upon investigation, found that the continued operation by the Southern Pacific Co. of its passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., is

required by public convenience and necessity and will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce. Such service ordered continued for a period of one year from the date hereof. Investigation discontinued.

John MacDonald Smith for Southern Pacific Co.

E. T. "Eddie" Williams, Jr. and Howard Peterson for Arizona State Corporation Commission, protestant.

Floyd Cross and L. C. Cybert for State Corporation Commission of New Mexico, protestant.

J. Abbey for city of Tucson, Ariz., protestant.

H. N. Smith, Herbert O. Paul, Bill R. Cowan, E. F. Jergins, James J. Corcoran, Charles R. McGown, J. F. Crawford, and W. W. Witt for protesting railway labor organizations.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION

Division 3, Commissioners Tuggle, Webb, and Tierney.

Webb, Commissioner:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the Southern Pacific Co., a common carrier by railroad subject to the provisions of part I of the act, filed a notice and supporting statement on September 2, 1965, in which it proposed to discontinue, effective October 6, 1965, the operation of its passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40, between Tucumcari, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., a distance of 764 miles. Copies of the notice were served and posted in the manner prescribed by section 13a(1) of the act and the regulations of this Commission.

Upon receipt of petitions and letters of protest filed on behalf of individuals, business establishments, community organizations, labor associations, and by State regulatory commissions, we instituted, by order dated September 23, 1965, an investigation of the proposed discontinuance of service and ordered that the service be continued for a period not exceeding 4 months beyond the effective date of the notice.

Because of the statutory limitation upon the time available for investigation and decision, the order provided for the omission of an examiner's report and recommended order, and for certification of the record to us for initial decision.

Hearings were held at Phoenix, Ariz. Briefs have been filed by Southern Pacific and by the State of Arizona.

Trains 39 and 40 are part of a through operation between Kansas City, Mo. and Los Angeles, Calif., with the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co. (Rock Island) operating them on a daily schedule in each direction between Kansas City and Tucumcari, and Southern Pacific operating them between Tucumcari and Los Angeles. Phoenix is 1 of 10 intermediate stops eastbound and 1 of 11 intermediate stops westbound.¹

These trains are consolidated with Rock Island's trains Nos. 21 and 22 operating between Tucumcari and Memphis, Tenn. Although trains 39 and 40 are not listed in the published passenger train schedules of the Southern Pacific, the record shows that train No. 39 leaves Tucumcari at 10:15 p.m. and arrives at Phoenix at 2:25 p.m. Train No. 40 leaves Phoenix at 11:40 a.m. and arrives at Tucumcari at 5:10 a.m. The schedules of the trains, the names of the points served, and their respective populations are set forth in appendix A attached.

¹ The issues in this proceeding are related to those considered in Finance Docket No. 23272, Southern Pacific Co. Discontinuance of passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Los Angeles, Calif. and Phoenix, Ariz., decided Jan. 26, 1965, and in Finance Docket No. 23625, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co. Discontinuance of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Kansas City, Mo., and Tucumcari, N. Mex., decided Sept. 27, 1965.

The equipment of train No. 39 now consists of two diesel units, seven head-end cars and one passenger coach, between Tucumcari and Phoenix. One of the head-end cars is a railway post office (RPO) car. In addition, one mail storage car operates from Tucson, Ariz. to Phoenix; one express car operates between Tucumcari and El Paso; and one storage mail car operates between Tucumcari and Tucson. Train No. 40 consists of three diesel units, five head-end cars, including an RPO car, and one passenger coach between Phoenix and Tucumcari. In addition, one mail storage car operates from Phoenix to El Paso; and one baggage-mail car operates between Phoenix and Tucson. The crew consists of an engineer, fireman, conductor, brakeman, flagman, and one express-messenger. The carrier pays half of the wages of the express-messenger.

The carrier's general balance sheet as of June 30, 1965, shows total assets of \$2.38 billion, including current assets of \$239 million, special funds of \$5.1 million, investments, less reserve for adjustment of investment in securities, \$214.7 million, total properties, less recorded depreciation and amortization, \$1.9 billion, and total other assets and deferred charges \$17.3 million. Liabilities were: Current liabilities \$146 million, long-term debt \$768.9 million, including \$35.9 million due within 1 year; reserves \$36.6 million; other liabilities and deferred credits \$21 million; capital stock \$424.9 million; and retained income unappropriated \$987 million.

Southern Pacific's income statements for the years 1963, 1964, and the first 6 months of 1965, show, respectively, railway operating revenues of \$704,488,237, \$728,577,557, and \$374,903,392 net railway operating income \$71,283,705, \$60,304,529, and \$36,350,794; and net income, after fixed charges and other deductions \$67,052,889, \$63,898,391, and \$36,990,214. Between 1963 and 1964 total passenger revenues declined approximately \$3.5 million and freight revenues increased \$27.5 million. The carrier's ratio of total operating expenses to total operating revenues for 1963 was 78.53 and for 1964, 79.92. Passenger operating ratios for 1963 and 1964 were 123.35 and 122.28, respectively.

For the years 1963, 1964, and the first half of 1965, train No. 39 carried an average of 44.8, 33.7, and 16.3 revenue passengers per trip, respectively. During those same periods, train No. 40 carried an average of 44.8, 32.0, and 14.7 revenue passengers per trip. Based on these averages, train No. 39 transported approximately 16,352, 12,334, and 2,934 revenue passengers during the periods mentioned, while train No. 40 transported approximately 16,325, 11,712, and 2,646 revenue passengers. An analysis of passengers handled during a 1-year study period from October 1, 1964, to September 30, 1965, developed that out of a total of 6,818 passengers transported on train No. 39, 66.2 percent were received on the carrier's line at Tucumcari, and 30.3 percent detained at the Los Angeles termination point.

Of the total number of passengers handled both on and off (6,818 times 2), El Paso had 11.2 percent, Tucson 12.2 percent, Phoenix 17.2 percent, and the six stops intermediate to Tucumcari and Phoenix 11.1 percent. The remaining 48.3 percent were handled at Los Angeles, Tucumcari, or intermediate stops between Phoenix and Los Angeles. In the reverse direction, of the 5,500 passengers transported on train No. 40, 60.6 percent traveled through to Tucumcari for transportation beyond on the Rock Island's lines. Only 13.6 percent of these passengers originated at Los Angeles with the balance accumulating along the line. Of the total number of passengers handled on train No. 40, both on and off, Phoenix had 18.8 percent. Tucson 13.8 per-

cent, and El Paso 19.6 percent. The remaining boarded and/or detained at other intermediate stations. In terms of the average number of revenue passengers carried per trip during this study period, train No. 39 had an average of 19 passengers and train No. 40 an average of 15 passengers. The data resulting from this study establishes quite clearly that the involved portion of railroad serves both as a local common carrier for El Paso, Tucson, and Phoenix, as well as a "bridge" carrier between the lines of the Rock Island and that portion of the Southern Pacific system lying west of Phoenix serving the Pacific coast area.

The carrier, in demonstrating the financial results of operating the trains between Tucumcari and Phoenix, conducted a 1 week study, from August 1 through August 7, 1965. The revenues and expenses derived from this study were multiplied by 52.14 weeks to arrive at an annual basis. Inasmuch as the consist of the involved trains was materially changed from their composition in 1964, such a costing procedure is basically reasonable. (See app. B.) However, the carrier does not confine its revenue and expense projections to the change in consist, but computes its expenses on factors such as different mileages, switching, etc., attributable to operations west of Phoenix, that are not used in its computations for 1963, 1964 and the first 6 months of 1965. Hence, no comparison can be made between the anticipated figures for the year 1965 and those of the previous years based on actual experience and confined to the pertinent Tucumcari-Phoenix operation.

Furthermore, most of the expense items are predicated on system averages applied to miles operated. The annual statistics of the involved trains, as provided by the carrier, and shown in appendix C cannot be reconciled in all categories. For instance the route miles of 763 for train No. 39 and 764 for train No. 40 are confirmed by reference to the carrier's passenger train schedule. Similarly the annual train miles and chair car miles reflect correct mathematical computations. (Distance times 365 days.) However, the remaining mileage statistics are irreconcilable with the distance involved. Considering that train No. 39 is powered by two diesel locomotive units, the diesel unit miles would logically be computed by multiplying the train miles by two or 556,990 miles, instead of 909,215 miles shown by the carrier. No explanation is found in the record to explain this large variance. In addition, some of the trains' annual statistics include mileage operated between Phoenix and Los Angeles. The carrier advances some arguments in support of the consideration of these additional mileage figures, but their effect on expenses incurred on the line of railroad under consideration herein is deemed speculative. Switching expense at the Los Angeles terminal is another cost item for which there is no substantive evidence upon which a proper evaluation can be made. Based on the foregoing criticism, and disregarding fully allocated costs, interest charges, and terminal expenses, no practical evaluation can be made of the cost evidence submitted by the carrier. The carrier recognizes the fact that these trains have a feeder value to its system, but did not include any feeder revenue in its statement of estimated revenues and expenses. It can reasonably be concluded that the net loss claimed by the carrier is greatly overstated, if indeed a deficit exists.

Although the carrier emphasizes the decrease in revenue passengers transported on these trains, it is all the more remarkable, considering the drastic attempts of the carrier to discourage patronage of these trains, that over 12,000 passengers were transported during the October 1, 1964-September 30, 1965 special study period.

Not only has the carrier eliminated these trains from its published passenger train schedules, ostensibly to save potential passengers from the ordeal of riding them, but the carrier's agents deny the existence of these trains to an inquiring public. The Los Angeles ticket office is closed 2½ hours before train 40 departure time. Only one passenger coach is provided for each train. When the coach is shopped, passengers at Phoenix and Los Angeles are denied transportation and their fares refunded. If the coach is put out of service between Phoenix and Los Angeles, a caboose is substituted for the passengers to ride in. All employees of the carrier and other pass-carrying passengers are prohibited from using these trains, and have been directed to use train Nos. 3 and 4 which operate over the involved route. Trains 3 and 4 are in such demand that during several months of the year they operate in two sections. They consist during the remainder of the year of between 18 and 21 cars. Even with that number of cars it has often been necessary to turn passengers away because of capacity loads. Under the circumstances, the carrier's action in discouraging use of trains Nos. 39 and 40 is most unusual.

In Finance Docket No. 23272, Southern Pacific Co. Discontinuance of Passenger Trains Nos. 39 and 40 Between Los Angeles, Calif. and Phoenix, Ariz., decided January 26, 1965, the carrier's witnesses testified, in effect, that if the Commission should enter an order requiring the continuance of passenger service on these same trains between Phoenix and Los Angeles, the carrier's legal department would be consulted to ascertain what steps might be taken to discourage use of such service. In our report in that proceeding we found a public need for the continuation of the service. In addition, we made it clear that any action by the carrier to undermine the service would weaken any argument that the service is not required by the public convenience and necessity.

The evidence in this proceeding makes it abundantly clear that Southern Pacific has continued to discourage use of these trains by passengers. In fact, it has intensified its efforts in that direction. Whenever it appears, as it does in this proceeding, that a carrier has deliberately downgraded its service in order to justify discontinuance of a train irrespective of the actual or potential needs of the traveling public, the Commission will order the service to be continued. See Pennsylvania R. Co. Discontinuance of Passenger Service, 320 I.C.C. 319, 323 (1963). The Commission will not find burdens on interstate commerce within the meaning of section 13a of the act to be "undue" if those burdens are voluntarily created by carriers for the purpose of obtaining a favorable decision from the Commission.

Various employee organizations opposed discontinuance of the trains in question but urged that, in the event discontinuance were permitted, conditions be imposed for the protection of adversely affected employees similar to the conditions prescribed in Chicago B. & Q. R. Co. Abandonment, 257 I.C.C. 700. In view of our findings herein, no further consideration of this matter is necessary.

Contentions of the parties as to facts or laws not specifically discussed herein have been given consideration and found to be without material significance or not justified.

We find that the continued operation by the Southern Pacific Company of passenger trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex. and Phoenix, Ariz., is required by public convenience and necessity and that the continued operation thereof has not been shown to constitute an undue burden on interstate or foreign commerce.

An appropriate order will be entered.

APPENDIX A.—Present schedule trains, Nos. 39 and 40

	Population	Train No. 40, eastbound	Train No. 39, westbound		Population	Train No. 40, eastbound	Train No. 39, westbound
Los Angeles	2,479,015	Leave 11:30 p.m.	Arrive 3 a.m.	Lordsburg	3,436	Arrive 6:20 p.m.	Leave 7:50 a.m.
Colton	18,666	Leave 1:05 a.m. ¹	Leave 12:30 a.m. ¹	Do		Leave 6:30 p.m.	Arrive 7:40 a.m.
Indio	9,745	Leave 3:25 a.m.	Leave 10:30 p.m.	Deming	6,764	Leave 7:40 p.m.	Leave 6:50 a.m.
Yuma	23,974	Arrive 5:55 a.m. ²	Leave 8:20 p.m. ²	El Paso	276,687	Arrive 9:30 p.m.	Leave 6:20 a.m.
Do		Leave 7:05 a.m. ²	Arrive 9:10 p.m. ²	Do		Leave 10:30 p.m.	Arrive 4:20 a.m.
Phoenix	439,170	Arrive 10:30 a.m.	Leave 6 p.m.	Alamogordo	21,723	Leave 12:07 a.m.	Leave 2:35 a.m.
Do		Arrive 11:40 a.m.	Arrive 2:25 p.m.	Carriazo	1,546	Arrive 1:05 a.m.	Leave 1:38 a.m.
Tucson	212,892	Arrive 2:10 p.m.	Leave 11:45 a.m.	Do		Leave 1:15 a.m.	Arrive 1:15 a.m.
Do		Leave 2:40 p.m.	Arrive 11:15 a.m.	Vaughn	1,170	Leave 2:56 a.m.	Leave 11:52 p.m.
Willcox	2,441		Leave 9:05 a.m.	Tucumcari	8,143	Arrive 5:10 a.m. ³	Leave 10:15 p.m. ³

¹ Flag stop. ² Pacific standard time. ³ Mountain standard time.

APPENDIX B.—Southern Pacific Co.—Estimated revenues and expenses of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Phoenix, Ariz., and Tucumcari, N. Mex., based on current conditions

Line No.	Description (a)	12 months (b)	Line No.	Description (a)	12 months (b)
	Revenues:			Expenses—Continued	
1	Passenger	\$239,400	19	Depreciation:	
2	Mail	2,022,900	20	Diesel locomotives	\$219,600
3	Express	73,800	21	Passenger cars	79,300
4	Other passenger train	1,200	22	Rents for passenger cars	3,900
5	Total revenues	2,337,300	22	Terminal companies	82,300
	Expenses:		23	Subtotal, expenses on lines 6 to 22	2,606,300
6	Express messenger		24	Net profit or (loss) before expenses on lines 25 to 36	(269,000)
7	Wages: Train and enginemen	549,500		Interest:	
8	Servicing:		25	Diesel locomotives	20,100
9	Diesel locomotives	130,100	26	Passenger cars	38,900
	Passenger cars	111,500	27	Maintenance of way and structures	237,200
10	Repairs:		28	Station supplies and expenses	5,000
	Diesel locomotives	488,300	29	All other transportation	23,200
	Passenger cars	493,200	30	All other maintenance of equipment	33,700
11	Casualties	18,800	31	Traffic	29,600
12	Switching	58,900	32	General	34,100
13	Station employees	29,100	33	Haul of company material	30,900
14	Increased wages and benefits for lines 8 to 13	17,500	34	Increased wages and benefits for lines 27 to 33	5,300
15	Health and welfare for lines 7 to 15	49,000	35	Health and welfare for lines 27 to 34	10,300
16	Payroll taxes for lines 7 to 15	113,500	36	Payroll taxes for lines 27 to 34	23,900
17	Train fuel	161,800	37	Subtotal, expenses on lines 25 to 36	492,200
18			38	Total net profit or (loss)	(761,200)

APPENDIX C.—Annual statistics of trains Nos. 39 and 40¹

Line No.	Description (a)	Train No. 39 (b)	Train No. 40 (c)	Total (d)	Line No.	Description (a)	Train No. 39 (b)	Train No. 40 (c)	Total (d)
1	Train-miles	278,495	278,860	557,355	6	Passenger car-miles—Continued			
2	Diesel unit-miles	909,215	1,148,655	2,057,870		Chair car-miles	278,495	278,860	557,355
3	Passenger car-miles:				7	Total car-miles	3,344,130	3,670,805	7,014,935
4	Baggage car-miles	2,892,625	3,374,790	6,267,415	8	Gross ton-miles (thousands)	291,095	339,313	630,408
5	Refrigerator car-miles	173,010	17,155	190,165	9	Switching hours	852	973	1,825
					10	Route miles	763	764	1,527

¹ Purported to be based on actual operations during 7-day period, Aug. 1-7, 1965, inclusive.

ORDER

At a session of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Division 3, held at its office in Washington, D.C. on the 24th day of January A.D. 1966.

[Finance docket No. 23800]

SOUTHERN PACIFIC CO. DISCONTINUANCE OF TRAINS NOS. 39 AND 40 BETWEEN TUCUMCARI, N. MEX., AND PHOENIX, ARIZ.

Investigation of the matters and things involved in this proceeding having been made pursuant to the order of said division, dated September 23, 1965, a hearing having been held, and said division, on the date hereof, having made and filed a report containing its findings of fact and conclusions thereon, which report is hereby referred to and made a part hereof;

It is ordered, That the Southern Pacific Co. be, and it is hereby, required to continue the operation of trains Nos. 39 and 40 between Tucumcari, N. Mex. and Phoenix, Ariz., for a period of 1 year from the date hereof; and

It is further ordered, That this investigation be, and it is hereby, discontinued effective

35 days from the date of service of this order.

By the Commission, Division 3.

H. NEIL GARSON,
Secretary.

FAIR PACKAGING AND LABELING

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, too many years have elapsed since legislation was initially introduced to protect the consumer against deceptive and misleading packaging and labeling practices. Our distinguished colleague in the other body, Mr. HART, has labored long and

hard over the past 4 years to protect the consumer.

Now, President Johnson has sent to Congress a comprehensive message outlining proposals which would give the consumer the protection needed.

Today, I am introducing a bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce which would prevent the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging and labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce. It does not overlap into previously enacted legislation.

My bill requires that the labeling on packages be clear and accurate stating the nature and the quantity of the contents. It prohibits packaging which is deceptive in shape or promise nonexistent savings through promotional gimmicks. And it provides that appropriate and reasonable weight standards be set up to facilitate comparative shopping.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that my bill is general enough so that it takes into consideration that there are individual manufacturing problems in different types of packaging.

American industry has made tremendous progress in providing attractive and informative packaging for the consumer. Its standards are the highest in the world. Nevertheless, there are too many instances of deceptive labeling and packaging, even though in many of these there is no deliberate intent involved.

This, however, does not help the housewife and her equally confused husband who are bombarded with vast rows of competing products. Their contents are similar, but their labels and packages are not. Thus, often, seemingly identical packages in weight and size are not identical. Giant, super giant, family, economy, and gimmick labels promising non-existent savings are so confusing and misleading that it often becomes a complicated exercise in mathematics to do the weekly shopping.

Since the housewife usually shops at a self-service store, she has to rely heavily on the package and label as her source of information in making a choice. It is, therefore, imperative that products be packaged and labeled so that she does not need a slide rule, ruler, scale, and perhaps even an MIT graduate to calculate the best buy for her money.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to stress that my bill, originally introduced in the other body, provides the much-needed protection for the consumer, while at the same time does not place stringent and demanding controls on the manufacturers, nor would it make packaging less attractive and less efficient. And it would not prevent economy in scale packaging or impose costly restrictions.

I strongly urge this second session of the 89th Congress to give full and liberate consideration to this legislation and to enact a positive and meaningful law which would enhance the quality of American industry's packaging and labeling practices through a Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. I believe that this legislation would go a long way to further mutually beneficial consumer-manufacturer relations. And finally, I believe that this legislation would provide a positive measure, although not a fiscal control, to help curb the present soaring inflation.

GROWING FOOD SHORTAGES DEVELOPING AROUND THE WORLD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been watching over the months, the growing food shortages developing around the world. We have seen the evidence mount that the world is facing an increasingly severe lack of food. This, in spite of the fact that America, through the mechanisms of Public Law 480 has done virtually everything possible to help our neighbors and friends

around the world solve this terrible problem.

Today our President has told us both in his message to Congress and at a personal briefing in the White House that we are no longer facing merely a food shortage in India, but a famine of a magnitude unknown in the modern world. Unless we act, and act swiftly, anywhere from 25 to 40 million Indians face death from starvation. The cause of this famine is as old as mankind itself—nature at its worst—a drought of unprecedented severity.

Our President has laid aside all considerations of political, ideology, and power politics and has responded to answer the cries of the hungry and starving men, women, and children of India.

He has proposed that we ship, in addition to the 6½ million tons of wheat already committed to India, another 3½ million. He further stated that in addition to this vast amount, India needs another 3½ million tons. He has called upon all the people of the world to provide these 3½ million tons. Up to this point Canada has responded with 1 million tons of wheat and flour while some 20 countries have pledged approximately \$150 million to help stave off this disaster. But our President has said, and rightfully so I believe, that even if we have to ship the balance of 2½ million tons ourselves, we will do so. In addition to the wheat, India requires 200,000 tons of corn, 125 million pounds of dried milk, and 150 million pounds of vegetable oils, just to maintain a subsistence level for its growing population. As the world knows, America will keep its pledges and promises regardless of what sacrifices this may require at home. I think it is fair to say that this effort which will cost a minimum of \$1 to \$1½ billion will be reflected here at home either in higher taxes and/or higher food costs. Many times in America's short history we have been called upon to make sacrifices, not only of treasure, but also of the lives of our fighting men. Each time America has risen to the challenge and met the responsibilities thrust upon her and I have no doubt that the Members of this House and the American people will not shirk this responsibility in this most tragic hour of our brothers and sisters who live in India.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action by our President shows, once and for all, our true intentions in Asia. This is not the action of a country bent upon war and plunder and destruction. This is the action of a President leading his people to the most noble of all pursuits—the helping of fellow humans suffering the worst disaster that can be imagined—famine. This shows the world once again that what we truly seek all over the world is peace and a genuine desire to help those who need our help. This action refutes conclusively those here at home and abroad who cry we seek the destruction of mankind by our action in Vietnam. For what we are doing in India is exactly what we are doing in Vietnam—trying to help a people to help themselves to a way of life that will not be plagued by mankind's ancient enemies, hunger, pestilence, and igno-

rance. For our President has said not only will we help India in these terrible times with food but we shall send Americas, men and women to show the Indians the way to avert a tragedy, such as the one facing them now, from ever occurring again.

I think this is a time for all the nations of the world, regardless of their political beliefs, to join us and come to the aid of India. This is the time for Russia and China and those countries of Eastern Europe to put their money where their mouth is and help the starving children of India. This is the time for France to stop worrying about collecting gold and remember the times in the past when other countries helped her in her hour of need and to help the mothers of India live. This is the time for the members of the white Atlantic community who comprise 20 percent of the world and have 75 percent of the world's resources to realize that their responsibilities do not end at their own border. This is the time for all of us to remember the golden rule:

Do unto others as we would have others do unto us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am speaking for all of my constituents when I pledge my unwavering support to the President. Winston Churchill called Britain's role in World War II "Britain's finest hour." I think it is fair to say that history will regard this program of compassion for India as America's finest hour. History remembers many Kings, Prime Ministers, and Presidents for their leadership and courage in times of war. I am sure history will remember President Johnson for his leadership in rallying the peoples of the world to the aid of a stricken people and I believe this is the way he wants to be remembered.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODELL (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. RESNICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FRASER, for 30 minutes, on March 31.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to be:

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS to revise and extend his remarks made today and to include an article from the Atlanta Journal of March 18, 1966.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. FINO.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MCVICKER in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mrs. KELLY.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. TENZER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 31, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2252. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on the number of officers above lieutenant commander, by rank and age groups, receiving average monthly flight pay authorized by law for the 6-month period ended January 1, 1966, pursuant to Public Law 301, approved February 18, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2253. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development), transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts, during the period July 1 through December 31, 1965, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82-557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 71. Concurrent resolution to approve selecting of the U.S. Olympic Committee and to support its recommendations that the State of Utah be designated as the site for the 1972 winter Olympic games; without amendment (Rept. No. 1386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 614. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1387). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 764. Reso-

lution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 1388). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 787. Resolution to provide for the expenses of an investigation authorized by House Resolution 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 1389). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1488. An act to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 126,300, long calcined tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. S. 2642. An act to authorize the release of platinum from the national stockpile, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13365. A bill to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13367. A bill to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluor spar from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; with amendments (Rept. No. 1393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13368. A bill to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13369. A bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13371. A bill to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13373. A bill to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13578. A bill to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13579. A bill to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13580. A bill to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13663. A bill to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No.

1401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 13774. A bill to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile; without amendment (Rept. No. 1402). 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. MORRISON:

H.R. 14122. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14123. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 14124. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14125. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 14126. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14127. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 14128. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 14129. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 14130. A bill to provide for the best care, welfare, and safeguards against suffering for certain animals used for scientific purposes without impeding necessary research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 14131. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code, to increase the rate of pension to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, their widows and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14132. A bill to increase the rate of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows, children, and parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14133. A bill to increase the rate of pension payable to certain veterans of World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, and their widows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14134. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 14135. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the basis on which pension is payable, by eliminating the net worth eligibility test; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 14136. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, to increase by \$2 the fee for such stamp; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14137. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14138. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14139. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to implement the existing requirement that an applicant for a farm housing loan thereunder be unable to secure the necessary credit from other sources; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 14140. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide more equitable tariff treatment for parts of ball bearings with integral shafts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 14141. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of surplus personal property to State and local governments, Indian groups under Federal supervision, and volunteer firefighting and rescue organizations at 50 percent of the estimated fair market value; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 14142. A bill to amend section 331 of title 46 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 14143. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make additional benefits available to certain veterans of World War I who have been permanently and totally disabled for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 14144. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 14145. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to develop, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the use of experiment and demonstration plants, practicable and economic means for the production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate, as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 14146. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, to eliminate the provisions of section 9 thereof concerning two or more members of a family in the competitive civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 14147. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 14148. A bill to provide compensation for damages to certain facilities rendered inoperative or otherwise adversely affected as a result of the modernization of the Monongahela River navigation project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 14149. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Railway Labor Act to provide necessary emergency provisions for the protection of the public health, welfare, and safety in certain labor-management disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 14150. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14151. A bill to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14152. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey on a program to develop, preserve, and restore the resources of the Hudson River and its shores and to authorize certain necessary steps to be taken to protect those resources from adverse Federal actions until the States and Congress shall have had an opportunity to act on that program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 14153. A bill to amend the act of October 10, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes" so as to control all types of illegal transportation of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 14154. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that the existing suspension of duty on manganese ore and related products shall apply with respect to such ore and related products imported from any available source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 14155. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Badlands National Monument in the State of South Dakota, to authorize exchange of land mutually beneficial to the Oglala Sioux Tribe and the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 14156. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 14157. A bill to authorize the acquisition, transfer, conveyance, and lease of certain property in the District of Columbia for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States, as sites for other international organizations, and as sites for governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 14158. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce by preventing the use of unfair or deceptive methods of packaging or labeling of certain consumer commodities distributed in such commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 14159. A bill to strengthen the regulatory and supervisory authority of Federal agencies over insured banks and insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 14160. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 14161. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14162. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 14163. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1965 to prohibit certain fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation, flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUPFFERMAN:

H.R. 14164. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14165. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.J. Res. 997. Joint resolution to support U.S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.J. Res. 998. Joint resolution providing for a national education policy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 999. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 1000. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 14 occurs as National Flag Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.J. Res. 1001. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of May in each year as Steel Mark Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H. Res. 808. Resolution relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H. Res. 809. Resolution relating to the distribution among the States of research and development funds made available by Government agencies; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 14166. A bill for the relief of Filomena Luiga Serrao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 14167. A bill for the relief of Genowefa Libera Budzyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 14168. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Catherine B. Murphy, and dependent children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 14169. A bill for the relief of Roberto Inda-Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 14170. A bill for the relief of Gerlando Murena and Vincenza Murena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 14171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Soon Wol Yang (also known as Mary Yang); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 14172. A bill for the relief of Artemio G. Pagdanganan, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 14173. A bill for the relief of Antonio Barquet Chediack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14174. A bill for the relief of Esteban Fernández Noda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 14175. A bill for the relief of Pietro Giuseppe Serini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Natural Disasters Strain SBA Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my unqualified support to efforts to pass S. 2729. This bill would increase the Small Business Administration's lending authority and would provide for two revolving funds for financing SBA functions.

The SBA has had a great impact on my district during the past year because of the devastating floods that hit the Denver area last June. Damage estimates were more than half a billion dollars. These damages included—in addition to public roads and bridges—homes and private businesses.

As of now, the SBA has made more than \$35 million worth of loans to more than 1,200 people and businesses in the Denver area as a result of this flood. These loans—for 30 years at 3 percent interest—in many cases have meant the difference between hopeless ruin and the chance to begin again.

However, 1964 and 1965 were years with an unusually large number of such natural disasters. Floods struck California, Oregon and Washington and the Mississippi River Valley; Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida were hit by especially damaging hurricanes.

These natural disasters put a strain on the funds available to the SBA. SBA had a statutory responsibility to meet disaster needs. In order to do so, SBA diverted money from other areas to handle disaster loan applications. The demand for such loans was so great that by last October SBA had to stop accepting regular business loan applications.

This legislation now before us would help prevent such situations by creating two revolving funds—one to finance the disaster loan program, and the other to handle SBA's remaining functions. Purpose is to prevent disruption of SBA's regular lending activities in the future because of unexpected disaster loan requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is sound. SBA has demonstrated time and again that it is playing a vital role in our econ-

omy by helping people to help themselves. I strongly urge passage of S. 2729.

The 48th Anniversary of the Republic of Byelorussia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, the Byelorussian people observed the 48th anniversary of the birth of the democratic Republic of Byelorussia. In honor of this occasion, I wish to express my admiration for their fortitude and steadfastness and hope that soon they reach their objective of freedom from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

The Byelorussian people lived under the Russian czars for several centuries in their homeland. During all that time they had jealously guarded many of their national traits and traditions, and steadfastly clung to their national goal, freedom and independence. Early in 1918, when they had the chance, they proclaimed their national independence on March 25. They set up their own democratic form of government, and in the short time allowed to them, they began to rebuild their wartorn country.

Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy long their richly deserved reward. In December of that very year the ruthless Bolsheviks were on the warpath; eventually the Red Army overran the country and it was annexed to the Soviet Union, thus bringing about the enslavement of some 10 million Byelorussians by the Kremlin tyrant.

Since then, for more than 45 years, these people have been living under the oppressive yoke of their heartless overlords. They live as in a large prison house. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments in Byelorussia, including all hope for freedom. But the Byelorussian people still cling to their national aspiration for independence. They naturally feel that they should not be robbed of their inalienable right to freedom, and in this they have the wholehearted sympathy of the peoples of the free world.

The 25th Anniversary of the USO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago the United Service Organizations, Inc., was created to bolster the morale of the millions of young Americans about to engage in the great life and death struggle of World War II.

The methods of warfare have changed since then, but human nature and human needs have not. Winning the peace is still a lonely battle, and the USO, entirely supported through public contributions, has offered a service of friendship and support for a quarter of a century to the boys who must bear the burden in our fight to maintain freedom.

USO clubs are operating virtually around the world. From Anchorage to Istanbul to Saigon, they are acting to further the welfare of the members of the Armed Forces by offering a friendly, wholesome rendezvous point for our uniformed youth. About 80,000 civilian volunteers are working to make these clubhouses a home away from home. And, these volunteers, aided by the USO professional staff, are the backbone of the USO service. They are men and women of all ages, professions, races, and religions whose unselfish work is making possible this wide-scale contribution to military morale.

The USO comes to the young GI through no enforced legislation or military directive. It is a voluntary expression of the American people for the spiritual and moral well-being of our sons and daughters in the Armed Forces. The USO is a federation of six civilian agencies supported by the direct contributions of the American people through the United Fund and similar groups. The member agencies are the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Catholic Community Service, the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Salvation Army and the National Travelers Aid Association.

The \$6 million USO budget for 1966 will provide off-post morale services which the command itself cannot create

or achieve. One of the organization's most popular efforts is the sponsorship of live shows on the average of more than 2,500 a year. Groups of entertainers travel by plane, helicopters, even dog-sled, to reach the most remote outposts of our troops.

One of the most beloved celebrities to lead the troupes of USO performers has for many years been the great comedian, Bob Hope. His humor has bolstered the spirits of a generation of American fighting men. In Vietnam last Christmas, his jesting comments were worth a hundred sermons in reassuring the men of America's support.

"I forgot to burn my draft card," he said, "and here I am."

At the request of the White House and the Pentagon last year, the USO embarked on an expansion program to achieve full wartime footing. The military buildup in Vietnam and the prospects of a long-term struggle means that thousands of young men will feel the loneliness of a far-off and war-torn land. But the USO clubhouses in Saigon, Da-nang, Nha Trang, and Tan Son Nhut will be there as a reminder that the American people will not forget nor neglect them. The friendly services of USO will offer a comforting welcome.

This week, as the United Service Organizations proudly celebrates its 25th anniversary at the Washington Hilton, a special award will be given to Bob Hope for his years of devoted service. Both USO and Mr. Hope merit our tribute and national thanks.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall the feeling of warmth and fellowship which the USO brought to me and to my fellow soldiers during World War II and so it gives me a great amount of personal satisfaction to note that my very able administrative assistant, John R. Buckley, has been unanimously elected by the Board of Directors of the National Capital USO to membership in the USO Corporation.

I am certain that he will bring to his new position with the USO the same tireless energy and unflagging loyalty with which he continues to serve me and the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida.

William C. Welch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, effective Monday, March 28, Mr. William C. Welch, Director of the Veterans' Administration Congressional Liaison Service, departed for an assignment to the Special Advisory Committee to the Administrator.

Bill has been on the Capitol Hill scene for a great number of years, and I know will be missed by his many friends. He has an enviable record of service to his country beginning with his military

service in the U.S. Marine Corps from 1941 to 1945. Upon separation from the service, he furthered his education at Furman University and the University of Wisconsin, the latter under a Rockefeller scholarship. He did graduate teaching in history and political science from 1951 to 1953 at which time he joined the Central Intelligence Agency in liaison work.

Bill's service on Capitol Hill began in 1954 when he joined the staff of the late Henderson Lanham, of Georgia, and was with him until his tragic death in 1958. He became administrative assistant to Erwin Mitchell who was a member of my Committee on Veterans' Affairs from 1958 to 1961 at which time he assumed his duties of Director of the Veterans' Administration's Liaison Office.

I know all of his friends wish him well in his new assignment and know that he will perform most capably as he did in his previous assignment.

Need for Manganese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will permit the free entry of manganese ore and certain related products from any available source.

Manganese is one of the basic raw materials in the production of steel. With the demand for steel increasing each and every day, particularly due to Vietnam, the pressures on the supply of basic raw material becomes greater and greater. It is in our national interest to secure manganese from any source available.

The Congress recognized the pressures on raw material supplies in the 88th Congress, when we enacted Public Law 88-338, which suspended the duty on manganese imported into the United States from free world countries. In the House report accompanying the bill which became Public Law 88-338, H.R. 7480, our committee—the Committee on Ways and Means—stated:

Your committee also believes that enactment of H.R. 7480 is desirable from the standpoint of domestic producers of ferro-manganese and other manganese alloys. Suspension of the existing duty on the basic raw materials will reduce costs to these processors and should result in enhancement of the competitive position of domestically produced alloys in the market.

The report also pointed out that the principal use of the ore and the ferro-alloy was in the production of steel.

In consonance with the suspension of duty on manganese ore, the 89th Congress enacted Public Law 89-204, which suspended the duty on nickel in various forms in a further effort to help stabilize the production costs of steel.

There remains only one other significant source of manganese available to the United States and that is ore from

the Soviet-bloc countries and primarily from Russia proper. The Russians are presently selling an estimated 600,000 tons per year to Western Europe. There has been none imported into the United States for a great many years due to the prohibitive duty on manganese from the bloc countries. It is believed entirely appropriate that the duty on manganese ore from the bloc countries be suspended in the same manner as is the case of that entering other free world countries, in order that sufficient quantities of manganese be available to meet our own growing requirements and to help hold down the costs of steel to U.S. consumers.

Public Law 88-338 referred to above expires on June 30, 1967. It is believed that the most expeditious way of improving the manganese situation is to amend the present law by expanding the suspension of duty on manganese to cover ore from the bloc countries. Such an amendment means that the matter would have to be considered in 1967 when the present legislation expires, but during this time, sufficient experience could be gained in endeavoring to buy from Russia to govern our actions in 1967.

In the November 22, 1965, issue of the Engineering and Mining Journal "Metal and Mineral Markets" there was a special study on manganese. This was one of a series of such studies made on various materials by this highly reputable publication. Among other things it concluded that with the current prosperous free world economy pacing the demand for steel and ferroalloys, a manganese ore shortage is not an impossibility. They also stated that the political situations in Africa, Brazil, and India reduces them as a dependable source of supply.

The most recent published report shows that over 127 million tons of manganese was consumed in the United States in 1964 as compared to 85 million tons in 1958. This significant upward trend has continued to date and we face a more serious problem as we superimpose the growing requirements of the Vietnam situation which are materially increasing the demands for steel and ferroalloys in various forms. The increasing demands for manganese has firmed up prices for manganese ores, ferroalloys, and metals. As the demand increases due to the Vietnam requirements, prices of the commodities must logically increase. This in turn will increase the cost of steel for our domestic users and defense effort.

As you know, our steel industry has been seeking every conceivable way to hold down its production costs. This is necessary not only because of the increasing competition from foreign steel in both domestic and foreign markets but to assist in holding their prices within the guidelines specified by the President.

It is recognized that some may object to this action because of their opposition to trade with bloc countries. However, our growing need for manganese from all possible sources should far outweigh this position. This is particularly true since the demands for manganese will grow stronger as we feel the effects of the heavier appropriations for Vietnam. I yield to no one when it comes to opposi-

tion to any proposal which gives any advantage to the Soviet bloc.

However, in this case it is obviously in our national interest to secure manganese from Russia since manganese is absolutely necessary to us in our steel production. This is the sort of trade with the Soviet bloc which no one can question redounds to our own benefit.

The acquisition of needed materials from Russia is quite common. One example is Russian chrome ore which is vital in the production of steel and ferroalloys and which enters our country free of duty. It appears entirely consistent that manganese be given the same treatment. In this connection it should be noted that Russia is supplying approximately 25 percent of the total chrome consumed in the United States and without it our steel industry would be severely handicapped. This is particularly true at the present time since chrome ore from Rhodesia, another large supplier, is not presently available due to the adverse political considerations which prevail today. In addition to chrome, other basic materials such as platinum, palladium, and potash are examples of materials which are acquired from Russia.

If enacted, the proposed legislation should lessen the pressure to increase steel prices due to the greater availability of a high-cost item in the production of steel. This in turn will help keep down the spiralling costs of the war in Vietnam and at the same time make American steel and ferroalloys more competitive in the markets of the world.

This should not be confused with the emotional, political question of trading with the Soviet bloc. The only relevant aspect involved is good hard American business.

Anniversary of Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that today is the 26th anniversary of the terrible Katyn Massacre of 15,000 Polish prisoners of war by Soviet Union officials. On this day in 1940, this incredible mass murder occurred in the Katyn Forest region of the Ukraine, and it has never been rectified.

A select committee of the House made a report on the Katyn Massacre in 1952, but Congress has not taken further action on the matter, and there has been only limited discussion of it since that time.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress must never permit such crimes by the Soviet Union to be forgotten since they illustrate the true nature of communism. That is why we must not only remind the American public of these historical tragedies by observing them on the floor of the House, but we must establish a Spe-

cial House Committee on the Captive Nations.

I am sure that the three Members of the House who served on the special House Committee on the Katyn Massacre who still serve in the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], will join me in urging all of the Members to review the report of the special committee and apply its message to current events.

Vietnam Debate Reflects the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, debate and discussion over our mission and obligation in Vietnam have been much in the news the last few months. There are those who feel such debate—coming, as it does, largely from within the ranks of the Democratic Party—hinders our Vietnam efforts.

I feel that such debate is not only fundamental to the American way of going about things, but also it aids in formulating a national resolve by thoroughly airing the complexities of the picture. I bring this up because Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, recently delivered a speech on the subject in Denver. I had the privilege of hearing that speech, delivered at the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Colorado Democratic Party. I want to share Senator PROXMIRE's excellent words with my colleagues, and I respectfully include that portion of the Senator's address pertaining to Vietnam in the RECORD:

I support the administration position in Vietnam. I support it because it has wisely accommodated to the constructive criticisms of Democratic critics.

Senators MANSFIELD, MORSE, ROBERT KENNEDY, and others have done far more than keep the U.S. Senate's tradition of debate and discussion alive. They have made explicit suggestions that have been accepted and have measurably improved the administration's position in Vietnam.

As an administration supporter in Vietnam I say thank God for Senator FULBRIGHT's courageous insistence on holding open hearings on what we are doing to achieve negotiations and a defensible peace in South Vietnam.

Those hearings not only vastly increased public understanding of the stringent limitations on our alternatives in Vietnam, they also forced the administration to rethink and clarify as well as defend its position there.

The Fulbright followthrough with hearings on Red China have contributed a far greater understanding in Congress and the country of China, and how we can best pursue Asiatic freedom and peace—in Vietnam and elsewhere.

This country has never engaged in a war in which the party controlling the Government has itself had such a monopoly on criticism or in which that criticism has been

so consistent and powerful. And certainly we have never before so clearly incorporated that criticism so quickly into our national policy.

Critics asked the President to call for a ceasefire. The President has done so.

They called for a lengthy bombing pause. The President did just that.

They asked the administration to put the controversy before the United Nations. It has done that.

They called for our reaffirmation of the Geneva accords, and our request for reconvening the Geneva Convention to act as intermediaries. The President has done this.

They called for a vigorous peace offensive. The President sent his top foreign policy officials throughout the world in the most vigorous peace offensive the Nation has ever engaged in.

They asked that we call for a free election in South Vietnam and announce we would abide by the results even if the Communists won. President Johnson has done this.

They called on the President to accept a Vietnam-wide election—north and south—and abide by the results. The President has agreed to do so.

They have asked that the war be limited to military targets. It has been rigorously so limited.

They ask that we not insist on unconditional surrender by the North Vietnamese. The President has made it clear that we do not insist on unconditional surrender; that we will not invade North Vietnam.

We are not bombing Hanoi, nor blockading Haiphong; we covet not a foot of Vietnam territory, north or south; we want no base in Vietnam; we do not ask that South Vietnam align herself with us.

Indeed, we offer a billion-dollar economic reconstruction program after the war to include North Vietnam itself.

At the moment the difference between President Johnson's position and that of his toughest critics in the Democratic Party in the Senate is a narrow hair's breadth.

Neither would withdraw from Vietnam. Neither wants a wholesale attack on North Vietnam.

Both want to negotiate peace as soon as possible.

Both want the people of South Vietnam to decide their future freely.

This is a national policy that unites the Democratic Party and the Nation. It does not divide our party or our country. It is no accident that the demonstrations, the teach-ins, the sign-carrying protests, the peace marches have all but ceased.

We have at last a national policy in Vietnam that won overwhelming national support. And it has been won in the best American tradition—by debate, dissent, discussion.

Of course, differences remain but they are differences over military tactics or political ambitions or just plain personal animosities, and as long as we're human those differences will always be with us.

Future Homemakers Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of National Future Homemakers of America Week—March 27 to April 2, 1966—I extend congratulations and best wishes for the future to the Future

Homemakers of America, a national organization of 600,000 high school students enrolled in home economics courses with local chapters in every State, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

We hear constantly these days about the delinquents, beatniks, and draft card burners, while the vast majority of our hard-working, serious and law-abiding youth, who prepare themselves to become our good citizens of tomorrow, receive little or no attention. This distorts the true picture of our youth. It is time we recognized and paid tribute to the virtues of this vast majority.

National Future Homemakers of America Week spotlights a 4-year program to help each member recognize and develop her abilities and to participate in family, community, and world projects. From their ranks will come the future mothers, wives, teachers, jobholders, voters, and opinion makers of our great country.

The Future Homemakers of America was founded in 1945. It unified under one organization the various State and local clubs of high school home economics students. Its membership grew from 100,000 at the end of its first year to its present 600,000 members. Twelve national youth officers direct its work programs and plan and preside over its meetings. High school teachers serve as local chapter advisers. It is sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education and the American Home Economics Association.

Food to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the emergency shipment of an additional 3.5 million tons of food grain to India as proposed by the President deserves the full and immediate support of Congress.

It would be a moral wrong for our Nation to simply sit on its mountain of surplus food while millions in India face the threat of death through starvation.

The drought now sweeping India is the worst in modern history. Resources from all over the world will have to be mobilized if a monumental tragedy is to be averted.

These additional amounts of grain the President seeks for this humanitarian purpose, along with the 6.5 million we pledged earlier to this effort and coupled with the generous donations of other Nations, will mean that today's threat of famine can be replaced with hope for tomorrow.

We are being asked to give of what we do not need, of that which we do not require, to keep alive our bodies, our economy, and our Nation. Yet, this gift can mean life itself to a great nation.

It can mean that India can avert a tragedy and instead of going through a long period of recovery, face tomorrow with hope and confidence.

It can mean that India can concentrate upon the means of finding a solution to its own growing food problems.

Even after these surplus foods are donated to India, there will still be the monumental task of transporting this grain to India and to those parts of that vast country where famine is the worst.

I feel certain that these problems can be and will be solved by cooperative efforts between India, ourselves, and other friendly governments throughout the world.

Fino Blasts Farmers Home Administration Laxity and Loan Giveaway, Introduces Corrective Legislation To Tighten Loan Standards and Urges Cutback in Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would restrict the situations in which the Farmers Home Administration may make loans to country dwellers who allegedly cannot get other credit.

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture can make loans to rural residents for rural housing at advantageous rates varying with the economic condition of the borrower if the Secretary decides that other credit is unavailable. Unfortunately, the Agriculture Department has been lax in establishing whether or not other credit is available.

The Comptroller General recently examined loans made in five States by the Farmers Home Administration and found that 20 percent of the total number of loans examined were made to applicants who could have obtained financing from other sources. The Comptroller General citing language of Congress stating that the program was not intended to supplant or compete with credit available from other sources, blamed the laxity of Farmers Home county supervisors.

My bill deals with this situation by requiring applicants to show, as a condition of getting loans, that they have been refused credit of a sort the terms and conditions of which they could reasonably have been expected to fulfill. This will make the program live up to the intent of Congress that it not compete with private credit.

There is a section of the farm housing title of the 1949 Housing law—section 502(b)(3)—which provides that some farm housing loans may, if the Secretary so decides, be required to be refinanced by the borrower through responsible private credit sources. I think that the Secretary of Agriculture should look into exercising his powers under this section with respect to the loans which should not have been made. Such

refinancings could restore millions to our treasury.

A few weeks ago, I introduced legislation to provide that the loans of the Farmers Home Administration, the Small Business Administration, and other agencies cannot be put into the pools of Government loans in which the Federal National Mortgage Association—as agent for the agencies—is going to sell participations. My reason for trying to keep these loans out of the pools by restricting the pools to Veterans' Administration and Federal Housing Administration insured loans is that, in addition to trying to stop a budget gimmick, I do not want to see programs like the Farmers Home Administration rural loan program get any bigger. It is big enough already and if the Comptroller General is correct, it is wasteful enough already.

If Government agency loans of all kinds can continually be put in pools, in which participations are then sold, this will greatly encourage the Government to take over an ever-increasing share of national loanmaking. The Government will make the loans at cheap rates. Then it will sell some kind of notes or participations at higher rates to get its money back. Then it will make more loans. It looks like Government is out to socialize lending. That is not surprising. The administration is out to socialize residential patterns, and the idea of socialized lending seems to go hand in hand. What is bad is that socialized lending is subsidized lending. Someone is being asked to subsidize someone else's loan. There is enough of this already.

The bill I am introducing today will tighten Farmers Home Administration loan requirements and hopefully take that agency out of some competition with private credit. My previous bill to keep Farmers Home Administration loans out of the proposed pools will, if passed, block a budget gimmick and head off the large-scale expansion of the farmers home loan program that would follow on the heels of use of the pools to steadily refinance loans and increase the supply of available funds.

The Comptroller General has put his finger on a program that needs scrutiny. My bills will do the job. I urge this House to act.

Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen, of Idaho, Before the Appropriations Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815—and the proposed reduction in funds for vocational

education—are matters of grave concern to the people of the State of Idaho.

Following is a copy of a statement I made today before the Appropriations Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and also copies of two joint memorials I received from the Idaho State Legislature and which I included in my statement:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE SUBCOMMITTEE, MARCH 30, 1966

Mr. Chairman I appreciate the opportunity of presenting my views on the proposed reduction in funds for Public Laws 874 and 815, and for vocational education to you and this committee.

Mr. Chairman, Idaho is a State rich in natural resources. Idaho has an abundant supply of fresh, clear water for domestic and municipal use; for use in irrigation and reclamation; for use in creating electric power; and for recreational use.

Idaho is rich in timber stands and in mineral resources. It has some of the richest farm lands in the United States.

Unfortunately for the citizens of Idaho, however, is the fact that two-thirds of the State is owned by the Federal Government—which pays no taxes.

It is also a fact, Mr. Chairman, that the population of many of Idaho's school districts have increased to a great extent in recent years through the influx of Federal employees and their families. This has placed a heavy financial burden on the local taxpayers but, with the help of Public Laws 874 and 815, they have been able to meet the demands.

Now, however, they are threatened with the loss of vital revenue through the proposed reductions in the Public Laws 874 and 815 programs. This cannot be allowed to happen.

Federal funds allocated to school districts through Public Laws 874 and 815 are not mere grants—or gifts—from the Federal Government. They are, in essence, a payment to those school districts in lieu of taxes with the Federal Government realizing its responsibility to the districts because of the increase in their school populations caused by actions of the Government.

The superintendents of school districts in my congressional district overwhelmingly oppose these cuts. Typical comments from these superintendents are: "This money is very essential * * * without these additional funds, our minimum school curriculum would need to be curtailed even further." "Reduction of funds will create very serious budget problems * * * tax base in serious disproportion to our student population due to high proportion of Federal employees." "Many schools including this school will be forced to cut their school programs back." "Would have a staggering effect on the Pocatello schools." "Our educational program would be drastically hurt."

The superintendent of one district, Mr. Chairman, said that 70 percent of the children were there due to an Air Force base. He said reduction in Public Laws 874 and 815 funds would make it impossible for the district to continue educating these children, and that the Air Force would have to establish its own school for them—which, he said, would cost the Government at least twice as much to set up and administer.

Also, the proposed reduction in funds for vocational training would seriously hamper occupational training in Idaho where plans have already been made for the 1965-67 biennium, based on the assumption that the Congress would not cut back funds for the program. I believe it is obviously quite unfair and unrealistic to encourage the States to establish programs based on a certain de-

gree of Federal participation, and then to change the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. Chairman, I most emphatically urge and request that these funds not be cut back.

To show the strong feeling in my home State on this matter, I request permission to include as part of my statement communications I have received. These include: joint memorials from the Idaho State Legislature; letters from Mr. D. F. Engelking, Idaho State Superintendent of Public Instruction and Mr. S. R. Glenn, director of the Idaho State Board for Vocational Education; a most comprehensive resumé of major educational programs supported by Federal funds, prepared by Idaho State University; and letters and telegrams from superintendents of individual school districts.

Thank you again for the opportunity of presenting these views.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the impact of Federal programs has long been evident in the State of Idaho, and will continue to affect this State; and

Whereas such federally sponsored programs result in the immigration of large numbers of families, and children of these families must be educated; and

Whereas the education of these children places great burden upon existing instructional facilities and educational resources of this State; and

Whereas it is the heritage of our country and the right of all to receive the benefits of a good and competent educational program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed with all due speed to extend Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, as amended, authorizing the funds for educational purposes in areas burdened by the increased numbers of educable children, caused directly by the impact of Federal programs; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. E. DREVLLOW,

President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 15

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the sovereign State of Idaho, hereby respectfully represent that:

Whereas the Federal budget request for vocational education for fiscal year 1967 is considerably lower than the amount authorized by the Vocational Education Act of 1963; and

Whereas a reduction in Federal appropriations under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will seriously curtail the development of public vocational education

programs in the Nation, and reduce the number of youth that might otherwise benefit from such programs; and

Whereas a vigorous and expanding program of public vocational education is essential to the domestic and military economy of this Nation; and

Whereas the Federal-State-local relationship built up over the many years has proven itself for an effective program of vocational education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 2d extraordinary session of the 38th Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the full amount authorized under section 4 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. E. DREVLLOW,

President of the Senate.

Attest:

DRYDEN M. HILER,

Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Cigarette Smuggling Racket Cheats New York State and New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 30, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the growing practice of cigarette bootlegging is depriving State and municipal taxing authorities of millions of dollars in revenue. With New York State and the city of New York searching for new sources of revenue to meet the increasing costs of government operations and services, it is high time they plugged up the loss in tax revenues resulting from cigarette bootlegging.

Recent disclosures indicate that New York State and New York City may be losing approximately \$50 million annually in tax revenue due to the growing practice of interstate cigarette smuggling. Other States and cities are also affected and I am hopeful that my colleagues will immediately review the picture of cigarette tax revenues in their own States and municipalities to determine the extent of loss of cigarette tax revenue.

Mr. Speaker, of equal importance is the effect of this unequal trade upon the small businessman—the independent retailer—the backbone of our free enterprise system. The retailer not only loses the cigarette sales but also suffers the loss of other business resulting from other purchases which the customer makes when he comes to his shop. We cannot rely on the bootlegger or the

smuggler to think about the small retail merchant—we must speak out—act promptly to protect his interests.

As if this is not enough damage, the smuggler and bootlegger are involving innocent merchants to dispose of the cigarettes they illegally transport in interstate commerce to evade city and State taxes. I have been told but I do not have confirmation that they are enlisting our youth, in plying their illegal trade in the sale of bootleg cigarettes, thus contributing to and promoting juvenile delinquency and disrespect for law and order.

The wholesale tobacco industry, the chain store, and the department store are also affected by the loss of sales of cigarettes and other products as well. These merchants are threatened with substantial damage and loss of business.

In 1949, there was a wide practice of advertising and offering for sale, tax-free cigarettes by mail. This occurred when there developed a wide difference between the selling price of cigarettes in one State and that of a neighboring State. State and city taxing authorities, retailers, wholesalers, and merchants complained and the Congress passed the Jenkins Act of 1949 which was later amended—15 U.S.C. 375-379.

The Jenkins Act was passed to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes for shipment into a State where a tax is imposed by requiring the seller to file a report of the sale with the taxing authorities of that State. When the Jenkins Act was signed the practice stopped. I am today introducing a bill to amend the Jenkins Act to require that any person or firm selling or transferring in excess of 5,000 cigarettes to file a report with the taxing authorities of the State into which the cigarettes are being transported. The purpose of the legislation is to eliminate the bootlegging of cigarettes and to protect the small businessman who suffers economic harm as a result of the illegal transportation of cigarettes in interstate commerce. Just as the original Jenkins Act effectively eliminated the mailing of cigarettes for tax evasion, so do I believe this amendment will effectively eliminate the practice of bootlegging of cigarettes in interstate commerce.

The expanded growth of cigarette sales in the nontax cigarette States like North Carolina and in low tax areas such as the District of Columbia for ultimate interstate transportation is producing a new breed of bootleggers which is not regulated by the present provisions of the Jenkins Act.

The following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1966, outlines the present loss in revenue to States and municipalities which impose sales and use taxes on cigarettes:

SMUGGLERS CUT CIGARETTE TAXES BY MANY MILLIONS

(By John G. Rogers)

The motorist in the Brooklyn filling station was paying for his 10 gallons of gasoline when he asked the attendant in a low voice: "Got any cigarettes today?"

The attendant sized up the motorist, decided to risk it, and nodded his head affirmatively.

"I'll take two cartons," the motorist said. "Cost you 6 bucks."

The motorist settled up and drove off. He was pleased because, against the going retail price of 43 cents a pack, he had saved 13 cents on each of the 20 packs in his purchase. The attendant was pleased because he had made a profit of 11½ cents on each of the 20 packs.

The big losers in the deal were New York City and New York State. Between them, they should have collected 16 cents a pack in taxes—a total of \$3.20—but they didn't collect anything because the sale was a surreptitious one of cigarettes smuggled in the day before from North Carolina.

ESTIMATE

In various settings and through various characters, the sneak sale of smuggled cigarettes in New York City has reached the point where tobacco industry spokesmen estimate the city-State tax loss up to \$51 million a year.

Joseph H. Murphy, State commissioner of taxation and finance, will say only that the loss is "substantial." However, his current estimate for the State's annual tax share is at a rate that is \$31 million less than in pre-smuggling days.

An educated industry guess is that legitimate cigarette sales in the city are off 22 percent. The industry believes legitimate retailers throughout the State are losing up to \$138 million a year in cigarette business and, perhaps, another \$60 million in related sales.

LUCRATIVE

It was inevitable that such a lucrative, subrosa racket would attract organized crime, including the Cosa Nostra. Law enforcement officials once accustomed to seeking small independent smugglers, are now beginning to see a pattern of large-scale, well-planned smuggling, especially into Brooklyn.

They know, though they didn't intercept it, that recently a trailer truck came in with 9,600 cartons, bought for about \$18,000 in North Carolina, resaleable in New York for up to \$10,000 profit, depending on the method of disposal.

Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron E. Koota estimates that a daily average of \$50,000 worth of illegal cigarettes enter the borough by means ranging down to the small independents who stuff a few cartons under the back seats of private cars.

"The problem is serious and continually getting worse"—that's the summary of City Finance Director Roy M. Goodman.

"There are indications that such criminal elements as the Mafia are cracking down on independent bootleggers and have started to organize pickup and dropoff points for illegal cigarettes," says Morris Weintraub, managing director of the Wholesale Tobacco Distributors Association of New York.

The costly woe bedeviling the city, State, and cigarette industry traces back to April 1, 1965, when the State cigarette tax was doubled to 10 cents a pack. The price of a pack in this city of an estimated 3 million smokers shot up to between 40 and 45 cents, the highest in the Nation.

COUNTERFEITS

Almost immediately the smugglers began to roll, some in private cars, some in rented panel trucks and occasionally, some in king-size trucks. Traffic built up between New York and the two choicest supply points—North Carolina at \$1.85 a carton, Washington, D.C., at \$2.07.

Those are retail prices. North Carolina is favored for big operations because roadside dealers have storehouses bulging with the

goods—cases which hold 60 cartons of 10 packs each.

With the cigarettes back in New York, small independents sometimes make the ultimate sales themselves, their volume not being large enough to fit in a middleman. It's not hard to sell a \$1.85 carton in the city for \$3. Large-scale smugglers may sell to storekeepers for perhaps, \$2.75 a carton. The storekeeper then sells at the prevailing retail price of \$4.30 or so.

TRAFFIC

In the beginning, small storekeepers simply risked selling packs that bore no New York tax stamps. Lately, many of the smuggled cigarettes bear counterfeit stamps. So far the State department of taxation and finance has identified 17 different varieties of phony stamps.

The smugglers' outlets have varied widely—barbers, gas station attendants, laundries, even housewives. In the first 3 months of the smuggling wave, 197 arrests were made in the New York area and 112 convictions were obtained. Prosecutors complain though that light penalties—often a \$25 fine—are not rough enough to discourage a bigtime smuggler.

The State has made 746 seizures of illegal cigarettes, totaling 618,000 packs. The sale of the seized cigarettes to dealers willing to pay the required taxes brought in \$325,445.

But, as the war goes on between the smugglers and the law, the State knows that more smugglers get through than are caught. One tactic found the State sending spies to North Carolina to watch for cars with New York plates loading up at roadside stands. Descriptions of cars and plates were telephoned ahead. Cooperative Maryland State Police alone seized 450,000 packs in a recent period from New York-bound cars.

Lately, however, the smugglers have been switching cars somewhere on the north-bound trip, throwing off the surveillance of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act will help recoup for New York State and New York City, their respective shares of the taxes they are now losing of between \$32 and \$50 million per annum. Perhaps this will also stimulate the taxing authorities and the mayor of the city of New York to look into all other areas of possible tax losses and take steps to plug up the tax leaks to help meet their budget—every little bit helps.

One of the reasons I am concerned about the New York City tax situation is that the mayor of the city has proposed an income tax which would apply to resident and nonresident workers alike. I represent the Fifth Congressional District, New York, no part of which is located in the geographic boundaries of the city. However, a great segment of my constituents are employed in the city of New York. They are employed in factories, retail shops, service industries, wholesaling, manufacturing, brokerage, insurance, and banking as well as in all professions.

If one of my constituents owns property in New York City, he pays his real estate taxes. If he owns his business and pays rent, he contributes to a portion of the taxes paid by his landlord. If he rides the taxicabs—if he eats in a restaurant—if he goes to the theater—if he makes a purchase—whatever he does in the city of New York, he helps promote its economy and he contributes to the taxes collected by the city.

In only one way does the city subsidize him and that is with a subway ride for 15 cents which costs the city much more. I favor an increase in subway fare to 25 cents rather than any form of tax upon suburban residents. It is the fairest way to collect needed revenues. Just stop giving something away below cost. New York City residents should want to stop subsidizing each subway rider from out of New York City by giving him a ride which costs more than a quarter for only 15 cents.

By taking this step, the mayor of the city of New York will be taking a step in the right direction. The commuter or nonresident income tax would be a grave mistake. It will result in a loss

to the city of New York of a great many service businesses and other small business which could operate out of the suburbs where their proprietors live.

On Sunday, March 27, 1966, the New York Times reported that New York City Investigations Commissioner, Arnold G. Fraimon stated that the city was losing about \$9 million a year and the State of New York about \$22.5 million a year as a result of interstate shipments of cigarettes to avoid the tax. The New York State tax is 10 cents a pack and the New York City tax is 4 cents a pack.

The legislation which I have introduced today would help bring about an increase in New York State's revenues of approximately \$22.5 million and about

\$9 million to the city. In view of the difficulty in estimating the loss of revenue due to illegal operations resulting from cigarette bootlegging, this figure may be considerably higher. By plugging up such tax leaks and through an increased transit fare, if necessary, we can bring financial help to the city without a nonresidents and commuters tax.

This legislation will also help other States and municipalities to collect their just share of taxes levied on cigarettes. Where State and local legislation is required to effectively implement the proposed amendment to the Jenkins Act, it is expected that it will be forthcoming to the end that smuggling and bootlegging of cigarettes may be stopped.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Victor S. Koontz, First Christian Church, Disciples of Christ, Hooversville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Fountainhead of all wisdom, Creator of all existence, Author of life, and Preserver of peace, grant this day the visitation of Thy Holy Spirit upon the deliberations of this body as it seeks to unite our great Nation in the common good for all.

Give to each legislator wisdom and harmony in cooperating with and in the support of the interests of Thy people at home and abroad. May the actions of this assembly today become the will of God, the consent of the governed, and the choice of all who seek freedom.

Bless every effort expended toward the causes of man's questing for truth, justice, and peace with all others whom Thou hast fashioned after Thyself. Through Jesus, the Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING, COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on mines and mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXPORT-CONTROL ORDER ON HIDES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago eight Members of the House joined in a request to three of the major committees of this body to investigate certain aspects of the recent export-control order on hides. Our request followed information which was supplied to us by the Secretary of Commerce in a meeting in the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] that the price on military shoes was expected to go up or was already up about \$1.75 a pair notwithstanding what they thought was a commitment by shoe manufacturers to hold the price of shoes down if they were able to get controls on exports of hides.

Since that time the Washington Star on March 29 has announced a 4½-percent price increase by two major shoe companies in St. Louis.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT] has also received information from the Defense Supply Agency that the price for low-quarter shoes to the Army is going up from \$5.75 to \$8.75 on July 1, 1966, an increase of more than 50 percent in the price of low-quarter military shoes.

Now very obviously there needs to be an investigation of what appears to be war profiteering by some shoe companies, especially in view of the export-control orders which were placed on hides. I think the export-control orders should be terminated without delay and I think the shoe companies should be brought before the proper congressional committee and a thorough investigation conducted.

WHY SAVE HAIPHONG?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, not very long ago I made the statement on my own responsibility that there was on the high seas a Soviet ship which I conjectured was headed for Haiphong.

In order to keep the American people properly informed I would like to report to the House—and the American people—

the fact that the Soviet ship *Sovetsk* arrived in Haiphong Harbor at 1:35 p.m., Saigon time, on March 23, or 10:35 a.m., March 24, Washington time.

This ship—I am reliably informed—is reportedly carrying 2 MI-6 Soviet helicopters.

These helicopters are reportedly the largest in the world, and have a lift and carrying capacity far in excess of anything we possess.

I saw them at the Paris Air Show last year.

They are big—and they are reportedly efficient.

If my information is correct, their delivery to the North Vietnamese—through Haiphong Harbor—and the courtesy of the sanctuary we have so far provided—will improve the supply situation of the Vietcong by a very considerable amount.

I continue to ask the question, "Why save Haiphong? Why save Haiphong?"

PLEASE—NO BULLETS FROM OUR FRIENDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, our Government does not control the policies of the West German Government. Nevertheless, I hope that strong representations are being made to the West Germans against their plans to help build a steel mill in Red China. It should be very plain that the Red Chinese Government is a belligerent one, which is agitating the conflict in South Vietnam. It is known that the Red Chinese are the principal source of weapons and ammunitions which are being used by the Vietcong and North Vietnamese against our forces there. It is also known that Red Chinese labor forces in numbers estimated at 20,000 to 35,000 are in North Vietnam, helping to build, maintain, and repair roads, railroads, and bridges, which keep open the supply lines and troop routes to South Vietnam for the Communist forces.

A steel mill in Red China will certainly contribute to the economic strength of that nation and directly or