

a man of the cloth, as much as anyone, can and ought to avoid it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Mar. 28, 1966]

SENATOR BYRD PRAISED

EDITOR, THE GAZETTE:

If the Reverend Philip Newell were as good a man as Senator BYRD he would be preaching the gospel instead of getting involved in political name calling. Senator BYRD is doing a splendid job for the taxpayers and we should have more good men like him in Washington. No one, black or white, should be allowed to live for years off the sweat of another, and we all know that is exactly what is going on. Senator BYRD is trying to right a terrible wrong. The clergy aren't helping anyone's cause when they spew off such garbage as has been going out recently. People are sick and tired of hearing everything except the gospel preached.

Mrs. CLEO BLANKENSHIP.

ST. ALBANS.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the newspaper article to which I have alluded.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, Mar. 25, 1966]

BYRD'S DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICY
CHASTISED

(By James A. Haught)

An activist Washington minister said in Charleston Thursday that Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, seems to be driven by an almost fanatical desire to prove that Washington Negroes are inferior and to punish them for it.

The Reverend Philip R. Newell, a leader in several social reform programs in the District of Columbia, said BYRD has a "twisted sense of morality" and actually causes some of the social evils he claims to be fighting.

Mr. Newell, a former Pocahontas County pastor, came to Charleston to speak at a dinner at St. Matthew's Episcopal Church (where his brother-in-law, the Reverend Michael Paine, is curate). In an interview earlier in the day, he expressed bewilderment over BYRD.

"People around Washington keep asking, 'What makes BYRD go? Why is he so obsessed with this one thing? Hasn't he got more important matters to consider?'

"He must spend hours and hours studying and working on investigations and bluffing witnesses at hearings He's hooked on one idea, the idea of Negroes in Washington."

BYRD, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, is one of the most powerful Members of Congress in directing the life of Washington, which is governed by Congress.

Washington is the only major city in America with a predominantly Negro population. BYRD has waged a vigorous campaign against "welfare cheaters" in the city and has opposed allowing Washington to participate in the Federal ADC (aid to dependent children) program. Some Negroes there have suggested that BYRD, a former member of the Ku Klux Klan, is motivated by racial feelings.

Mr. Newell frequently finds himself opposing BYRD in Washington because the minister is involved in numerous Negro better-

ment causes. He is associate pastor for neighborhood work at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church; chairman of the Presbytery of Washington's Urban Church Work Committee; on the steering committee of the Committee on the Public Welfare Crisis; is active in the District of Columbia Coalition of Conscience; and belongs to the Washington Interreligious Committee on Race Relations.

"I'm appalled by the amount of time that BYRD spends on the District of Columbia welfare situation," the minister continued. "And his effort isn't aimed at helping the families in trouble but, rather, exposing them and punishing them. . . . Why does he get so much fulfillment from this?"

"A man in his position is supposed to be deciding national policy, and yet he spends all his time trying to take bread out of the mouths of poor children and to punish them for the sins of their fathers. . . ."

Mr. Newell pointed out that, at BYRD's instigation, 77 special investigators were hired for the sole purpose of trying to find people on the welfare rolls who weren't eligible to be.

"These investigators weren't social workers. They were mostly former cops deputy sheriffs from down in Virginia. . . . Their only job was to find 'cheaters.' There hasn't been any similar program anywhere in the United States."

He quoted a Washington Post editorial which indicated the investigators are directed primarily by BYRD. He called them BYRD's special police force.

BYRD claims the investigators found 67 percent of the welfare recipients in Washington were ineligible, the minister said, but other figures indicate the national rate is only 5 percent.

Mr. Newell referred to the "man in the house" rule which specifies that if a man is present the wife and children cannot qualify for welfare help.

"That merely breaks up homes," he said. "When the untrained, uneducated husband can't find work, and the family gets more and more desperate, the wife finally tells him to move out so she can get some income to support the children."

Mr. Newell referred to the Mary Etheredge case, in which a Negro mother and her five children were evicted from their home after one of the investigators found a man in their house and the woman's welfare payments were stopped. Later, a Catholic nun found the woman and children huddled in the rain and the woman died a few hours later of pneumonia.

Demonstrators picketed Senate buildings carrying a coffin and a sign inquiring "Is There a Man in BYRD's House?" The Senator commented that the woman's death was the fault of her husband, who drank and intermittently deserted the family.

The clergyman said BYRD has a "twisted sense of morality." He pointed out that, while West Virginia has 49,096 recipients of Federal ADC assistance (third highest number in the Nation), the West Virginia Senator opposes application of the program in Washington.

Mr. Newell pointed out that BYRD gave an all-night speech in the filibuster against the Civil Rights Act of 1964, during which he suggested that the Government should do something to curtail the high percentage of Negroes in Washington. "Ironically, the main theme of his talk was opposition to Federal intervention in local affairs."

"By common consent, he's one of the hardest working men in the U.S. Senate," he said, "but he spends an inordinate percentage of his time working for goals which I believe are morally wrong and socially objectionable."

"In seeking to combat crime and delinquency, he wants to strengthen the police and courts, instead of getting at the root

causes which are squalid living conditions and the absence of any hope of getting out."

"You can't teach people middle-class values unless you give them a chance at middle-class jobs and middle-class homes and middle-class education."

He said chances for Negro betterment in Washington are being harmed by the posture of BYRD and a few Deep South Democrats on the Senate and House District of Columbia committees.

The clergyman, who was pastor of four Pocahontas County churches until he moved to Washington in 1960, said he still is a West Virginia taxpayer because he and his Charleston brother-in-law still own a 150-acre farm in Hampshire County. He added:

"I'm proud to be a West Virginian and a Democrat—and I even voted for BYRD once."

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, under today's prior order, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 1966, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 5, 1966:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Findley Burns, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1966:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Fred B. Smith, of Maryland, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

Lester R. Uretz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant General Counsel in the Department of the Treasury (Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Spurgeon E. Crayton, pastor of Holy Trinity Baptist Church, Amityville, Long Island, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Psalms 133: 1: *Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Let us pray:

Our Father in heaven, grant that we may now be drawn together in unity and in spirit. May these days of crisis, which try our souls and tend to harden them, create within us new resources and capacities, enabling us to follow the loftiest ideas without fear and without faltering. Grant that amidst the yearnings of our troubled world and through the storm of

human indifference, we may hear the voice of our Great Captain of life's mighty ocean saying, "peace be still."

Bless our leaders and Nation in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Texas if this has been cleared with the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I understand it has, I might say to the distinguished minority leader.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is now sitting, asked me to come over and make the request. I am sure that the gentleman has cleared it with the proper persons on your side.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is this the full committee, or a subcommittee?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, the full committee. We are now engaged in the CATV hearings, and there are many, many witnesses who desire to be heard. In order to accommodate them this procedure should be followed.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECENT DECLINES IN FARM PRICES

HAILED AS A BREAK FOR THE CONSUMER BY THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MICHEL. 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. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the Secretary of Agriculture expressed his personal pleasure at recent declines in farm prices and hailed them as a break for the consumer. This is the first time any Secretary of Agriculture, even Mr. Freeman, has shown public delight at a drop in farm income. His jubilation was accompanied by the announcement of plans to break the price of dairy products, including a proposed 33-percent hike in the quota for imports of Cheddar cheese.

Everybody knows that it is not the farmer who benefits from inflated food

prices. It is the middleman who makes the profit. It is a fact that the man who drives a milk-delivery truck in a large city gets more money for a 36-hour week than the average dairy farmer earns in a 400-hour month.

When farm prices rise, Secretary Freeman is overjoyed and takes credit with the farmers. When they drop he is again enraptured and takes credit with the consumers. I suggest that Mr. Freeman should go on television as a substitute ventriloquist because he has shown an ability to talk out of both sides of his mouth and out of the middle, too, all at the same time.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5838) for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas.

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

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

MAJ. DONALD W. OTTAWAY, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4602) for the relief of Capt. Donald W. Ottawa, U.S. Air Force.

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

H.R. 4602

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Captain Donald W. Ottawa, United States Air Force [XXXXXX], of Wichita, Kansas, is relieved of liability to the United States in the amount of \$2,522.46, representing the total amount of overpayments of compensation paid to him by the United States Air Force as the result of an administrative error in determining the amount of service that should be credited to him for pay purposes. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Captain Donald W. Ottawa an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of this Act. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "Captain" and insert "Major".

Page 2, line 5, strike "Captain" and insert "Major".

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Major Donald W. Ottawa, United States Air Force."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ALAN DEYOUNG, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10990) for the relief of Maj. Alan DeYoung, U.S. Army.

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

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

There was no objection.

HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF FLY AND HER GROWTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1049) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

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

S. 1049

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267, the sum of \$1,289.96 for distribution to the persons entitled thereto.

Sec. 2. The heirs and devisees, immediate and remote, of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 266, are hereby relieved of all liability to reimburse the United States for any payments erroneously made to them representing revenues from the allotment of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

MRS. VIRGINIA SUAREZ TEJON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3059) for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon.

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

H.R. 3059

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality

Act, Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Virginia Suarez Tejon shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EVANGELIA G. LATSIIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5003) for the relief of Evangelia G. Latsis.

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

H.R. 5003

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of section 205(c)(1) of that Act shall be inapplicable in the case of Evangelia G. Latsis.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the words "provisions of", strike out "section 205(c)(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 204(c)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

KUNIKI NAGANO ZWIEFELHOFER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5533) for the relief of Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhoffer.

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

H.R. 5533

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhoffer may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Chief Warrant Officer and Mrs. Robert L. Zwiefelhoffer, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kuniki Nagano Zwiefelhoffer may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Chief Warrant Officer and Mrs. Robert L. Zwiefelhoffer, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FEIGHAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "eligible orphan" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "child".

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

CHO MYUNG SOON AND CHO MYUNG HEE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8219) for the relief of Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee.

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

H.R. 8219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Stirling, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cho Myung Soon and Cho Myung Hee may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Alexander J. Stirling, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the act.

"Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

SERAFINA ANTONIETTA COREA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8833) for the relief of Serafina Antonietta Corea.

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

H.R. 8833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Serafina Antonietta Corea may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen T. Cappadona, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 205(b) of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Sarah Antoinette Cappadona may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Stephen T. Cappadona, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sarah Antoinette Cappadona."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABDUL WOHABE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10220) for the relief of Abdul Wohabe.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

JOANNA K. GEORGULIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Joanna K. Georgoulia.

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

S. 518

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act of Joanna K. Georgoulia may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F), and a petition may be filed in behalf of the said Joanna K. Georgoulia by Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens of the United States pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended,

Joanna K. Georgoulia may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by Mr. and Mrs. George H. Jules, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

KOCK KONG FONG

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2752) for the relief of Kock Kong Fong, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "June 30, 1958," and insert "the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are all amendments to these bills germane to the bills?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. In fact, this is one of seven House bills which were amended by the Senate. These bills passed the House in the 1st session of the 89th Congress and were pending before the Senate Committee when the new immigration legislation, Public Law 89-236, became effective.

Mr. GROSS. I am particularly concerned to have the gentleman's statement that all the amendments to all the bills he proposes to call up are germane to those bills.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, they are perfectly germane.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman and withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PREZEMYSLAW NOWAKOWSKI

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2938) for the relief of Przemyslaw Nowakowski, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Przemyslaw Nowakowski may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Harry Nowakowski, a citizen and lawfully resident alien of the United States, respectively, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANOJLO VERZICH

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 2939) for the relief of Manojlo Verzich, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Manojlo Verzich may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Mr. and Mrs. Merko Verzich, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. PANAGIOTA VASTAKIS AND SOTEROS VASTAKIS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3875), for the relief of Mrs. Panagiota Vastakis and Soteros Vastakis, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "section 205" and insert "section 204".

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH TIGNO EDQUID

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4743), for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Ralph Tigno Edquid may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Lieutenant and Mrs. Arthur Edquid, a citizen and lawfully resident alien, respectively, of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID GLENN BARKER AND RICHARD PAUL BARKER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6112), for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park) may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Allen N. Barker, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in these cases."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KI SOOK JUN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9442), for the relief of Ki Sook Jun, with a Senate

amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hood in behalf of Ki Sook Jun, and the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children defined in section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSMUNDO CABIGAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the "official objectors" on the Private Calendar. The rules of the House do not permit questions, explanations, or debate during the call of the Private Calendar. Nevertheless, I try to study each bill and resolution thoroughly and make my decision objectively and equitably.

Today I objected to the consideration of H.R. 5838, a bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas. The bill would authorize payment of \$10,000 to Mr. Cabigas as a gratuity because of the accidental death of his son while on active duty at Andrews Air Force Base.

Last year, after the House Committee on the Judiciary approved this bill, the Congress approved a new group life insurance program for servicemen. It provided retroactive benefits for certain military personnel who were killed between the time national service life insurance expired and the effective date of the new insurance program. Under that law, beneficiaries were granted \$5,000. Congressional policy appeared to be set by this law. Mr. Cabigas is receiving the benefit under this law and, therefore, it does not seem equitable for his case to be treated differently from many others under the general policy established by the Congress.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES] for his sincere concern for the interests of his constituent. In spite of his earnest and sustained efforts, I was constrained to object for the aforesaid reasons.

TO AUTHORIZE THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7813), to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "lend" down to and including "escort" in line 9 and insert "one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate."

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, give us a brief explanation of the bill, including the action of the other body.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1965, the House passed three bills authorizing the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

These bills were a continuance of a policy adopted by the Congress many years ago to place ships in the hands of our friends so as to permit them to perform functions—particularly anti-submarine warfare—that we would otherwise be required to perform ourselves.

These ships are taken from our reserve or mothball fleet and almost always are the kind of ships that are highly unlikely for return to our active naval fleet. They are serviceable and can do a job but they are not modern ships in the sense of those in our active naval fleet today.

Simply—but not cynically—stated the loan of these ships is for our own benefit and not primarily for the benefit of the friendly foreign nation. We are happy that they can protect their own shores with these ships but, in the last analysis, it is the interests of this country which are being served by these loans.

The Senate took a somewhat different view of the loans contemplated by the three House bills. The Senate agreed with us with respect to ships for Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Philippines—and substantially agreed with us with respect to Argentina and Brazil.

The Senate, however, did eliminate Venezuela, Peru, Chile, and the Republic of China. The last of these friendly foreign nations, the Republic of China, is the subject of the Senate amendment to H.R. 7813 which is under consideration at this time.

At the conference between the Senate and the House on October 22, 1965, the House accepted the Senate version of the ship loan legislation at least in part because of the lateness in the session. In-

deed, October 23, 1965, was the last day of the 1st session of this Congress.

The conference report contains the following language:

It was agreed in conference that the Senate conferees will give serious and sympathetic consideration to the ship loan program as passed by the House early in the next session of the Congress.

H.R. 7813, as amended by the Senate, is a reflection of this conference agreement.

The House version of this bill contemplated the loan of one destroyer and two destroyer escorts to the Republic of China. The Senate has amended the ship loan to the Republic of China by striking one of the destroyer escorts.

H.R. 7813 as it is now before the House would do only one thing: permit the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort from our mothball fleet to the Republic of China. It does nothing else.

FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS

The costs involved in the transfer of these ships are contemplated to be on a cost-share basis with the United States providing grant aid austere reactivation and overhaul and the Republic of China defraying modernization costs. The U.S. share would amount to about \$2.9 million from military assistance funds for a destroyer, and \$2 million for a destroyer escort. The Republic of China share would depend on the extent of modernization the country desires and whether any or all of the work is done in U.S. shipyards. If it is determined to perform all the ship modernization in U.S. yards, costs would be about \$5.7 million for the destroyer and \$2.7 million for the destroyer escort with the Republic of China defraying the differences over the above-mentioned figures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the minority side has been well advised on this bill. As usual, the Committee on Armed Services is unanimous in this effort. This is a vital and important part of the military assistance program. The ship that was in question for Venezuela, at the time the original bill passed the House, has been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 57]

Abbitt	Fino	Multer
Abernethy	Foley	Murray
Adair	Fraser	Nix
Arends	Fuqua	Powell
Bell	Gilbert	Reinecke
Blatnik	Grider	Resnick
Bolling	Griffin	Ronan
Bray	Halpern	Rooney, N.Y.
Brock	Hardy	Rostenkowski
Burleson	Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush
Burton, Utah	Herlong	St Germain
Cabell	Holland	Scheuer
Cahill	Huot	Scott
Callaway	Jacobs	Sweeney
Cameron	Randall	Tenzer
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Toll
Cheif	Karth	Tupper
Clark	Keogh	Walker, Miss.
Colmer	Leggett	Watkins
Conyers	Long, La.	Whitten
Dowdy	Martin, Ala.	Willis
Farbstein	Matthews	Wilson, Bob
Farnsley	Miller	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I today have the privilege of introducing a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary, April 14, of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States.

That organization has a noble past, a strong present and a brilliant future. As a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to see at close range the activities of that organization during the past year and a half.

The OAS is the institution that maintains the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. It promotes economic progress and improvements in the welfare and the level of living of all peoples of the region. Most important, it helps to strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence in the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we in this body are recognizing the progress of the OAS as it consolidates the gains of

the past and creates dynamic and vigorous institutions to meet present and future crises.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. DENTON. 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. 14215), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 14215, with Mr. PRICE 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 unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. Chairman, we are presenting today for the consideration of the House, the 1967 appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. The activities included in this bill are extensive in scope, and if I were to fully discuss each and every item in the bill at this time, it would take considerably more than the hour allotted to me. For the Interior Department alone, there is everything from green forests to blue lakes to black coal. Then when the items under the related agencies are included, the variety becomes even more diverse.

I will not endeavor to discuss each item in the bill since I feel that the report on this bill rather fully explains the action recommended by the committee in each instance. Therefore, during the time allotted to me, I will limit my remarks to some of the highlights which I feel should be called to the attention of the House in its consideration of the bill.

Total appropriations recommended in this bill are \$1,321,149,500. This amount consists of \$1,169,703,500 of what we refer to as direct appropriations; \$125,446,000 for the appropriation of receipts; and \$26 million in borrowing authorization.

The appropriation of receipts and the borrowing authorization involve a small portion of the total appropriation, and for the 1967 fiscal year, do not vary significantly from what we have provided in these bills during the past several years. Therefore, I will direct my remarks principally to the direct appropriations.

On page 1 of the report you will note that the direct appropriations recommended for 1967 in the amount of \$1,169,703,500, represent an increase of \$30,316,430 over the appropriations approved for the 1966 fiscal year including anticipated pay supplementals. The amount recommended by the committee is also a decrease of \$34,811,000 below the budget estimate.

Naturally in an appropriation bill of this type, you are bound to have conflicting ideas of the funding which should be provided. The President had his idea, which was reflected in the budget estimate presented to the committee. This committee deemed it appropriate to make some revisions in the amounts included in the budget estimates. I am sure there are others who have even different ideas of how this bill should be funded.

I believe it would be appropriate for me to take a few minutes at this time to commend the members of this subcommittee. All of them are knowledgeable of the activities covered in this bill, each of them has what I would call special knowledge of various aspects of the bill. Attendance at subcommittee hearings by all members was very good, and the chairman was gratified at the interest each of the members displayed in all of the items heard in the hearings.

The subcommittee attempted to delve into each activity covered by this bill to adequately determine the justification of the amounts being requested. We began our hearings on February 2, 1966, and completed the hearings on March 9, 1966.

I am very pleased to state that in all of our discussions on items in this bill, a bipartisan attitude prevailed at all times. I believe I can say without exception that in each of our determinations, the decision was based solely on the merits of the case. With this very excellent cooperation by the members of the subcommittee and the diligence with which they examined each request, I believe I can truthfully say that we are presenting today a well balanced bill, one that should provide sufficient funds to carry out the necessary activities of the agencies, and one that is mindful of various budget considerations that are dictated by world conditions today, and the guidance the Congress has given us through the enactment of various legislation in past years.

I think it is most important that I bring to your attention a consideration that is frequently overlooked and not accorded adequate significance in connection with this bill. To a large extent, this bill is self-supporting through the income derived from the activities it covers. On page 34 of part 1 of the hearings is listed the receipts of the Department of the Interior activities covered

under this bill. On page 14 of part 3 of the hearings are listed the receipts generated by the activities of the Forest Service. To summarize these amounts, activities covered by this bill are forecast to generate \$992,300,000 in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1967 as compared to \$758,800,000 in fiscal year 1966. So while appropriations for 1967 will increase by \$30,316,430 in 1967, we will have an increase of \$233,500,000 in receipts generated by the activities of agencies covered by this bill.

Another way one might consider this is that receipts generated by this bill lack only about \$328,849,000 of totally funding the operations in this bill, and it provides approximately \$321,513,000 for various services and facilities for the American Indians.

In my opinion, there are two important considerations that recommend this bill for your approval: First, to a very large extent the activities in this bill are self-supporting; and, second, funding contained in this bill is for the improvement and betterment of America, in fact I feel this appropriation can be properly categorized as "an investment in America."

MAJOR INCREASES AND DECREASES

As I have mentioned previously, this bill would provide \$30,316,430 over the funding level of 1966. For the most part, these increases are brought about by new legislation enacted by the Congress and the growing demands on facilities covered by this bill.

To briefly mention a few of the items of increase, I would like to point out that an increase of \$32,500,000 is included in the bill for additional education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indian. Although appropriations for the Indians have increased materially over the past several years, the general status of the American Indian is still such that we cannot afford to brag about it. School facilities are still limited, although greatly improved over 2 or 3 years ago; and although great progress has been made in improving the general health of the Indians, we still have a severe shortage of medical facilities, and much more work needs to be done in the housing area. I would like to point out that much has been done to improve these areas in other sections of the country during the past years, and it is only fair that we provide the Indians the same benefits.

There is an additional \$4,400,000 for management, protection, and maintenance costs in the national parks. As a result of legislation enacted by the Congress, we have 10 new park areas in 1967, and with our increasing population, national park visitations are increasing each year. It is estimated there will be 127.5 million park visitors in 1967.

Three million six hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for acceleration of the solid waste disposal program, and additional activity in the coal research program.

There is an increase of \$9 million for various activities by the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and

wildlife for restoration projects in the Appalachian region.

Seven million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for the acceleration of the saline water research program. A large portion of this increase is for the construction of the replacement plant near San Diego, Calif.

Six million two hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, mainly in connection with land management practices in connection with the 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands.

Five million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for construction of the rail rapid transit system. Legislation authorizing this activity was passed last year and plans for the construction of the system are just now getting underway.

Four million eight hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional operating and research costs of the Smithsonian Institution. The new building space authorized by the Congress is now ready for occupancy and of course, it will require additional funds for the staffing and maintenance of these exhibit spaces.

Offsetting these increases we also have some major items of decreases. For example, there is a decrease of about \$21 million in the construction of facilities and roads. This is in consonance with the President's recent indication that to the extent possible, the construction of new projects should be held to a minimum level at the present time.

Ten million dollars of the decrease relates to nonrecurring items which were contained in the 1966 appropriation, consisting of \$1,400,000 for the construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial, \$4,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska, and \$4,100,000 for payments to the Alaska Railroad in connection with damage to its facilities by the earthquake.

Other reductions include \$4 million for the rehabilitation of Guam as a result of the availability of 1966 funds previously appropriated for the urban renewal program which was not approved by the Guam Legislature. There is a \$2 million reduction in subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels, and several other miscellaneous reductions.

EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN THE BILL

On page 3 of the report are listed some of the major activities funded by this bill, and I will mention a few of them at this time: management, conservation, development and protection of the forest, range, mineral and water resources of 464 million acres of the Nation's public domain lands; administration of mining and mineral leasing on 780 million acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf; provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to 59,800 Indian children in the public schools; management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including about 18,800 miles of parkways, roads and trails in 230 national

parks, and other areas comprising about 26.4 million acres with an estimated 127.5 million visitors in 1967; and the management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands, including an estimated harvest of 11.6 billion board feet of timber in 1967 with a value of \$146,400,000.

ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST IN THE BILL

Several items in this bill were of considerable interest to numerous individuals, and I will take a few minutes at this time to report the recommendation of the committee with regard to these items:

First. Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development: Under Public Law 88-309, funds are provided to finance on a cost-sharing basis, fishery research and development projects proposed by States. The program provides for financing by the Federal Government of up to 75 percent of the project cost. The objective of this program is to increase the total fishery research effort of the United States. In 1966, a total of \$4,100,000 was available for distribution to the States. The 1967 budget estimate provided for the distribution of \$2,600,000 to the States, a reduction of \$1,500,000. The committee is recommending the restoration of the funding for this program to its 1966 level which will once again provide \$4,100,000 for State projects under this program. This was probably one of the most unpopular reductions recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Numerous outside witnesses appeared before the committee recommending restoration of this reduction, and the committee received hundreds of letters urging restitution of the funds.

Second. Excess foreign currency authorization: For the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the budget estimate recommended an excess foreign currency authorization in the equivalent of about \$4,900,000. This authorization would have provided for the use of foreign currency in Poland, Israel, Burma, Ceylon, and Yugoslavia. The major portion of this authorization, approximately \$3,500,000, was for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler in Poland. There was great opposition to this proposal both by numerous Members of Congress and outside witnesses. The bill as recommended by the committee today contains no authorization for the construction of ships in any foreign country under this bill, and recommends deletion of the total item for excess foreign currency authorization. In the opinion of the committee, funding of operations in foreign countries by this means is not consistent with well-controlled and regulated appropriation procedures.

Third. Land and water conservation fund: Great interest was also indicated in the operation of the land and water conservation fund. This item involves the appropriation of receipts from the sale of recreation/conservation use permits, motorboat fuel tax, and the sale of surplus property. The proceeds of this fund are used for the Federal purchase of land for recreation, forest areas, and wildlife habitat.

In 1966, \$125 million was appropriated for this fund, but due to the decrease in estimated revenue in the fund, \$110 million is provided for 1967.

Included in the funds provided for Federal acquisition was \$10 million for the acquisition of land in the Redwood National Park. The committee has deleted this item without prejudice, in view of the fact that authorizing legislation for the acquisition of this land has not yet been enacted. With a few minor revisions recommended by the committee in the use of this fund, there is a total of \$76,203,000 provided for assistance to States, an increase of \$11,763,000 over the amount provided in the budget estimate, and a similar decrease in the amount available for the Federal land acquisition program.

Amounts available for assistance to States are on a 50-50 matching basis.

Fourth. George Washington Memorial Parkway: Extensive consideration was given by the committee to the proposal for the acquisition of park land along the Potomac River on both the Virginia and Maryland sides of the river. Of special interest was the acquisition of parkway land from the Wilson Bridge to Fort Washington for the ultimate purpose of constructing a parkway between these points. The committee did not approve this proposal for the reason that adequate authorization does not exist to cover the acquisition of land as proposed in the budget estimate, and in the opinion of the committee, the whole matter of the construction of parkways in this area needs to be reviewed by the proper legislative committees in the House and Senate. Many doubts and questions attend the intent of the authorization on which this request was based, and in the opinion of the committee it would be most beneficial to have a current and specific statement of policy by the Congress with regard to the construction of parkways by the National Park Service, not only in this area but for the entire Nation. Until such legislation is obtained, vexing problems and doubts will continue to attend any proposal for the construction of parkways, especially in the vicinity of the Capital area.

Fifth. Arts and humanities; Public Law 89-209, approved September 29, 1965, authorized grant-in-aid programs for the arts and humanities. The initial appropriation for this activity was made in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966. The 1967 budget estimate proposed funding for the National Council on the Arts and the National Council on the Humanities. The committee recommended a reduction of \$1 million below the budget estimate for the National Council on the Arts.

At the time of the hearings, the National Council on the Humanities had just recently been organized and had not met as a body. The budget estimate presented to the committee contained no specific indication whatsoever of a budget program for 1967 since the Council had not approved any specific activities for the budget year as of that time. For this reason, the committee passed over the budget estimate of the National

Council on the Humanities without prejudice, pending determination by the Council of specific projects to be financed in fiscal year 1967.

Sixth. Rail rapid transit system: The budget estimate for the National Capital Transportation Agency was reduced by \$8 million. The total budget estimate for this agency was \$25,580,000; \$17,055,000 to be funded under this bill and \$8,525,000 to be funded under the District of Columbia bill.

Included in the estimate was \$12,200,000 for tunnel liner. Although construction is not scheduled to begin until July 1967, it was testified in the hearings that because of the individualistic specifications on this liner, considerable leadtime was necessary for its procurement. In the opinion of the committee, the planning schedule submitted by this agency is quite optimistic, and it is very problematical that preliminary planning and design will have progressed to the point where it will be feasible and practical to begin the procurement of this liner in fiscal year 1967. For that reason, the committee recommends a reduction of \$8 million in the Federal share of the agency's estimate related to the procurement of the tunnel liner. As stated in the report, the committee has no desire to retard or delay the construction of this system, and if it develops that the planning schedule as set forth in the budget estimate can actually be maintained, the committee will be inclined to give favorable consideration to a supplemental request for this item in 1967 or the reprogramming of available funds for the initiation of procurement of the tunnel liner.

Seventh. Anadromous fish: Public Law 89-304, approved October 30, 1965, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish. This legislation authorized to be appropriated for the period ending on June 30, 1970, not to exceed \$25 million to carry out the purposes of the act. There appears to be great interest in this legislation and the committee has received numerous requests regarding the funding of this program in fiscal year 1967.

This matter was discussed during the hearings and the committee was informed that because of the timing of the legislation and the necessary preliminary work that had to be done in getting the States organized since this work was to be performed through cooperative agreements with the States, no funds were included in the 1967 budget estimate for this activity. The committee understands that organizational work on this program is proceeding, and there is a good possibility that funds for the administration of this program will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my general remarks on this bill. As I have stated, it has received the serious consideration of the committee; we think it is a bill with good balance, and earnestly recommend its approval.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The reason I am asking this question—and I know it is too late to get some new controversy started here and I am not asking this to start a controversy—but it came to my attention more or less accidentally that within this department there were some high-priced employees who had been given leaves of absence with full pay in order to accept fellowships to work on doctorate degrees—and presumably upon the completion of that they would come back to the department at a still further increase in salary.

What I want to ask is this. Is it the policy of this Government to pay full time when a man is on leave to do something that will benefit his own career?

Mr. DENTON. Congress passed legislation to that effect. This legislation provides that an employee of the government can take training if it improves his work, and if he agrees to stay with the Government employment for a certain length of time. That is applicable not only in the Department of Interior but in every department of the Government. There are two or three pages in the hearings on this subject.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to get this clear. In other words, you are recommending to this Congress that we pay a man who is a grade 12—

Mr. DENTON. We are not making any recommendations. The Congress made the recommendation. Our committee did not enact the legislation. Our committee only appropriates in accordance with the legislative acts that the Congress has enacted. If you are dissatisfied with the program, it is not because of our action but because of the provisions in the Government Employees Training Act, or its maladministration by the agencies.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me ask one question. Is there money in this bill to provide the salaries of people who do not do any work and who get additional compensation and sufficient money to maintain them in their schools?

Mr. DENTON. There is money in this bill for the Federal Employees Training Act to carry out the program as directed by the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know they were hesitant about giving the names of these people or where they were. This information has to be dragged out of them. I have not made any direct inquiry to the Interior Department to get these names. But the request has been made by a responsible Member of this House and I can tell you that I am reliably informed that there are several employees of this Department who are on leave—with full pay—and their income is being further supplemented by scholarships and fellowships—and at the conclusion of their educational program they will presumably return to work at higher salaries. I have no objection to assisting an individual in getting an education but I do resent my tax dollars being spent to permit any person to draw the equivalent of two salaries when he should be willing to bear a part of the

burden himself. The principle, in my opinion, is wrong. The Government Employees Training Act is permissive legislation and was not intended to give such windfalls.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. On page 656 of the hearings, part II, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will find a breakdown of costs. The number of employees total 4,773 who participated in this training program. I might suggest to the gentleman that he might be interested in reading this.

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

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Beginning on page 662, part II, of the hearings, and running for several pages, I find there is a hiring of all kinds of consultants, and just preceding that there is a request for an additional \$100,000 for the transportation of persons totaling some \$287,000.

Mr. DENTON. I think the gentleman will find our extended remarks on that in the second paragraph of the report. We have looked with disfavor on contracting out so much work, and the hiring of numerous consultants. We think it would be much better for the agencies to use their own employees. We cover that at some length in the report.

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

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. I wish to express my approval and pleasure in relation to this item of \$61,700 to strengthen the registry of national landmark programs. As the chairman has said, this is an All America bill, and I am happy to see that we are not forgetting the value to America of preserving the old landmarks and the old heritage of the days that are now past, and the mementos which are being so rapidly obliterated.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, has given all of us in the committee on both sides a full and accurate account of all of the actions of our committee, and I agree with the chairman's statement that this is a nonpartisan bill. Each item has been considered on its merits.

I shall not take up your time unnecessarily in going over again the actions of the committee. Those have been adequately explained to you by our chairman. I am especially pleased with the provisions contained in the bill for the betterment of the Indian Americans in this country.

Actually, the Department of the Interior appropriation request, which ex-

ceeds last year's appropriations by some \$30 million, was in the area having to do with Indian programs. Most of it is for school buildings for the education of the Indian children who are in need of classrooms to carry out that important function of our Government.

In that regard the bill attempts to provide comparable facilities that are afforded other segments of our population in regard to their well-being.

As the chairman has pointed out, the bill also contains an additional amount of \$500,000 to attack trachoma. This is a most urgent item. Trachoma is a terrible eye disease, and I think I should take the time to read from the hearings. I refer to part 3, page 949:

Trachoma is a profound personal tragedy for its victims; and it is linked to the economic plight of the people, for the visual impairment and blindness caused by the disease are an impediment to the acquisition of skills required to improve their economic lot. As a measure of this economic toll, a pilot survey on San Carlos and Sacaton Reservations Indians in fiscal year 1964 found a rate of 830 per 100,000 individuals to be industrially blind (20 per 200 or less vision in both eyes) due to trachoma sequelae. It is of interest in this connection that approximately 23 percent of the blind-aid recipients in Arizona are American Indians and that one-third of these are blind due to trachoma.

As the chairman has pointed out, this disease of the eyes was nearly wiped out back in the 1930's. For some reason or other, particularly in the Southwest among the Apaches and the Navajos, this horrible eye disease is now coming back. This item was added to the budget once the information was available to the committee with respect to the increasing growth of this disease among these peoples.

Trachoma is controllable with sulfa-nilamide treatments that can be taken orally. When I was a kid on the reservation I remember that they did not have this kind of treatment. The eyelid would be rolled back with a stick, and the eyelid would be scraped. You could hear the victims of this disease screaming a block away. Today the treatment is much more humane. When this appropriation is approved by this House and the other body and becomes law, it will help to start a program to eradicate this dread disease.

The greatest work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is carried on in the field of education and welfare. We have more students than ever before who are now taking advantage of the educational opportunities provided by this bureau through the appropriations in this bill. This bill contains the funds needed to carry on this challenging work.

As the chairman of our subcommittee has pointed out, I believe it is a tight budget. When the President sent us his budget for fiscal year 1967, he told us that we could continue our domestic spending at about the same rate as in the past and even begin new programs in an orderly and responsible way, at a pace that reflects the claims of our commitments in southeast Asia and Vietnam. So I believe we can have bombs and bread and butter, and maybe a few blossoms strung along the way in these times that are trying men's souls.

The cost of the war has meant some sacrifice. Some of the bureaus and offices of the Department of Interior were asked to cut back on their requests. The members of our committee, and particularly our very able chairman, Mr. DENTON, have made a conscientious and sincere effort to bring the budget requests of the Department of Interior into focus with the realities of fiscal responsibilities.

It is not an easy task to rework budget requests. It is not an easy task to decide which programs should be cut, which should be maintained at their previous levels, and which should be increased or started.

This body has among its Members who have said, time and again, that it should have an opportunity to express its will and not be dictated to by the administration. We have seen fit to cut \$34 million from the original budget requests. We have seen fit to reallocate at least \$7,200,000 to certain projects that had been considered by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget and turned down.

As a consequence of hearings, during which individual citizens have come to explain the need of these projects, we have taken into consideration and included in this bill projects which amount to approximately \$7,200,000. I hope this committee will give its full support to this action.

I particularly would like to call the attention of Members of the House to certain areas and programs contained in this bill which merit our special consideration. I endorse the additional funds for the National Park Service. In these times of a little more affluence in our society, our people are going out into the countryside to look for a place to get away, not only from the busy, but also sometimes humdrum, crowded city life. Our population is increasing. There is need for the additional recreation facilities that are made possible in some State or community or area near an overgrown municipality.

I also endorse the expenditure of funds in Samoa and Guam.

I visited Guam shortly after the first hurricane about 2 years ago. In December, I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting the Samoan people, who are now receiving programs that are financed through the interest of this committee, of this body, and the other body.

Progress is being made there in the field of education and health and improved well-being of our friends, the American Samoans. It is an impressive record.

I am especially interested in the Office of Saline Water, with respect to contributions it can make to the use of brackish water and the possibility of fighting against water pollution in our streams and rivers.

I believe there is a good opportunity for the Job Corps in our park areas, and our Bureau of Land Management, public land areas, and in the reservations under the control and supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps, camps, they should be out in these open areas, where these people, who may be

dropouts from school, may have an opportunity to come in contact with the nature of their country.

I believe these programs can be of mutual benefit if the programs are administered properly and there is sufficient coordination among the agencies. I was a little disturbed to find, as contained in the record of hearings, that the proportion of Job Corps supervisors to Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps is probably narrower than it should be.

If we are going to have these camps, I do not know of any better place to have them than in our parks, forests, and land management areas. I agree with the chairman that this bill can be referred to as an investment in America, since practically every item, if analyzed, will be found to be instrumental in making America a little better place in which to live. I believe this bill merits your approval and merits the approval of the full committee. I recommend it to you for passage without reservation.

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

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his intelligent approach and appraisal of the wide range of problems which face this committee. It is a committee which deals with everything from funding progress in the trust territories to funding the National Capital Transportation Agency here in Washington, D.C.

The hearings were held in great depth and the chairman's fairness toward every section of this Nation and our trust territories, his fairness to all the problems ranging from hurricanes, forest fires and park policing to funding the new arts and humanities program was exceptional.

At this time I would also like to pay tribute to the ranking member of this committee who was chairman of this subcommittee when I first became a member, for his intelligent, alert interest in every American program reported here. It was through his vision and his willingness to make the original investment that the schools of Samoa are today so outstanding. His work on behalf of educational TV has opened a new program of education not only for the young people there, but to the adults. To MIKE KIRWAN I pay a sincere tribute.

No appropriations bill suits everyone in this House. There are those who would cut and those who would raise. Some 64 Members of Congress appeared before us asking for additions and increases in the budget. Many representatives of important segments of the industrial economy appeared before us urging that money be expended in research that can and will mean the future of not only regions, but the Nation. The committee tried to select very carefully those items which should be funded, war or no war, realizing, of course, that the major part of the national budget is going into defense and into winning the conflict in Vietnam.

The largest increase in this entire bill is for our Indian people and even with this increase we are going to have problems. The status of the Indian people in our Nation is a national disgrace. The poverty, the lack of job training, lack of programming for the future all show up today in the housing, inability of many, many Indians to speak our English language and the inability of these Indians to take their place in the 20th century society of these late 1960's. I join the distinguished ranking minority member in his concern.

I commend Secretary Udall of the Department of Interior for his recent statement wherein he proposes a new and more imaginative look at the entire Indian problem. This should be done without delay and is almost a century late.

In this appropriations bill there is a substantial increase in funds for Indian schools. I think some of you would be interested in knowing what we have done.

In the year 1959 the percentage of those entering high school from the elementary schools was 46.6 percent. In 1965 it was 77.4 percent. However, it is well to examine this figure a little closer.

In 1965 there were 3,098 students in the ninth grade in the high schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the 10th grade there were 2,766; 11th grade 2,133; 12th grade 1,832. Obviously if these figures relate to potential students, there were substantial dropouts. It is also interesting to note that the number of Indian students graduating from 4-year colleges and universities rose in the year 1960 from 56 to 121.

However, when I questioned the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and asked him, "Have you any comparable percentage between the dropout rate in the Indian boarding schools and in the public schools?" he replied:

With these figures which I have indicated earlier, the high school graduates increased for 46.6 percent to 77.9 percent so that nearly four out of five of those entering Federal boarding high school will remain to graduate.

But, he indicated on page 373 of the hearings that the dropout rate in the public schools during these same years was increasing at a rapid rate and creating a serious situation.

Some of the statistics are listed on page 373 and you will be interested in some of them now: In Arizona of 767 eighth-grade students there were only 273 high school graduates. In my own State of Washington of 189 eighth-grade graduates in the public schools, there were only 95 12th-grade graduates. In the State of New Mexico there were 591 eighth-grade graduates and yet there were only 311 high school graduates.

Therefore, our requests for education today are large in the Federal area, but more needs to be done in the public sector of education. What causes these young people who start the ninth grade in a public high school to drop out before finishing? The dropouts will be related later in their lives to problems of unemployment, crime, juvenile delinquency, and welfare.

The Commissioner testified on page 374 of the hearing record that welfare costs have been going up for several years on the reservations. He related the rising welfare costs to the era of mechanized farming and the slowdown in needs for unskilled seasonal farmworkers.

The only appreciable slowdown in relief and assistance to the unemployed Indians came during the accelerated public works program. The Commissioner stated:

We put \$21 million of direct expenditure for public works on the reservation during a 15-month period. During that period the general assistance load did not increase.

These figures and these statements clearly indicate that unless we educate, train, and provide some educational opportunity for our Indian people, they will remain on job assistance rolls. It is a far better program for their pride, their families, and for their communities and for the national good that they be trained so that they may become part of the economic future. This is the reason in this bill that you will find sums of money spent to develop industries in their own areas.

Indian reservations need better management and assistance to develop there an economy which will develop the Indians' ability economically.

Turning to another most important facet of our national resources, I would like to point out that in the field of the U.S. Forest Service we did not fund as heavily as we should have. Necessary construction in many instances has not been funded due to the Presidential request and also due to the financial limitations. However, I do want to point up some of the costs of not continuing our research or in slowing down.

For example, we are opening up an Appalachian timber economy and proposing to put it in the mainstream of the entire timber economy of this Nation. Perhaps more than any other industry this one has had its ups and downs. There are periods of tremendous depression and there is behind it one overall pressing problem which is the competitive position of lumber itself with the use of other products—aluminum, steel, glass, plastics. Now, when we are about to want to do a good job in the Appalachia region, I have raised the question, "How can we afford not to go ahead full speed on the research which retain or give the forest products a better position?"

This is directly related in the chemistry section of the Madison Forest Products Laboratory.

For forest research the Bureau of the Budget did not propose this year to construct an Animal Damage Laboratory which would serve two States.

The preservation of wild animals and at the same time the preservation of our forests is of major importance. The laboratory facility of the States of Oregon and Washington is pressing hard to develop some way of discouraging animal damage without causing damage to the animal population—this through the use of chemicals on the seeds and on the roots of small trees. In the State of Washington alone the animal damage to our forest development is \$15 million an-

nually. The Government, the States, and private industry spend small fortunes annually in planting trees and in reseeding operations, not only for forest products, but to maintain watersheds, eliminate the causes of flooding and to restrain drought. For example, reforestation in the State of Washington in 1965 cost \$1,734,929.72. Yet, animal damage can destroy in a very short time the investment made by Federal and State Governments as well as the investments by those with private forests. The economy of the entire forest-producing area of the Nation is becoming more and more dependent upon research.

I deeply regret today that there are not adequate funds to construct these much needed laboratories.

In conclusion, may I say that we funded projects for which we will be criticized, undoubtedly, but there is no project in the United States of America that cannot be criticized by someone who wants to criticize. We have appropriated money today for the programming of the arts. The chairman has already explained why the humanities were omitted. And may I indicate to everybody concerned Congress does not wish to supervise the arts. I do urge all of you to read the hearings and the excellent testimony by Mr. Stevens as he appeared before our committee.

The committee has repeatedly made plain our interest and I think there can be no charge by anyone that a program of arts and humanities will be used for propaganda purposes. In fact, to make this plain the committee questioning was long and serious. May I say on behalf of this program, we annually spend millions of dollars for outdoor recreation. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife receives in this budget some \$37 million. I think it would be well for us to remember that there are millions of people who will never hold a gun in their hands and who will never use a fish pole. They live in the cities of our Nation and access to the outdoors is difficult and often too expensive for many. But these are the people who can benefit from and will enjoy a program of arts. These are the people who will enjoy the ballet, plays, paintings, music and literature. All the Nation will enjoy them, but particularly to our urban dwellers, these potential programs offer a tremendous opportunity to enjoy the creative and performing arts.

This Nation spends substantial sums of money on many and a wide variety of items. I am going to list some of them for you now.

This Nation, in 1964, spent \$13,600 million for liquor. In that same year, they spent \$7,826 million for tobacco crops.

Let us turn to the field of juvenile delinquency and crime.

FBI figures for 1964: 41 percent of those arrested were under 25 years old. Annual cost of all crime is now estimated by the FBI according to the President's crime message, at \$27 billion. The proportion of crime attributed to youth and juveniles is unknown. Assuming that juvenile delinquents and youth up to age 25 contributed to the

total cost of all crime in proportion to their arrests, the figure would be \$11 billion.

Per capita costs is between \$3,000 and \$6,000 per year per bed.

California's budget alone is \$100 million for California Youth Authority. New York Youth Authority is \$55 million—this gives total group under 25 years of age, rather than 16 to 25.

In this year, military assistance for nations around the world, excluding Vietnam, is proposed in total of \$1,150 million which breaks down to \$3,151,000 per day.

Finally, I only want to remind the Members of this Congress to look back across the centuries of history. What has survived? Art, music, literature, theater. The battles that have been won in many instances are almost forgotten; alliances and lands have changed; but Shakespeare, Brahms, Michaelangelo, Da Vinci are immortal.

America will be remembered in the centuries ahead for her ideals, and her surviving culture.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not have much time, but I will yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman speaks of the illiteracy of the American Indian. I am sure she is right, but how many hundreds of millions of dollars is this Government dishing out each year on the education of foreigners around the world?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would just recommend that the gentleman read last year's report of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. He can get the information there. I am discussing American Indians at this time.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill pending before us today. However, before I begin to discuss any part of the bill and my impressions of it, first I want to extend my deep appreciation to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton] and to our ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] for the kind cooperation and assistance extended to all the members of the committee as we proceeded through these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has already discussed some of the technical problems contained in this bill. My distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] has discussed many of the problems that face the American Indian. Certainly there is no greater advocate of the problems that must be solved on behalf of the American Indian than my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

It is natural inclination for men of concern to occasionally experience moments of introspection, to ask of themselves: What have I done today to better the lot of mankind, to make this great

Nation of ours a little better place in which to live? What have I done to so shape the destiny of our Nation that it shall be a richer and greener pasture for our children?

This is a question which those of us who serve in this House cannot ask often enough. For we are privileged to act in a fiduciary capacity for 190 million men, women, and children who share in the ownership of the most noble exercise in Government that mankind has ever known. Inevitably, they share the fruits of our wisdom when we have the vision to act with purpose.

In just a few short hours at the conclusion of debate, each one of us in this House will have a rare opportunity to end our day's labor, secure in the certain knowledge that we have helped to make the United States of America a richer and greener pasture for tomorrow. We can do so by supporting this appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. Without equivocation, I say to you that no legislation to come before this body does more to enrich the lives of our fellow Americans.

No legislation will do more to give to our children the same America which was given to us by our own fathers—and certainly this is the smallest heritage we owe the future.

There is in this bill a montage of America under all her magnificent aspects.

There is the continental sweep of the National Park Service. You may stand in the very heartland of America, at Grand Teton. You may look to the far shores of the Pacific, to Point Reyes, and the National Park Service is the protector of beauty there. Or you may look to Cape Cod, where once America's whaling industry plied its trade, and the National Park Service is there. Or you may go deep into the most mysterious swamp in all of our 50 States, the Everglades, where the wildlife is not only prolific but is unspeakably savage and beautiful at the same time, and your guide will probably be one of the men of the National Park Service who are trying to save this remarkable territory for other generations.

Wherever you look the National Park Service is there, and is saving the heritage of America.

And through the Forest Service, they are saving more than mere scenery. They are studying the problem of husbanding our resources in land and water, so that our children may have the land on which to grow their food, and the water that will give life to tomorrow.

If this were the only agency in this bill, it would give ample justification for its passage. But it is only one of many.

Look to the two sections of the Department of the Interior which are concerned with fishing, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries. We look at the oceans, the vast Pacific on the west and the Atlantic on the east, and the Gulf of Mexico to the south of us. To us they are gigantic bodies of rolling waters, but to the men in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries they are repositories of the food of the future. There is a new research

center in California, and another in Florida. Daily they are researching the patterns of the deeps. So new is this research, that there is a new species discovered nearly every day.

As a matter of fact, with the new work being done in this field, we have discovered fish swimming in the deeps of the ocean which were thought to be extinct for over a million years. We have scarcely probed the shallow waters of the Grand Banks. We have not even begun to touch the unknown world of the Marianas Trench and all of the other great deeps that lie on the ocean floor. We know nothing of the chains of mountains and the volcanoes that lie hidden beneath the oceans. We are only now beginning to chart the path of the food fish that move with the winds, the tides, the temperatures, the currents.

And if it is sport you want, not commercial fishing then visit any of the 50 States of America and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries will guarantee that trout and bass will be running in the early morning when you go down to the stream to take up the mantle of Izaak Walton.

But the work of the Department of Interior is certainly not principally concerned with the oceans beyond our borders. It is concerned with the land beneath our feet.

In the Bureau of Geological Survey there are men who are working day and night to discover the still hidden natural resources which the future will demand. They have recently discovered a major silver deposit at Creede, Colo. They are working at new ways to detect petroleum deposits. They are charting the crust of the earth, which their Director, Dr. Pecora, most properly called "a veritable 3-dimensional jigsaw puzzle."

These men who work in the Office of Geological Survey are most remarkable men, who do not think of the edge of the sea as the end of the continent. For them, the land shelf reaching out under the ocean is just as much a part of our Nation as the very land on which we stand today. They are men who have a truly global sweep to their vision, and whose discoveries here are watched by every geologist across the world.

I have spoken often about the ocean. But the Office of Saline Water looks on it with different eyes. In that salt water there may lie not only the food for the future harvests, but even drink for our cities of tomorrow. There are already desalination plants in operation which, at this very moment are converting the waters of the sea into a reservoir of usable, drinkable, water.

You will all remember the magnificent gesture of our commanding officer at Guantanamo Naval Base who, when Castro announced that he was shutting off the water supply for the base, calmly went out and cut the pipe in scorn. Our desalination plant at Guantanamo not only gives our men ample drinking water and bath water; we have enough left over for the swimming pool.

And in the middle of all this natural wonder in this bill is the merest touch of the esthetic in the arts and humanities portion.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who walked in reverence past the painting called the

Mona Lisa. I walked past the Pieta at the World's Fair. I have luxuriated in magnificent plays and musicals on Broadway, and in other theaters when these plays were on the road. I read fiction and nonfiction as much as the limited time permitted me allows. I am an unabashed enthusiast for the arts and humanities.

I am reminded of a story of Dr. Johnson who was once invited to dinner, and who, when asked about the meal later, remarked:

It was a nice dinner, but not the sort of dinner you would invite a man to.

Mr. Chairman, I feel about the arts and humanities section of this bill much as Dr. Johnson felt. Without this section it would still be a fine bill, but not the sort you would invite a man to examine.

There is, finally—and I have deliberately held this portion until last—the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Chairman, this portion of the bill must be very close to my heart, because I represent the northern portion of the anthracite mining section of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I could not possibly finish my remarks without paying my personal compliments and thanks to Dr. Hibbard, the Director, and to Mr. Frank Memmott, the Deputy Director of the Bureau, for the remarkable cooperation they have extended me in my work of representing the 10th Congressional District.

You will note on page 15 of the report on this bill a reference to a "practical means of extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in the State of Pennsylvania." This section refers to the culm dumps in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to portray the problems we face in this area. It is really only known by those who visit the area. Where others worry about the surface of the earth and what might be done with the land on which they live, my own constituents must worry about the deep mines under the earth and the constant threat of cave-ins, of mine subsidence, with all the attendant destruction to property, and sometimes to life.

In South and North Carolina today men are fighting bravely against forest fires, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they may all be extinguished by nightfall, because fire is a dreadful enemy.

But in my own district, Mr. Chairman, we have mine fires that have been burning for 50 years, and we have no hope to extinguish them by nightfall. We have refuse dumps, called culm dumps in the anthracite area, which have caught fire by spontaneous combustion, and which also have been burning for 50 years. They lay a pall of smog over the area on foggy nights, a smog which eats the paint off the houses, that must surely have a serious effect on human lungs, and that hides the highways in a dangerous darkness. We need programs to solve these problems. They are vital to the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill before us. It is a bill to keep the land green. It is a bill to keep the ground productive. It is a bill to keep the streams of Amer-

ica running with fish. It is a bill to keep the oceans of the world brimming with food fish. It is a bill to keep the air of America unpolluted. And it is a bill to give that final richness to America, the richness of the arts. This is the richness which has made man not just a little better than the animals, but rather just a little less than the angels.

I hope my colleagues will approve this bill in its entirety. I know what work went into the preparation of the final form of this bill. It was not pieced together frivolously. It is the product of prudence and intelligence, and a wise frugality. Let it not be said of us when this day is past that we knew the cost of everything and the value of nothing. This bill was written by men who looked deep within themselves, to learn the value of the future of America. I know of nothing more valuable on the face of this globe.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman who is now addressing us on his fine presentation and also to commend the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from South Dakota, who made such an excellent presentation here and who has worked so hard in retaining the funds for the arts and humanities, legislation I sponsored on January 11, 1965, together with many other Members here in the House.

I would like to read several telegrams that I received today, if the gentleman will allow me. The first telegram is from my great and close friend Erich Leinsdorf, conductor of the world renowned Boston Symphony. The telegram is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,
April 4, 1966.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been greatly disturbed during the past few days by the general trend of the interview of Mr. Roger Stevens by a congressional subcommittee. The arts can only be supported and furthered, and they can progress only when experts are entrusted with all detailed decisions of where support is needed and should be placed. For the United States and its magnitude and considering its other financial commitments, the original sum for the arts and humanities has been small enough. To cut it further will not help us financially but will ruin some of our great reputation in the world of art and science. I hope your vote will be with the arts and sciences.

Respectfully and sincerely,
ERICH LEINSDORF.

And if I may read another one from the American Association of Museums:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 4, 1966.

Hon. S. O. CONTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Association of Museums, speaking for 5,000 American museums which provide annually educational and cultural programs and services for more than 300 million American children and adults, urges your support of the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Museums across the Nation

heartily endorse the arts and humanities legislation and realize fully the value to the Nation's cultural life and development of the Foundation's important efforts and programs. These valuable initial efforts of the Foundation should not be curtailed or hampered.

JOSEPH ALLEN PATTERSON,
Director.

In addition to the two telegrams I have just read to you, I have also received numerous pieces of communication from persons in all walks of life; all supporting this legislation. When this measure was originally under committee study, I received an avalanche of mail in support of the measure. The mail was so overwhelming that I had to keep one person busy full time just responding to the letters I was receiving in support of the arts and humanities bill.

The support came from the average Mr. and Mrs. America, and also from some of our noted scholars and educators. The letters came from Dr. Edwin E. Sten, dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Boston College.

From Dr. J. A. Stratton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who in his letter said:

I do want to emphasize my own strong belief in the need for concerted support of the arts and the humanities and to endorse in principle the bills you are now considering which will make this support a reality.

In his letter to the Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Dr. Stratton said:

Despite the magnificent generosity of private gifts in the United States to museums, orchestras, opera companies, universities, and the like in support of the humanities and arts, there is every evidence that this is insufficient. Even great established organizations, such as the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Metropolitan, and San Francisco Opera Companies, are faced with mounting difficulties every year. Moreover, it has become practically impossible to initiate new ventures solely with private donations.

Other letters of support came from Dr. John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts; from Russ Miller, director of studies at Deerfield Academy; from Edmond S. Meany, Jr., headmaster of Northfield School. Thus you can see some of the support the arts and humanities bill had.

It is my understanding that later this afternoon an amendment will be proposed to completely delete the Arts and Humanities Foundation from fiscal 1967 funds. I shall not comment on that amendment at that time, but shall limit my remarks to the present ones. I do want each and every member, however, to know that I am completely opposed to such an amendment. The Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard on this year's appropriation measures as we do each year. The Appropriations Committee cut almost \$7 million from the foundations request. To cut more would be to kill this budding giant.

Perhaps if some of my colleagues had more of an opportunity to be exposed to the fine work of groups such as the Boston Symphony they would not be attempting to cut this \$7 million.

I certainly again wish to compliment the gentleman and hope we will at least get these meager sums provided for in this budget.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me in the well, made one of the finest pleas for the programs financed by the moneys authorized in this legislation that could possibly be made. I wish to congratulate him as a new Member of the Congress for his statement.

I want to take note of the fine relationships that exist between the appropriating committee, especially the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agency Appropriations, and the authorizing committee of which I am chairman. For many years we have had this fine relationship. This was true when the committee was chaired by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. It is now true as the committee is chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and those members who serve so ably and unselfishly upon this subcommittee.

I can say to my colleagues that it is a most pleasing experience when one goes before the appropriating committee and is permitted to give his own personal opinion as to the relationship between the authorization procedures and the appropriation procedures. While this bill is not in all detail what I might have asked for if I had been on the committee or perhaps as I would like it now in every detail, nevertheless I do understand as much as anyone the great responsibility of this committee, and I want to congratulate them for the fine work that they have done, and to suggest to my colleagues that we should support this bill wholeheartedly in the form it comes to us.

I think one of the most meaningful statements in the report appears on page 2. The activities covered by the bill are forecast to generate \$992,300,000 in Federal revenues for fiscal year 1967. When we look at the relationship between this amount of money and the amount of money appropriated, we can see how near this Department comes to carrying its own activities.

Then on pages 3, 4, and 5, and part of 6, we have a statement as to the extent of the activities funded in the bill. This is perhaps one of the most concise and factual statements that we have ever had brought before the Congress of the United States as to the activities that come under the jurisdiction of this particular subcommittee.

May I suggest that in this bill there are several places where some warnings are given to the Members of the Congress. It will be well for us to heed these warnings.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday, when we were in the Committee of the Whole House debating the second supplemental appropriation bill, I

stepped over to the other side of the aisle to address the House, because I was representing the President of the United States in his attempt to keep the \$41 million appropriation for impacted school aid out of the bill, which the President did not want and which was not budgeted.

Perhaps I should now step over there again today in support of the President. I would be very happy to do so, because I believe he needs our support in his effort to hold down Federal spending during the remainder of this year and throughout the fiscal year 1967.

I feel certain that all of you have read several recent press reports that indicated the President has complained that Congress is altering his budget plans to the extent that we are increasing, rather than reducing, his \$112.8 billion expenditure budget for 1967.

Of course, we all know that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can control the level of a considerable amount of the Federal spending in 1967, regardless of what Congress does in the way of providing new spending authority. The control of spending has been accomplished by earlier administrations, and it can be done again simply by impounding funds that are available for expenditure on nonessential programs. The classic example of such control is the action taken by a former President, Harry Truman, during the 80th Congress, when he impounded the funds for additional air groups.

Since I was not privy to what the President did in his meeting with the Cabinet last Friday, I am obliged to rely on the report of the White House deputy press secretary, Mr. Robert H. Fleming, with respect to conclusions reached at that meeting. Based upon Mr. Fleming's briefing, I was heartened to learn that the President hopes to reduce the anticipated budget deficit for this year by as much as a billion dollars. The reduction will be accomplished by reducing planned Federal spending during the last 3 months of this year and by the fact that revenues are coming into the Treasury faster than was anticipated in the January budget.

I am elated over the fact that the President has reached the conclusion that one very desirable way to ease inflationary pressures is by cutting back on nonessential Federal spending. This is a cause that I have been espousing constantly since the budget for fiscal year 1967 was submitted to Congress on January 24.

Now, if the President's bureaucratic minions in the departments and agencies will take to heart his admonition to them to seek out and defer outlays that may be desirable but are not essential, then some real progress can be made toward controlling the inflationary pressures in our economy.

I urge Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, to give the President their unstinting support of his efforts to reduce nonessential Federal spending in this and the 1967 fiscal year as a prime means of controlling inflation.

To do what I can to support the President, I shall, at the appropriate time

today, offer two amendments to the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215.

The first of my amendments would reduce total appropriations in the bill by \$7,293,000.

This \$7,293,000 represents the sum of 41 individual increases in appropriations above the budget request. The items covered by this total increase of \$7,293,000 represent projects of vital interest to Members of Congress. I want to make this absolutely clear to each of you. My amendment, if approved, does not affect a single project in this bill. The projects remain in the bill. It simply is a reduction of the total amount in the bill of \$7,293,000, which the bill over-budgets. Congress in its wisdom put these items in the bill, and it would be expected, Congress having put them in the bill, that the Department of the Interior would fund them and take care of them. We are not attacking a single individual item in the bill. It is simply a reduction of that amount.

May I point out to you—and I think this is very important—there is plenty of money in this bill, which amounts to \$1,170 million. There are sufficient funds in here for the Department of the Interior to find \$7,293,000 in order to fund these programs which the Congress in its wisdom put into the bill. So we are not taking out projects but are simply saying to the Department of the Interior that we are staying within the budget requests; you find the money.

It has been said here there is a \$34 million reduction in the budget estimates for this bill. That is right and that is good. But if you take the total amount of cut in the bill, it is about 3 percent. May I point out to you that even though there is a \$34 million reduction in this bill from budget estimates, the bill is still \$30 million higher than was appropriated last year. We can talk about reductions all we like, but I think we also ought to take a look at the amount of the bill and how much it is over the appropriation of last year. Again I point out that with \$1,170 million and an increase of \$30 million over 1966, there is no reason why the Department of the Interior cannot find \$7,293,000 to fund the projects which Congress said are important to all of you. They should be funded, and the President can certainly find ways in which to do it.

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

Mr. BOW. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the additional \$30 million or more over and above last year results primarily from making funds available for additional school housing for Indian children. This has been in the pipeline in anticipation of the housing for these children come schooltime next year.

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman that the \$30 million additional is still there.

Mr. REIFEL. But it is necessary for education.

Mr. BOW. I do not quarrel with you about it at all. The money will stay there. You will still have \$1,170 million. If any agency is in the position of having a budget of \$1,170 million and cannot find \$7 million there for these projects, then you had better get rid of the agency, because we all know that there is plenty of money to take care of these individual items.

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

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We could find and save \$7 million very easily by knocking out this hearts and flowers expenditure for the so-called arts and humanities, could we not?

Mr. BOW. There is about \$7 million right there.

Now, my other amendment, I will say to my colleagues, limits expenditures provided in this bill to 95 percent of the level proposed by the President for this bill in his budget for 1967. Such limitation would protect the President. I want to protect him from people who want to spend more. It would, in fact, protect him from those who want to spend more than he is proposing. This affects expenditures only and has no effect on proposed appropriations for 1967.

The second amendment would limit the President's spending to 95 percent of what he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. It would prevent him from going further. I might also add that I think it would be a specious argument for anyone to advance the idea that any kind of expenditure limitation amendment would put the affected departments or agencies in a straitjacket with respect to spending. The Committee on Appropriations has already made desirable cuts in the bill where it was determined that they should be made and that action provides flexibility. Again I say to you that this limitation amendment does not affect one dime of appropriations in this bill. It says that the President shall be confined to 95 percent of the amount he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. They cannot force him to go beyond that. These two amendments should be adopted. They do not affect projects in the bill, but they do give the President a little help in trying to cut down on Federal spending.

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

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

Mr. SKUBITZ. My colleague suggests what we do is take a percentage cut of 5 or 6 percent on every project across the board?

Mr. BOW. No. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. SKUBITZ. What are you suggesting?

Mr. BOW. I am suggesting we take \$7,293,000 of appropriations out of the bill, which is the amount that we have gone over the budgeted separate items, and say to the Department of the Interior, "Here, you have \$1.2 billion. Fund these projects which Congress put in the

bill from the appropriations provided." After all, Congress has the authority to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. We have the authority to say to them, "These are projects which should be funded, and you can find the money to fund them. We are giving you this tremendous amount of money. You take care of these projects. They belong to the Members of Congress."

Mr. SKUBITZ. Has the gentleman from Ohio so decided that he could cut out certain projects?

Mr. BOW. No, I am not saying that we cut out certain projects. I am saying that you could fund the projects out of the money now being appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has spoken, and it is the will of Congress that these projects be given proper care. We say, indeed, take care of them out of this large amount of money we are giving you.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the 5 or 6 percent across-the-board suggested cut is concerned, this might be a good idea on some of these projects. The President says that if we continue to go beyond his budget figures, he is going to have to ask for increased taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a question of whether we want to have an increase in taxes or some real fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this House of Representatives has got to stand up to this question, and if we want to really protect the taxpayers of this country against further increases in the already heavy tax burden, we are going to have to go along with these two amendments which I propose to offer. They do not affect this bill one bit with reference to any specific project contained therein, except they would cut total appropriations by \$7,293,000 and would limit spending for items in this bill to 95 percent of the amount the President proposed for expenditure in 1967 for this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support as strongly as I can the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, with particular reference to the \$7 million recommended by our Appropriations Committee.

As you know, this amount represents a substantial cut in the appropriations recommended by the President for this new agency for the next fiscal year. It represents a cut of \$6,930,000—or almost 50 percent of the funding the President recommended.

Now I recognize that \$5 million of this cut applies to the national endowment for the humanities, because as the House report states, the policymaking National Council on the Humanities, which guides the work of that endowment, had not had an opportunity to meet and formulate its plans and programs prior to its chairman's appearance before the Subcommittee on Appropriations chaired by my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

My remarks are not addressed now to that portion of the cut. However, for the RECORD I would like to point out that the Humanities Council was sworn into office 2 days after the Council Chairman, Dr. Henry Allen Moe, appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The swearing-in ceremonies took place at the White House at which time the President spoke eloquently on the very meaningful role this Council would play in the advancement of our Nation's learning and scholarship. The Council met in full session after the ceremonies at the White House, and has now framed a detailed program which may now properly be considered by the Senate, and which I feel is most deserving of strong endorsement by the Congress.

We are not debating that issue now. Mr. Chairman, though I repeat I would like the record to show my strong support for the humanities program, and my hope that the Senate will take all appropriate action to remedy an omission of funds which is attributable only to the time elements involved, and is in no way a reflection on the eagerness of the humanities leadership to proceed with their important work with all possible dispatch.

Today, however, we are concerned primarily with the appropriation for the national endowment for the arts, the equal partner with the humanities in the new Foundation, and the partner whose Council has been in being for just over a year.

I had the privilege of serving as floor manager of the bill creating the Council. It represents a group of 26 men and women who have dedicated themselves to the development of the arts in this country, who are nationally and, indeed, internationally recognized as outstanding leaders in their field of the arts, and who have worked long hours—often without any pay whatsoever—for a cause in which they and countless others deeply believe.

We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing, or frills or furbelows, for the American scene and our way of life. We are talking about the essential quality of American life, the kind of quality that is absolutely basic to our goals for the future—basic to young people and their development as better human beings, basic to the middle aged and to our older citizens, basic to the whole fabric of our country in terms of both the present and the future.

All leading civilizations throughout history have placed great emphasis on the arts. They have done so because the arts translate into lasting, permanent form man's highest aspirations. These facts are beyond debate. For centuries the arts abroad have been supported at a state or national level. Today the taxpayers in all leading European countries support the arts. Austria, for example, spends \$1.70 per person per year for the arts, including aid to arts festivals which attract thousands of visitors to that country annually.

The per capita expenditure for the arts involved in the appropriation we are considering amounts to less than 4 cents annually. Four cents per person, per year,

to benefit the arts by the richest Nation on earth—it is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance. It is sheer folly, and a complete misinterpretation of values, to say that we cannot afford it.

And yet it is just this small amount of money which is so urgently needed.

It is the kind of seed money which can return itself many, many times over, which is fundamental to our recognition of what the arts can do to benefit this country, and which can provide a highly important stimulus to private giving for the arts. That private support is simply no longer adequate to meet the growing demands our people are making on arts organizations all across the Nation. The inadequacy of private support was not only described in detail during the extensive congressional hearings on this legislation, but it is manifest in the hundreds of letters which the arts endowment has been receiving since enactment of the public law. For example, during the period between February 15 and March 31, the endowment received 441 requests for grants; 136 of these were referrals from the Congress; and may I add that more than 30 percent of these—48 in all—were referred by Republican members.

It is ridiculous to suggest that governmental support will diminish private giving for the arts. Just the opposite has been true in those States which have already established programs financed in part by State funds.

And speaking of our States, at a recent conference in Chicago, sponsored by the National Council on the Arts, the Governors of every State sent representatives to that conference held to explain the new law, and how each State could benefit by its provisions which make each State eligible for a maximum of \$50,000 in Federal funds. Some States sent as many as five representatives to the conference—and all at their own expense. That would seem a truly remarkable demonstration of interest for any new Federal program.

There are 55 entities designated to receive Federal funds in the act, including the District of Columbia and the territories. By cutting the total appropriation for the States, and the District and the four other areas, from an authorized and recommended \$2.75 million to the \$2 million before us today, that means that each State can receive only a maximum of \$36,363.63—a cut of more than 30 percent. Whatever is appropriated to the States must be allotted on an equal basis.

To cut State funding for the arts by over 30 percent and the basic grants-in-aid program by 20 percent—from \$5 to \$4 million—would hardly seem in line with an economy drive, not matter how well motivated.

But I am not here to complicate an issue which has already been decided by our Appropriations Committee, or to debate the wisdom of the action they have taken. I am here to defend this program and this recommended appropriation against any further incursions.

The program is aimed at helping the individual artist and arts organizations on a nationwide basis, and at assisting

each State to develop its own meaningful activities in the arts.

It is directed toward helping the young artist, the young musician, the young writer, painter, and sculptor, as well as the accomplished professional who now ekes out a most meager livelihood and who has been searching for years for the kind of opportunities this program can provide.

It is directed toward satisfying the needs of our people; for there is a great new audience in our country waiting to receive and enjoy excellence in the arts.

It is directed toward education in the arts—education in the classics so essential to our understanding of what is best and meaningful; education for young people in high school and for members of the adult community.

It is directed toward increasing cultural understanding between our Nation and our Latin American neighbors, while at the same time giving our own artists greater opportunities for employment.

It is directed toward increasing excellence of design as it applies to our whole national environment, especially in the fields of architecture and industrial design.

It is directed toward making the works of promising artists known to a wider audience, through museum exhibits in our smaller cities, those of less than 250,000 in population.

It is directed toward building up regional support of the arts, so that their values can be appreciated in local communities and at the grassroots level.

Are we to say that this program, which this Congress enthusiastically endorsed just a few months ago, is now unworthy of one ten-thousandth of 1 percent of our Federal budget?

The figure we are considering is less than that, in actuality.

Are we to say that the kind of civilization our men are now fighting for in Vietnam is not to be enriched here at home by this very modest support for the arts, which make the difference between a materialistic society and a truly creative one?

In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that in the darkest days of World War II, the British Government—with a budget far more limited than ours and under the gravest kind of duress—brought its Arts Council into being, to boost morale, to affirm that there is more to life than guns or butter and that the values of the human spirit and the creative mind are deserving of support, especially in times of crisis.

In view of the achievements that Council has brought to Great Britain, achievements which have been projected internationally throughout the free world—are we to call this action foolish, or misguided, or in error?

That is what we are discussing—the kind of civilization we want to make possible for the future of our own country, and the image we project beyond our own shores.

If there are those who choose to attack this program, and make this minuscule portion of the budget a special target; if there are those who wish to make this small but immensely meaningful

program into a political football—let them remember the tens of thousands of people who have supported the concept of this program over the years and who have so eagerly awaited its arrival. Let them remember the leading members of the business community who serve as board directors for the many hundreds of arts organizations throughout our country, and who fully endorse this Foundation. Let them remember the strong support which labor is giving to this program—and the millions of our people it can benefit in the years to come.

And let them also remember that he who kicks a political football into the air is by no means invulnerable to receiving the final boot.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I urge most strongly that the full amount recommended to us by the Appropriations Committee, the full amount we are considering today, be approved.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, we have a problem in the United States that is growing by leaps and bounds and which is apparently being overlooked year after year. This year the Department of the Interior finally took a good hard look at it and came up with some recommendations. But the recommendations did not come forward until the bill was being marked up in committee. I refer to the blackbird and starling problem that we now have in the United States. This problem is tremendous. According to the Department of Interior, we are suffering losses in the United States now of roughly between \$50 million and \$100 million a year and primarily from the blackbird and starling problem. In the State of Ohio, we are suffering losses in excess of \$15 million.

I would like just briefly to go into the report of the Department of the Interior on the question of blackbird and starling problems:

II. NATURE AND EXTENT OF LOSSES AND DAMAGE

Agricultural losses: The total economic losses attributable to birds have not been accurately determined but have been estimated to be between \$50 and \$100 million annually. Reports recently received from field offices of this Bureau indicate total damage by birds, other than game birds, of about \$58 million annually.

Losses caused by birds in New Jersey have been estimated at \$2½ to \$4 million annually, with corn damage being the major item. Estimated losses in New York, on the basis of incomplete reports, were comparable to those in New Jersey, with damage reported to orchards, vineyards, and corn.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the bill there is an amount of \$665,000 to eradicate blackbirds and starlings, and the Department of the Interior has said that until they find means to kill blackbirds and starlings without killing other species of birds they could not use any more money than that?

Mr. LATTA. No, I am not aware of that, and the report does not so indi-

cate. The money to which the gentleman has referred, approximately \$660,000, has been in the budget for some time for research on methods to prevent crop deprivations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. I realize that such an appropriation has been made by the Congress year after year. I was coming to that later on. I am sorry the gentleman is attempting to confuse this appropriation with what I am attempting to do here to carry out a new recommendation of the Department to deal specifically with the blackbird and starling problem.

If I may now continue, the report states further:

Arkansas' rice losses have reached nearly \$1½ million. California reports an almost \$8 million annual loss from bird damage, destroying over one-half million acres of crops.

In Ohio, annual losses from birds are predicted at about \$1 million annually, principally in field corn. One report from Ottawa County showed a loss in corn of somewhat more than \$100,000 in that county alone. Dr. Maurice L. Giltz, of the Ohio State University, recently reported that the value of corn sold for cash in that State, subject to damage by red-wing blackbirds, is estimated at \$15 million annually. In addition, corn subject to damage and used as feed amounts to many additional millions. He also reported that many large sums are spent by farmers in an attempt to prevent the destruction of their crops. These efforts, in spite of the outlay, have been only partially successful. A recent survey conducted by Dr. Giltz indicates that an average of somewhat more than \$5 per acre is spent to prevent destruction of the crop in those Ohio counties which experience persistent predations. In addition to the direct damage to grain in the soft or milky stage, bird pecking is responsible for additional damage from molding, rotting, sprouting on the cob, and general failure of the grain to mature when direct damage reaches a critical degree.

Last year conventions of 15 farm bureaus passed resolutions urging assistance with bird problems. The American Farm Bureau Federation, at its national meeting in Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1965, passed the following resolution, on which that organization is now acting:

"WILDLIFE PESTS

"Blackbirds, starlings, and similar pests are causing serious damage to crops and property in many areas. They are a hazard to aviation and a carrier of diseases to humans as well as livestock.

"This problem is increasing over a wide geographic area. Intensive research efforts at State and Federal levels and prompt use of all practical recommendations and methods to eradicate these pests are fully justified.

"We recommend an action program under authorized personnel to control wildlife pests. Adequate funds should be made available to the Department of the Interior for this program."

The Colorado Department of Agriculture conducted a starling survey in 1963. Of the 400 respondents reporting, 32 percent stated they had no problem, 45 percent had a slight problem, and 23 percent have a major problem. They also predicted that the problem would become more serious in the future.

In 1962, 580 livestock operators in the North Central States were contacted through a random selection by county agents. Sixty percent of those returning questionnaires indicated that starlings were a problem in their feeding operations during the winter months. Forty-six percent of those replying

reported appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed by starlings.

A similar questionnaire in Missouri yielded generally similar results. From 100 responses, 55 percent reported that starlings were bothering their feeding operations during the winter months. Of those reporting starling damage, 48 percent reported an appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed. The information is significant because the response from the counties and feeders contacted was far greater than experienced in most surveys. It indicates much concern with the starling problem.

The October 1964 issue of the American Fruit Grower magazine states that growers in southwestern Michigan reported annual losses of about \$2½ million worth of fruit from starling damage. Blueberry and cherry growers bore the brunt of the loss. The Journal of Economic Entomology, volume 51, No. 1, in an article titled "Some Factors Influencing the Infestation in Corn in the Field by the Rice Weevil," states:

"The main predisposing factor which influenced rice weevil infestations in the field in this study was bird damage to the husk. Corn ear worm damage alone was responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total damage, whereas the birds were responsible for 63 percent. The remainder of the damage was attributed to normal inherent characteristics of the corn."

So it goes all through this report, a report put out by the Department of the Interior, dated March 1966.

Getting to the problem that the gentleman mentioned here, about control, this is a problem that needs some additional funds, and the Department recognizes it. Turning to the Department's own recommendations in this report and its conclusion, it says:

The 1966 budget of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife includes \$660,000 for research on methods for preventing crop depredations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. In addition to this research effort, the Bureau is spending approximately \$170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem.

Get this, my colleagues: they are spending \$170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem which they themselves say is between \$50 and \$100 million annually, and in the State of Ohio alone is \$15 million.

Research at the present level will eventually produce improved methods; but the scope of present needs compel that these efforts be increased to provide needed solutions. These methods must be demonstrated and otherwise properly introduced to the public. An experienced cadre with technical, demonstrational, and investigative skills and experience is needed for this work. Accomplishment of these objectives would require an additional initial expenditure of \$1 million and 50 biologists (10 additional biologists in research and 40 for field programs). Of this amount, \$200,000 would finance additional control methods research, and \$800,000 would finance programs for dissemination and demonstration of the knowledge and techniques now available.

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

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Is it not true that in addition to direct damage to the corn crop, there is also damage to livestock through the spread of disease by blackbirds and starlings?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As he knows, tremendous damage has been caused in his district, and there have been stock diseases carried by these birds.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. As a matter of fact, in certain areas of my district which are noted for hog production, several farmers have found it is no longer profitable to go into hog production partly because of diseases that are spread by these birds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this a little further and ask whether, in this Chamber just yesterday, we did not hear a number of our colleagues discuss the question of the wheat that was going to be sent to India, that would be lost through consumption by monkeys and rats and the sacred cows of India, and whether it might not be a good investment for us to try to prevent that kind of damage in this country from birds?

Mr. LATTA. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think that an investment of \$1 million for research to attempt to wipe out a \$58 million loss annually to our farmers would be a pretty good investment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Particularly at a time when we may face possible shortages in some of the crops that are being damaged.

Mr. LATTA. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask in conclusion, is it not true that this money would be spent to find ways to limit the predatory birds without damaging other wildlife and songbirds and other birds that we want to preserve?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct.

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, the Department is well aware of this problem. As indicated in their own report, from which I have been reading, they have—

First. A stepped-up action program to reduce damage in critical areas, relying heavily on compound DRC-1339 and decoy traps.

Second. A stepped-up research program aimed at finding techniques, chemicals, and other materials useful in coping with a variety of species causing a variety of problems.

Coming to my own State of Ohio, and particularly northwestern Ohio, I might say that a great many of our farmers, who have been producing corn for years and years, have had to cease raising corn because of extensive blackbird damage. I happen to have in my hand a picture which appeared in the Fremont News Messenger on Monday, March 28, 1966, which shows the blackbirds in flight from a field. The sky is almost black. This picture shows what our farmers are subjected to.

I am glad to know that the Department of the Interior has recognized the seriousness of this problem and has finally come up with some recommendations. I

am only sorry that they did not come up with these recommendations months ago, when many of my colleagues and I joined together in an appeal for relief.

The mere fact that the Department did not come forward with these recommendations until the committee was marking up the bill does not seem to me sufficient reason to delay this program for another year. I may say a number of States, according to the Department, including Ohio, now have existing programs. Through the Agricultural Extension Service and the game agency and other agencies in particular we have provided ways to reduce damage from birds. It is anticipated any extended program of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife will be closely integrated with these existing programs. The details of how this integration will be worked out cannot be spelled out here. In any event, there will be no duplication of effort or competition with present efforts. Any increase in the Bureau's resources for this program could be used to supplement and strengthen the overall effort by all concerned. In all cases the Bureau would embark on a program of a State only—and I stress this—only after receiving a formal request to do so from the Governor or from an official authorized to represent them in this matter. Also, the program would be undertaken only after consummation of an agreement with the State.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I might tell the House that Ohio is taking such a step. According to an article which appears in the newspaper to which I referred earlier, Mr. Roy Kottman, director of the Ohio Research and Development Center at Wooster, outlined plans for a crash program this summer aimed at giving better control of the blackbird. He said that eight researchers are being assigned to the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Kottman said that the eight researchers being assigned to the project will be aided by other employees. The research center last week received \$12.5 million in emergency funds from the State of Ohio Controlling Board. The program is to receive the same amount in a later allocation. Mr. Kottman estimated that the blackbirds, primarily of the redwing type, destroyed about \$15 million in Ohio crops last summer, which is about 6 percent, of the State's \$225 million corn crop. We can no longer sit still. We have to get moving, because Ohio farmers cannot afford this kind of loss. Some farmers lose up to 15 percent of their crops as flocks of redwing blackbirds numbering in the tens of thousands invade their fields. In areas near Lake Erie, Mr. Kottman said, we have had a desperate problem during the last 10 years. The bird problem now reaches into about 50 of our 88 counties in Ohio.

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

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONTE. I am certainly very sympathetic to the plea that the gentle-

man from Ohio is making here. I think it makes a lot of sense. But I am wondering if the gentleman was here when his colleague, the ranking Republican minority member of the Committee on Appropriations took the floor earlier today and said he is going to offer an amendment to knock out all of these projects. He was saying it to the tune of "Bye Bye Blackbird."

Mr. LATTA. I do not know whether the gentleman makes this comment in order to play down the importance of this problem or not. I hope he does not. But certainly the gentleman to whom he refers, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Appropriations, is familiar with this problem. As I understand it, he himself brought the subject up at my request when this matter was being marked up in the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, sufficient Federal aid to our commercial fisheries is of utmost importance. For with these funds we will be enabled to continue research into methods of increasing the amount of fish in man's diet.

In discussing the appropriation for our commercial fisheries for fiscal year 1967, I first wish to thank the Appropriations Subcommittee reporting this bill and its most able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for taking a major step forward in this Nation's efforts to meet the growing world food and vitamin shortage. As you all know, the administration's budget request was for only \$3.2 million. The Appropriation Committee recommended \$4.7 million, or an increase of \$1.5 million for the program in 1967.

This higher level of funding will allow us to continue with important studies such as those in relation to the development of fish protein concentrate which holds such bright promise in alleviating the protein shortage in the diet of hundreds of millions of people. We must also remember that in addition to such specialized studies, these additional funds will enable the States to go forward with their full research program.

There will be some who will say, why spend the extra \$1.5 million. For the answer, take a look at the population predictions. Reportedly, the world's population is expected to more than double by the year 2000. Food even in the near future is surely going to be as scarce as many anticipate. Then we must get much more food from the ocean—the greatest remaining, least exploited, reservoir.

The world's fish catch, in 1964, set a new record of 51.6 million tons. It may seem like a lot of fish, but actually it is not. The great bulk of the catch for one reason or another is not used for human food.

We here in the United States have made no progress, really in seafood consumption, in spite of important development in processing, storage, and marketing. In 1965, U.S. per capita consumption of fish, fresh, frozen, canned,

and cured was only 10.6 pounds—almost exactly the same as in 1947-49 and 1957-59. We consumed more coffee per person in 1965, and also more beef, and chicken.

I mention these comparisons to indicate some of the untapped food potential which remains to be taken from the sea. Seafood and fishery consumption has lagged. The consumption lag has been due primarily because we, and others, have lagged in the attention we have given to this important matter.

I want very much to see the commercial fisheries of this country receive the attention that agriculture has received over the past several decades. In total, the investment in agriculture may be in the billions of dollars. Certainly it has paid off—no people anywhere are well fed for such a small portion of their labor time.

I think it is time that we intensified our efforts to revitalize our commercial fisheries. Back in 1964 we made an excellent start. We passed some monumental legislation for our ailing commercial fisheries. One of the acts, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of May 20, 1964—Public Law 88-309—rightly gave rise to substantial expectations. Yet, what happened? Apparently we had slippage between authorization and full activation. We lost 1 full year of appropriation because no appropriation for aid to the States was made for fiscal year 1965. During the second year of the program the President's budget request for commercial fisheries research was for \$2.6 million which the Congress raised to \$4.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, these funds for research and development of our commercial fisheries represent seed dollars—dollars for research, dollars for development and dollars for marketing a woefully neglected resource on which greatly increased demands may reasonably be anticipated very soon. These dollars will not be wasted. They will be repaid many times over in increased quantities of high-quality food.

I urge my colleagues to support the appropriations for our commercial fisheries at the level permitted under existing legislation.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] and the members of his subcommittee for bringing out a very good bill. It is a prudent bill and below the budget estimate, and all House Members should support it. I am especially pleased that the Committee has seen fit to approve the budget items for the Shawnee National Forest and the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in southern Illinois. I want to thank the Committee for seeing the need and granting our request, to start work on the Lusk Creek Lake project in the Shawnee National Forest by including a \$50,000 appropriation for this important work. The Federal Government owns more than a third of the land area of Pope County,

Ill., where this project is to be located and the payment in lieu of taxes is small from the sale of timber, therefore, this project is badly needed in order to provide more revenues to these hard hit counties, supply a balanced recreational program for the southeastern part of Illinois and improve the national program of this administration to provide more outdoor recreational areas for our growing population.

I want to thank the U.S. Forest Service for their help on this project and again thank this distinguished Committee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments that will be offered later by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOWL].

Mr. Chairman, these projects that were added were added because the members of the committee thought they were good and thought they were proper. It is my sincere belief that they should remain in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is foolish to think that if the budget is cut as it has been here, 3 percent, that they are going to further cut that budget in order to take care of these 41 projects that have been added. They just will not do it.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I want to thank the subcommittee for the language which has been placed in the report on pages 8 and 9 with reference to a construction start on the school at Eufaula, Okla., and with reference to the agricultural extension program for the Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a clarification from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], a question with reference to the language which appears on page 8 of the report which states as follows:

The committee recommends that the agriculture extension program in Oklahoma be funded at a \$100,000 level in 1967, with funds reprogrammed from the mutual help and low-rent housing program.

What I would like to know is this: Whether this refers to the national funds for mutual help and low-rent housing program, or to the sum provided for the State of Oklahoma alone?

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

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

Mr. DENTON. That refers to the national fund, and not to the amount provided for the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

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

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the subcommittee which has reported out this legislation. It is my

opinion that they have done a fine job here, and I particularly would like to address myself to one problem which I believe is going to confront us as we discuss this legislation. That problem is with reference to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, today as we consider the budget for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, I think it is well to keep in mind the stated purpose of this institution, "to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States."

The Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, has recommended an appropriation of \$7 million, a reduction of \$6,930,000 below the budget estimate of \$13,930,000. The money that is left in the appropriation has been scrutinized even further with expressions of doubt as to the validity of certain grants to individuals and organizations. There seems to be much concern as to who should approve what projects applying for aid from the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, to continue to cut the budget of the Arts and Humanities Foundation is to cut dangerously near the point of leaving the foundation impotent and unable to carry out its purpose. If we continue to advance the argument that the foundation is in its infancy and refuse to let it grow, then we are acting like the parent who refuses to let his child mature.

It is certainly the job of the committee to see that funds appropriated for the operation of the Foundation are not misused or used to show disregard of the programs outlined before it. But I think that prudence and an obligation to act responsibly require that the committee and this Congress permit the Foundation the opportunity to prove its worth and the value of its program.

The creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is a credit to this Nation and to the men and women who have worked with dedication to bring it about. It is testimony that we can build beauty as well as bombs.

We have splendid opportunity in the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and we should give it the support and the opportunity to function.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would today resist any attempts to cut further the moneys appropriated for this Foundation.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, the Willamette Falls Fishway project at Willamette Falls in Oregon, is considered by the Fish and Wildlife Service as the most important single project dealing with the perpetuation of salmon and steelhead runs in the entire Columbia River system. It is accurately estimated that the annual benefit accruing to the various commercial fisheries, sports fisheries, along the Pacific Coast from this development would approximate \$4 million annually.

In 1904 fishways were built at Willamette Falls for salmon and steelhead passage. These are now antiquated. In the intervening 62 years new fish ladder techniques have been developed, industrial usage and pollution have made the problem of fish passage more critical, and these ancient fish ladders have deteriorated to the point that they are not much help to the migrant fish population.

At the present, movement of fish over the falls through the old fishway is possible only during a very limited time when water flows are moderate. Fish are delayed on their upstream journey at the falls by high flows, and cannot find or enter the present ladder during low flows.

Last year Congress appropriated \$600,000 for construction of phase A of the Willamette Falls Fishways project and the contract for construction of phase A has been awarded. It is vitally necessary now that funds for construction of phase B of the project be made available. Based upon the cost of phase A, it is now estimated that the total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project is \$3,200,000.

Private industry is providing 16.3-percent financing for actual construction of this project, and in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's findings, industry should make available approximately \$510,000 for those items for which it has been established that industry has partial responsibility.

It is absolutely essential and vital that funds which are now included in this bill be appropriated in fiscal year 1967 to provide for continued construction of the Willamette Falls Fishways project. There is absolutely no question but that the Federal Government has never had such an opportunity for such a sound business proposition. The total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project will be \$3,200,000 but the annual benefits to be derived from this project will approximate \$4 million annually.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the item contained in the pending bill to provide support for the arts endowment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is both wise and proper to approve this initial appropriation at this time so that we can begin to move forward with our program of national patronage for the performing and creative arts in America.

For a long time I have been a supporter of the concept of Federal encouragement for the arts. Last year in the first session of this current 89th Congress, I was pleased to be among the House sponsors of legislation that created the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The reasons I advanced at the time we authorized the establishment of this body are the same I now offer in support of an appropriation.

As a cultured country, we have moved at an astonishingly slow pace to enhance our indigenous art forms. Many other nations of the world are far ahead of us in this respect and the strength and viability of their arts provide proof of the value inherent in government patronage.

While we have these world examples of what can be accomplished by public agencies lending their interest to the arts, we also have a closer-to-home demonstration of what government help can mean to educational endeavors. The National Science Foundation has strengthened science in the United States to a considerable degree. It has done so without Government control, as well.

I am well acquainted with the response received from the scientific community to the help provided by the National Science Foundation. Many of its grants go to the University of Rochester where researcher after researcher has reported to me on the new scientific vistas which are opened by this aid.

In addition to the honor I feel in representing some of the Nation's eminent scientists, I also feel a similar privilege in my representation of some of our country's greats in the field of art. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] with whom I have worked so very closely in this legislative area kindly called my home community of Rochester, N.Y. "one of the bright spots on the cultural landscape" of this country.

As many of my colleagues know, Rochester is synonymous with the finest in music education, symphonic presentations, ballet troupes, art and sculpture exhibitions, the art of photography, and in all the allied activities of American art. Those who are close to these concerns in Rochester and its environs have discussed with me on frequent occasions the promise they feel is held out by Federal patronage.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, one of the local organizations with which I have cooperated in this regard, the Ars Antiqua Society, asked me to author an article for one of its recent newsletters on the subject of the Arts and Humanities Act. Because it expresses my feelings on this measure and by extension voices my views on the desirability of approving this appropriation before us, I ask that it be printed with my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of this body will see fit to keep the amount appropriated for the Arts and Humanities intact, and will resist all efforts to reduce it.

THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT

(Note.—In September, amidst a ceremony in the White House rose garden, President Johnson signed into law the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. This bill was introduced and sponsored by Congressman FRANK HORTON. We are proud of his achievement and are pleased to print the following article.)

(Written exclusively for Ars Antiqua Society by Congressman FRANK HORTON, 36th District of New York)

It is my strong conviction that the arts and humanities are matters of crucial importance to our society. Those qualities which make us wiser, more humane, more

understanding and more appreciative of beauty and truth are the products of a deep kinship with the arts and humanities and a flourishing cultural life. I believe that these are the qualities which must be sought in greater measure to realize national success and individual fulfillment. While the arts and humanities, through the ages, have sustained man at his most profound level of being, we are growing increasingly aware of the need for their broader and deeper influence. More and more, we recognize their values not only in terms of national prestige, utilization of leisure time, but also as a necessity for man in an age of science and technology.

As significant as a rich cultural environment may be, the evidence is quite clear that our cultural development lags far behind scientific development and that support and encouragement for the arts and humanities must be increased to satisfy requirements for expansion and excellence in these areas. Convinced that the arts and humanities have a role equal in importance to the national interest as science, I am concerned over the existing imbalance in our national life and feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility for giving limited, but constructive support and encouragement for the development of our cultural resources. Because of the magnitude of the issues and the needs, I have supported arts legislation in the past. This year I introduced legislation pertaining to the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and have testified on its behalf and actively worked to win prompt and positive action on the measure.

The Foundation proposals have received enthusiastic support in the Congress and from the various sectors of our society. In my opinion the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities will provide vital recognition and support for the arts and humanities while guaranteeing maximum independence and freedom from improper Federal control. Moreover, the creation of such a foundation would signify to the Nation and the world that a free society values and is capable of sustaining a rich cultural life.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and the appropriation therefor in the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967, being H.R. 14215.

Perhaps the best example to demonstrate that governmental support and assistance serves to stimulate private funding for the arts is contained in the 4-year history of the New York State Council on the Arts.

The council began its activities with a survey of needs. During its first year—1961-62—the council operated with a budget of \$450,000 over 70 percent of which was supplied by its State appropriation, the remainder coming from private sources. During 1964-65, the ratio was entirely reversed, with almost 75 percent of a larger budget—\$562,000—coming from private funding and the remainder from the State. The council's appropriation in 1961-62 was \$330,000; in 1964-65, this has been more than halved—to \$153,000.

During the same period, the number of communities served by the council doubled, from 46 to 92; the number of performances tripled, 92 to 277; and the

number of touring companies aided by the council increased almost twelvefold, from 6 to 71—from the testimony of John Hightower, executive director of the council.

A special report prepared for the U.S. Office of Education and printed in the hearings calls the New York State Council on the Arts "the most developed State council in the country," and continues:

New York has also amply demonstrated that a State can assist and further the arts without loss of freedom—without setting up controls.

The bill is intended to encourage this type of State activity in the arts throughout the whole of the United States.

A great deal of what needs to be said in this field has been previously said by my predecessor, John V. Lindsay, now mayor of New York City. He was the coauthor of the arts council bill, and, in support of it, in this body stated on August 20, 1964, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 20, 1964

I rise in support of this bill, sometimes known as the Thompson-Lindsay arts council bill. It is an important proposal. It is the basis for national recognition of a great national good.

The background for this proposal should be reviewed and the matter put in full perspective.

The idea that the Federal Government should assume a role in the encouragement of the arts is not new; but in recent years, it has been a source of heated controversy and profound misunderstanding. Certainly, the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States are in the national interest. We are continually engaged in an effort to strengthen our national security. Surely it is also in the national well-being to enhance the cultural life of our civilization.

What is the basis from which I speak today? It is my great privilege to represent in Congress the area in New York which is undoubtedly the leading hub of cultural activity in the United States. Within the bounds of the district are the Metropolitan Opera, Carnegie Hall, Broadway's Great White Way, the New York City Ballet, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the New York Public Library, the Seagram Building, the Guggenheim Museum, Greenwich Village, Yorkville, Gramercy Park, Rockefeller Center, the New York Coliseum, Central Park, Cooper Union, New York University, the United Nations, Union Square—the centers of book and music publishing, the Nation's leading daily press, advertising, all major national radio and TV networks, scores of galleries, bookshops, and coffeehouses. The list could be extended indefinitely.

There is mounting evidence of increased interest in the arts in America. I am impressed and heartened by such signposts as the growth of the quality paperback, by the increase in symphony orchestras, and by the increased patronage of our Nation's art galleries. It must be pointed out, however, that while these hopeful signs are indicative of increased cultural consumption, they do not indicate that the creative climate is as healthy as it should be.

I think it is fair to state that our national leaders expressed a more profound concern with the growth and development of the fine arts in the early years of the country than they do today.

For example, George Washington in his first annual address to the Congress, January 8, 1790, declared "that there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature." John Quincy Adams in his first message to Congress called for the founding of a national university and for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution has expanded over the years and now includes no less than 10 bureaus, 4 of which are directly concerned with the arts: the U.S. National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery—which operates only partly on Federal funds—and the world-renowned National Gallery of Art.

In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the development of the District of Columbia.

The Library of Congress operates a music division which not only collects material relating to music, but also conducts a performance program.

The General Services Administration is charged, among other things, with the responsibility of design and construction of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government. Its annual payments to architects, muralists, sculptors, and painters are considerable.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has had a program of making and using motion pictures in its educational program.

The National Park Service has a program for the conservation of our national historic and architectural monuments.

The Office of Education has several specialists serving in areas related to the arts.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises for a number of years. Particularly since World War II under the foreign building program, the Department has brought in leading architects to design many of our new embassy buildings. Under our educational and cultural exchange program, representatives of our artistic community have traveled throughout the world, testifying to the vitality of our national life.

So it is clear that Federal participation in the arts is hardly a new development. It has gone on with a large degree of success for many years. The hostility that has been expressed to a Federal entry is justified only when one examines the problem of Government control.

Institutions of American culture are confronted with a number of difficulties, the greatest of which is financial instability. No one embarks on a career in the arts to secure a "comfortable" existence as long as there exists a scarcity of opportunities and a surplus of hopefuls seeking them.

As the House hearings on this subject held in 1961 pointed out, production costs have far outpaced reasonably available revenues, and great patrons of the arts who once gave of their personal fortunes to support cultural activities are disappearing.

How then can we as a nation help to restore these institutions to financial vitality and to give the individual artist an opportunity to do what long and arduous years of training have prepared him to do?

It seems clear that Federal subsidies to the arts are not necessarily the answer to artistic development in this country. Rather the role of an enlightened citizenry is of paramount importance. It is the responsibility of individuals in all parts of the country—the general public as well as the wealthy patrons and benefactors—to provide the principal basis of support for the artistic com-

munity. Private enterprise, and the American labor movement, too, must continue to bear a heavy share of this responsibility. There has been heartening progress in this area in recent years. Let us hope that it continues.

Further, financial support is only part of the problem. The function of the Federal Government should be to create healthy environmental conditions so that the arts can grow and flourish. Too often, Government, through such restraints as inequitable tax treatment, actually hinders artistic expression and surrounds the practice of the arts with unnecessary restrictions.

A number of State and local governments are providing increased assistance to the arts, and it is to them that we can turn to observe some of the more hopeful developments in the relationship between Government and the arts. A number of cities and States already have established executive offices whose purpose it is to give due recognition and status to the arts. New York State, under Governor Rockefeller, has developed one of the best. Many more are developing programs for the systematic improvement of the arts. It is on the local level that these programs should begin, for it is there that community resources for private participation can be best utilized.

The New York State Council on the Arts has been a great success in fostering and encouraging the arts, and in the words of Governor Rockefeller is "providing a pattern for emulation both for the Federal Government and for many of our States."

As I have stated, the Federal Government has taken an active role in support of the arts for a number of years. There is nothing new about this. However, widespread confusion exists because many people mistakenly assume that all Federal assistance to the arts must necessarily involve direct subsidies. In my opinion, subsidies are not the first order of business. The Government's best role is to make certain that the environmental conditions exist which will permit the arts to grow, advance, and flourish on their own. Recognition of the importance of the arts as a national good is important.

The step that the Federal Government should take at this time in order to give this recognition and to coordinate the existing Federal involvement in the arts is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

Three administrations—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have called for the creation of such a council. I have pressed for it ever since I have been in Congress. It has always been a bipartisan proposal and has received widespread support throughout the country.

As I have pointed out many times, the proposed council would have no authority or funds to dole out subsidies. The cost for its first year of operation would be extremely modest.

The structure and membership of the Council is defined in the Thompson-Lindsay bill. There is a Chairman and 24 members. The Chairman is full time and paid. The others are not. Certainly, the Council should be composed of individuals with broad judgment and the finest credentials. The Council would have the power to study the state of cultural resources in the United States, to propose methods of increasing private initiative in the arts, to support increased cooperation among local, State, and Federal departments and agencies and to foster greater activity in the forms and practice of the arts.

The Arts Council bill is only one form of recognition. Again, what I am talking about is indirect assistance, not direct.

There are other steps that should be taken. The Federal Government should remove unnecessary restrictions upon the creation,

practice, and appreciation of the arts in America. Federal tax relief is therefore essential. I have long urged that the Federal Government repeal its 10-percent admissions tax on live dramatic performances. The resultant saving would eventually be passed on to the public in the form of lower ticket prices. Indeed it would have to be passed on as there has been a sharp drop off in public attendance. It would result in the creation and production of more and better plays, musical performances, and symphony and opera for the benefit of our citizens. Just recently I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in support of my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, pointing out the distressed condition of the New York theater, center of the Nation's cultural life. Without tax relief, the New York theater may find itself in a very serious position as it opens its new season in the fall. I had with me two show business constituents, Mr. Hal Prince, producer of such Broadway shows as "Pajama Game," "Damn Yankees," "West Side Story," and so forth, and Mr. David Merrick, producer of "Hello Dolly," "Carnival," "Oliver," who joined me in testimony of the seriousness of the financial situation of the theater.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Department persists in lumping the dramatic arts together with other failing industries. To the Treasury, the dramatic and musical arts, shooting galleries, dog races, and flea circuses are all the same. The Treasury Department retains the hidebound view that what is right for an industrial organization is right for the theater industry. Naturally, this position is conveniently overlooked when the Government, in response to Soviet competition, uses our arts as instruments of foreign policy in our cultural exchanges program. But the Treasury Department fails to recognize that without a healthy environment for the creation of new plays, new works of music, and the like, there would be little or nothing to export. If this is the view of the Government, then it is placing a strong barrier in the way of a free and healthy creative climate.

Another change in the tax law which I have sought to bring about through legislation is more equitable tax treatment to authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions in the event that they sell the rights to their works. Under present law, tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is discriminatory. Benefit of capital gains tax treatment is given to the author of a patent in order to stimulate inventive activity. We should have a comparable means of stimulating literary, musical, and artistic creation. The bill (H.R. 2519) would repeal the exclusions which presently prohibit copyrights and literary, musical and artistic compositions from considerations as capital assets. The bill further provides that transfer of copyrights or composition rights in the hands of the creator shall be considered a sale or exchange of a capital asset. Under present law such sales are taxed as ordinary income. Persons who acquire an interest in such property from the creator prior to the substantial completion of the copyrighted work would also receive this treatment. In order to avoid difficulties which could arise in the operation of this legislation, two limitations have been written into the bill. A transfer would apply only with respect to work that has been substantially completed. Second, only one copyright or composition of a taxpayer year would be eligible for this treatment. This bill came very close to being reported out by the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress. It was stopped by the administration, which lobbied long, diligently, and senselessly against it.

A third area which has merited remedial action is the problem of authors, composers,

artists including performing artists who receive income in fluctuating amounts from year to year and whose earnings may be concentrated in a comparatively short period while the completion of the work itself may have taken several years. I introduced a bill (H.R. 2520) which would permit writers, musicians, and artists to spread the compensation that they receive from a work of art over the period in which they have worked on the project in computing the tax on this income.

I was pleased, therefore, when the tax bill in this Congress gave recognition to the problem and contained a limited "averaging out" provision. The bill did not give the relief afforded under my bill. The bill enacted does not deal with unused deductions and exemptions, and with small income variations.

Another proposal which I believe has great merit, long sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a veteran member of the Committee on Ways and Means, would provide a charitable contribution deduction of up to 30 percent for contributions by an individual to nonprofit museums, libraries, and other facilities in support of the arts. Under present Federal income tax law, a deduction for charitable contributions by an individual is limited to 20 percent of his adjusted income in all cases except gifts to churches, schools, and colleges, and certain types of hospitals and medical research organizations where the limitation is 30 percent. The proposed legislation would permit an added 10 percent to libraries and museums of art, history, or science. John D. Rockefeller III has suggested that opera, symphony orchestra, ballet, repertory drama, and community art centers also be included. All these suggestions which have been proposed to aid the arts either through tax and tariff relief—the Tariff Act could well be liberalized with respect to the importation of works of art, the construction of physical plants (buildings, concert halls, and the like)—should receive the closest and most detailed study from an advisory council on the arts. We could all benefit from the increased understanding that would result.

In the course of these remarks, I have pointed to much that is hopeful in the artistic taste and expression of this Nation. But for all that is full of promise, there is much that is shoddy and distressing. Bad city planning has crowded out reason and justice. New construction too often destroys the good with the bad. Roads encroach upon precious solitude. Entertainment often aims at the lowest common denominator. These may afford satisfaction for the moment but how much will endure? Artistic endeavor in America must not be judged by false or ersatz criteria. When we mistake the package for the product, the shadow for the substance, quantity for quality, and consumption for creation, we do ourselves a disservice as a nation.

The great ages in the life of a civilization have been those in which the arts have flourished. The Age of Pericles in democratic Athens was as noted for its philosophers, sculptors, and playwrights as for its generals and statesmen. We should not forget this. It was hardly an accident. The quality of a society is measured as much by its culture as its political and economic attainments.

This bill, then, represents an important effort to recognize the arts in the United States as a "national good." It is designed to pull together what at present is a scattered Federal concern. It is designed to give status to the concern and care of our National Government. It is a bill that has great merit and should be supported.

In an article in the Saturday Review of March 13, 1965, entitled "A Congress-

man Looks at the Arts," Mayor Lindsay stated:

A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT THE ARTS
(By Hon. John V. Lindsay)

Increasingly, it seems to be an accepted fact that the arts, and especially the performing arts, are a "good thing" for the community and the country. Four years ago Congressman FRANK THOMPSON and I were defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives in our attempt to put through a simple National Arts Council bill—a non-money bill that one would have thought generally noncontroversial. We were defeated on the ground that the arts and their general condition is no business of any government. One powerful Congressman denounced the bill as the opening wedge toward subsidy of poker games.

Only 3 years later, however, in 1964, we put the National Arts Council bill through the House of Representatives by an astonishingly large majority. It must also have surprised the administration, for it took the President 6 months to appoint the Council.

The Council's main job, of course, is to make a determination of where we go from here. What is the role of government in the arts? Is it possible to create a national goal to which the country will aspire? If organized society has an obligation to do something about the health of its people, or their education, cannot the same be said of the country's cultural resources? If the arts are one of the central elements of a good society and an important part of an individual's betterment, a source of strength to him, his family, and his community, is it not true that the health of the arts should be of concern to the elected and appointed representatives of that society?

The subject is considered important today where it was not 4 years ago. Something has happened to the politicians since that first unsuccessful foray. I suspect that they have been hearing from the housewives in their constituencies, who, happily, are beginning to become as excited about the condition of the local drama society as they are about the price of butter. More than 100 bills have been introduced in this 89th Congress for the purpose of supplying small measures of Federal financial support for the arts (unheard of), on a matching basis, to States and localities.

At the recent congressional hearings on the subject all kinds of testimony was presented in support of a Federal Foundation on the Arts; even Congressmen who would have left the floor in dismay 4 years ago were now declaring themselves in favor of it. Then, too, there has been a spate of State arts councils modeled after the pioneers in the field—New York, North Carolina, and Louisiana.

I'm still wondering, however, exactly where we go from here. We are dealing with an area so highly personal and individual and unorganized (fortunately), so experimental (again fortunately) and sensitive, that one treads cautiously where Government involvement is concerned. But granted the sensitive and personal nature of creativity, there are nevertheless some nasty unsolved problems of brick and mortar and boilerplate that make creativity unnecessarily more difficult. In the performing arts especially, all kinds of problems of business and administration, taxes and real estate, wage scales and other union requirements, foreign competition and costs in general are involved. There is no reason why these problems cannot be lessened, but any progress will require a very exact knowledge of the industry.

I have discovered, in researching this subject, that knowledge is hard to come by, that the discovery of facts and full information is most difficult. That is one of the several

reasons that I am excited by the new Rockefeller panel report, "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects." This was a blue-ribbon panel, so good and so responsible that I could not mention some of its members without calamitous omission; let me only say that John D. Rockefeller III, who has given luster and strength to the performing arts in New York City, was its chairman.

Fascinating stuff in this report. Did you know, for example, that in 1963, of the \$10 billion that was contributed by Americans to all charities, 78.6 percent was contributed by individuals, as opposed to 8.2 percent by foundations, 7.9 percent by wills and last testaments, and 5.3 percent by business corporations? I had begun to think that the foundations were the sources of all nongovernmental beneficence in this area. "Nothing could be further from the truth," concludes the panel. "For arts organizations to turn to foundations, large or small, in hope that their needs will be swiftly satisfied, is almost certain to lead to disappointment." Many of my constituents who have come to me for an introduction to a foundation, hoping for financial support for a worthy artistic endeavor, will sadly bear out the point.

And did you know that of the \$7.8 billion in individual contributions, more than 50 percent comes from those with adjusted gross incomes below \$10,000, and that those in the lower income brackets give higher proportions of their incomes than all taxpayers except those in the very high brackets? There have been some shifts in recent years that are interesting, too. For example, in the 5-year period from 1958 to 1963, individual giving to charities, increased by 39 percent, foundation giving by 62 percent, and bequests by 77 percent, while corporate contributions rose by only 2 percent, despite the fact that over the 5-year period corporate income before taxes increased by approximately one-third.

The beneficiaries of these sums are just as important to one's understanding as are the sources. In 1963 the \$10 billion received from all sources, included the \$7.8 billion from individuals, was distributed as follows: religion, 49 percent; education, 17 percent; welfare, 15 percent; health, 12 percent; paid into foundations, 4 percent; and all other, including civic and cultural, 3 percent.

Lest anyone still think that we are in good shape, however, one need only take a look at a few other figures. The average salary in orchestras in the United States ranges from \$2,000 to \$9,000. Actor's Equity estimated in a survey taken for the years 1957-58 that of nearly 7,000 members of its association employed as performers, the average actor's annual income approximated \$2,000. Clearly salaries have advanced since those years, but they remain indecently low. They are, however, still ahead of salaries in the dance, where it is estimated that \$3,000 to \$3,500 a year is the average income for a professional dancer (and he would be fortunate if this were steady from year to year). A prima ballerina can today hope for little more than \$10,000 a year. The prodigious cost of the opera is well known. The outpouring of money for 1964-65 for the New York Metropolitan Opera was over \$9 million and the end is not in sight.

Cost is, of course, the continuing crisis for all of the performing arts. The theater is the only one that has survived as a commercial enterprise and has been thought capable of self-support, and yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions fail to make money, and Broadway's output has dwindled from an average of 142 productions per year during the thirties to a mere 63 in 1963-64. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1938.

There is, of course, the cultural explosion that one hears is going on in the small towns of America. The Rockefeller brothers panel report finds that it is real and good and

healthy, but it concludes that the explosion is largely amateur. It needs professionalism and management and money if there is to be a higher appreciation and a wider understanding and enjoyment of the performing arts at their best.

The Rockefeller brothers panel makes the finding that one of the shortages has been information itself. This report supplies a good deal of information that has been lacking and for that reason alone is worthy of wide notice.

The final conclusion of the distinguished panelists is that even though so much new interest in the performing arts has been shown in America, it is surprising and shocking that the lag in the artistic excellence and the commitment of our people to its betterment remains so great. There are increasing initiatives by universities, communities, choral groups, and amateur undertakings, and there are great efforts by foundations and men and women of wonderful good will in every community who give of themselves and their resources for the construction of a local music, drama, or dance center. But still there is a colossal gap between what there is and what there should be.

What can be done about it? The panelists find that the energy must come from every direction. Most especially it must come from private sources and private initiatives. And it must come from States and municipalities, which must do much more than they have been willing to do to date. Lastly, the Federal Government has a limited but important role to play; this role will include financial giving, preferably on a matching basis, and tax relief. At all times, of course, the independence of the arts, their freedom of choice and decision, must be maintained. And there is the rub. But it can be done; it's been done elsewhere and there's no reason why it can't be done here.

With great increases in leisure time, and pressure on all sides to make room for an expanding population, it seems more important than ever to take a look at the needs of the inner man, his outward well-being having been generally accepted as a social goal.

It is almost trite to suggest that the mark of a civilization is the state of its culture, but unless the point is carefully understood there will be no advance. It seems beyond further doubt that society cannot ignore its cultural well being any more than it can the condition of its health or education. Any course of conduct to the contrary is sheer folly and will show up as such by the example of other civilizations and countries, to our ultimate shock and loss. Therefore, it is incumbent upon us to get on with the job; to beef up our municipal, State, and local art centers and advisory councils; to give proper national recognition by appropriate and additional national legislation; to strip away the tax, real estate, and other barriers that stand in the way of artistic growth; to advance our copyright laws and other protections for creative artists and authors; to encourage our schools and colleges to begin early and complete training in the performing arts; and to encourage and make possible the widest possible enjoyment of the performing arts in every community.

Even in the best of his own campaign for mayor in the fall of 1965, Mayor Lindsay took the time to appear in this body, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1965, and to state:

Last year Congress authorized the formation of the National Arts Council to study the role of Government in the arts.

The bill before the House today goes much further. It establishes a national founda-

tion to provide Federal financial aid to such activities as opera, dance, drama, painting, literature, and allied fields.

At the same time, it makes it quite clear that such aid will not involve any Federal control of the recipients. I plan to vote for this bill because I believe that culture in this country is in serious trouble.

Let us review the state of the arts:

On August 10, a cultural phenomena took place in New York City's Central Park: 70,000 New Yorkers tramped out to hear the New York Philharmonic play "Beethoven's Ninth Symphony." The crowd exceeded any that the Philharmonic had played before. It more than doubled the attendance at the game between the Minnesota Twins and the Yankees the same night. It topped the gathering of 55,000 teenagers which rocked to the Beatles 5 days later at Shea Stadium.

The crowd in the park was an impressive indication of the potential audience for the arts in this country.

A recent Rockefeller fund report cites some others: There are twice as many opera groups—754—in the United States as there were a decade ago; in the same period the number of theatrical enterprises has risen by 15 percent to 40,000; the number of symphony orchestras is now 1,400, double the number in 1939.

The statistics indicate that culture is doing pretty well in this country. Not so, said the report.

Almost all of the recent expansion in the arts has been amateur. Only 54 of the symphony orchestras are professional. Only one dance company in the Nation operates year round. Over the past 40 years the number of commercial theaters has dropped from nearly 600 to barely 200.

A few more figures: The average annual salary in our orchestras ranges from \$2,000 to \$9,000; many professional musicians earn only a few hundred dollars a year from concerts.

Professional dancers average only about \$3,500 a year, and the prima ballerina can today hope for little more than \$10,000.

The prodigious cost of opera is well known; the New York Metropolitan Opera required more than \$9 million last season.

Cost obviously, is the continuing crisis of the performing arts.

The Broadway theater is the only one that has proved remotely capable of self-support through the box office. Yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions lose money; fewer than half as many plays are produced on Broadway each year as there were during the 1930's. Few are serious dramas. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1939.

Performing arts can and do earn substantial income through ticket sales. But it was the conclusion of the Rockefeller report, however, that the arts cannot be logically expected to pay their way at the box office.

Somehow the gap between expenses and income at the box office must be made up by contributions, most of them from the private sector of the economy—individuals, foundations, corporations.

States and municipalities must do more. Most States would do well to follow my own New York, which under Governor Rockefeller's leadership spends nearly \$600,000 a year to bring theater, opera, and symphonies to small towns all over the State.

I have sponsored legislation to help the arts since I entered Congress in 1959.

Only a National Arts Council has been approved thus far. Now, however, I believe that more meaningful Federal participation is needed—specifically, money.

To date, Federal support of the arts has been largely ancillary. The State Department's cultural exchange program is one illustration.

The few direct Federal artistic activities, such as the National Museum, the National

Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery, are fine, but are concentrated in Washington, D.C.

Society cannot ignore its cultural well-being any more than its schools or hospitals. The arts, therefore, are the proper concern of the elected representatives of that society.

Parenthetically, I no longer hear much about that premise. But I well remember an arts council bill I cosponsored in 1959 being denounced by a powerful Congressman as the opening wedge toward subsidized poker games.

Our early Presidents were conscious of the responsibility toward the arts. John Quincy Adams, in his first annual address to Congress, called for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

It would be gratifying to President Adams that the House has been considering precisely such a law. For myself, I am gratified that the bill before us includes virtually all the proposals I have urged for the past 6 years.

Basically, the bill provides for establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which would parallel the National Science Foundation.

Under the Foundation, a national endowment for the arts will carry out a program of Federal grants to groups or individuals in the arts, enabling them to put on professional productions which, without such assistance, would have been unavailable to Americans.

A similar national endowment for the humanities will award grants and fellowships in language, literature, history, philosophy, and the other fields. During fiscal 1966 each endowment will have \$5 million to award, plus an equal sum to match certain private and State contributions.

To those who are concerned that Federal aid means Federal control, I call attention to that section of the bill which expressly forbids any department, agency, or employee of the United States from exercising any supervision or control over the policies, personnel, or operation of any non-Federal group dealing with the Foundation.

No statement, it seems to me, could more definitely delineate the Government's role in this program. With this safeguard, the small sums proposed can do much to cure the malaise afflicting the arts in the United States.

A nation's culture is its soul. Its enhancement enriches us all.

Mr. Chairman, with the record thus set forth, it would be unthinkable not to continue the appropriation for the National Council on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of full funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is unfortunate that the direct grants have been cut from \$5 to \$4 million and assistance to the States from \$2.7 to \$2 million under the endowment for the arts.

This means the matching funds available to the individual States will be cut from \$50,000 to \$36,000.

The overall amount for the encouragement of the arts and humanities is modest. This effort enjoys bipartisan support. It is a beginning program. It is a seed program. The funds for the States in particular are basic in my judgment to the encouragement of private or local initiative in the arts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I hope that a principle will be made clear here today

that is basic and of paramount importance—autonomy for the arts. The Congress must be disinterested as between particular grants. There must be a clear insulation from Federal control and from the dead hand of the Government. Congress should support the arts in my judgment, but without attempting to influence artistic judgment or direction.

The Congress must not interpose its ideas on artistic questions. This should be left entirely to the talented and public spirited men and women who serve on the National Council on the Arts and its several distinguished panels on the theater, the dance, and the visual arts.

The Congress has the right and clearly so to appropriate funds for the encouragement of the arts, but we should not deal with specific grants which, in my judgment, would be a grave error. We must, as the House of Commons has for two decades, uphold independence for the arts free from political interference.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities just as I supported the original legislation because I believe that when the history books are written on this 20th century, we are going to be judged not by how many screaming missiles or bombs we can produce. Bombs and missiles will determine, of course, whether we do survive—but we are going to be judged also on how we survived.

I think this will be dependent upon what type of scholars and what type of artists we are able to produce.

I had certain misgivings about this legislation and I certainly still have. They are the same as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] mentioned—that it will tempt the Government to dictate to the arts.

There is some language in this report with which I disagree, and I want to disassociate myself from this language because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. In my opinion, the words represent a veiled threat to the arts. This language is on page 36 of the report and is as follows:

The committee would also caution that extreme care must be exercised that those responsible for the administration of this program do not unduly influence through the award of grants, the type or style of art which is to be cultivated in this country.

As the committee views this program, there are many potential pitfalls that must be avoided if it is to merit the continued support of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest pitfall in this program is the Government telling artists how they should produce and what they should produce.

Artists and scholars must be free. They must be daring and imaginative, and they must be unafraid. If they think a congressional committee is looking over their shoulders, rather than stimulating and encouraging and helping artists and scholars, we are going to be frustrating them and tying them down.

If the day ever comes when I feel that in order to get an appropriation, an

artist must be pleasing to this Congress as far as his output is concerned, that is the day on which I will withdraw my support for this program because we do not want, in this country, the Government interfering with the arts. We ought to post a great big sign "Keep out," telling the politicians to stay out of the arts and the matter of awarding scholarships and leave such things to those who are best able to judge for themselves. We must not try to set ourselves up as censors.

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is most appropriate that the distinguished and able gentleman from New Jersey has made these comments with reference to this proposed legislation. Of course, this is one of the reasons why the people have been fearful of bringing the Government into these programs, however necessary such aid might be.

Mr. Chairman, Congress in the years ahead, like the administrative agencies, must be careful not to attempt to influence the arts and the humanities and their developmental progress. I know of no legal restraint that we could impose to bind any Congress in the future. But the Congress is going to have to practice self-denial and not try to impose its judgment over and above the judgment of the authorities who have the responsibility for the disposition of these funds.

Once we ever start to interfere in the sense of trying to express our own likes and dislikes, it will simply mean that eventually, for the sake of freedom of the arts, Government assistance will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman. I would remind my colleagues that in the Soviet Union, judges have just sentenced two people to jail for daring to be critical. We do not want to be put in a position of denying appropriations for any similar reasons.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes, or so much of that time as he may desire to use, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still amazed by the number of consultants hired by the Department of the Interior. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana could tell me how many supergrades they have in that Department, or if he could even approximate the number of supergrades in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DENTON. I cannot give you that information. I am sympathetic with your complaint about too many supergrades. In cases where the number of employees has been limited, they have contracted agency work. The work has

not been as good a quality, and it has cost more.

Mr. GROSS. There is now before a subcommittee of which I am a member a request for some 500 additional supergrades, and I have no doubt that the Interior Department wants some of those. I cannot understand why the departments and agencies, with these highly paid employees cannot do their work in-house without hiring all these consultants.

Mr. DENTON. I could not agree with you more. We made that complaint in our report. The gentleman will find it on page 5. We will follow up on that. I agree with you.

Mr. GROSS. I trust the gentleman will do just that.

I should like to ask the gentleman about this language appearing on page 43 of the bill: "Archeological Research and Excavation." What are we spending \$2,300,000 to excavate?

Mr. DENTON. That work is mostly done in foreign countries through American universities. Reference to it appears in our hearings. It is something that has gone on for years. Some of it is in Egypt, and the Near East. The Government has done this for years.

Mr. GROSS. So we can add another \$2 million-plus to the arts and culture, or whatever you wish to call it.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to call it that.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to know where it was. It is over in Egypt.

Mr. DENTON. Part of it is in Egypt and part of it is in Guinea, India, Burma, Israel, and Tunisia, where there are ruins.

Mr. GROSS. It would not be possible for the Egyptians to take care of their own excavations, would it?

Mr. DENTON. I expect that they can take care of some of it. Other countries in the world are taking part in this excavation work, which is designed to increase the knowledge of the history of mankind.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask about the Job Corps. Is there any money in this bill for the Job Corps?

Mr. DENTON. No, that comes under the poverty program. There are funds for supervisory work of the Job Corps which are transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered if there have been any more experiences similar to that on the Indian Reservation in Wisconsin, where a couple of girl employees of VISTA went to teach the frug and the Watusi. While teaching the Indians these dances, they were thrown off the reservation. Evidently the chiefs did not want the girls teaching the Indians how to dance. I don't know whether this is supposed to be art, culture, humanities, or what, but the Indians were dancing before this country was discovered. At any rate, they were thrown off the reservation, and the "Great White Father" in Washington had to send somebody to Wisconsin to get the girls back on the reservation and bury the hatchet.

Mr. DENTON. That is not funded under this appropriation. That is in the

Economic Opportunity program. We will go into that when that bill is considered by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. You will do what, when?

Mr. DENTON. When the House considers the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, I am sure my friend from Iowa will take it up at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Even though this bill provides for the Indian Bureau, which administers the reservation in Wisconsin where the trouble occurred, I still must go to the poverty program people to find out how and where the hatchet was used?

Mr. DENTON. They fund the program and they are responsible for its administration.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] such time as he may require.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, as we review the debate that we have had today, we will see that it has been pointed out that had any Member of the House written this bill himself, there would have been areas that he would have cut and areas in which he would have added. Certainly I find myself in that position. But I rise to recognize the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleagues of the majority, the minority leader, the minority members, and the staff of this committee, for the fine job that they have done in an effort to reconcile the many areas concerned with our national needs.

For myself, I rise to point out that I support the bill. As has been mentioned, there are certain areas in the bill that some of us take exception to, and in other areas, some would have added funds.

In the subcommittee, and again in the full committee, there was a great concern for the considerations of financial responsibility which dictate that we reduce or postpone expenditures in order to maintain maximum economic strength at a time at which our forces are engaged in an active war effort in Vietnam.

On the other hand, as the hearing testimony reflected, there are increasingly pressing needs here at home with respect to the management and maximum utilization of our national resources, for an expanding population, which demand urgent consideration.

Under the circumstances, I believe the committee struck a reasonable balance, with the assistance of its fine staff, and brought to the House a bill which, while it represents a substantial reduction of the budget total, makes a reasonable effort to carry forward programs which the American people have demonstrated they want their Representatives in Congress to advance, within the limits of the economic safety of the Nation.

Mr. DENTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question with

regard to the construction going on in Rock Creek Park and on the Memorial Bridge. This has been disgraceful. It has been going on for over a year. It is a hazard every night and every morning to motorists. I am wondering about what is being done about it.

Mr. DENTON. In the supplemental appropriation hearing that we had the other day, we went into that very thoroughly with the National Park Service. The chairman of the full committee wrote a letter to the National Park Service about this.

We have had continual difficulty with this and have taken it up with Park Service officials on numerous occasions. We intend to follow up on it.

Mr. CONTE. Is this a Job Corps operation? Are they learning how to build roads?

Mr. DENTON. This is a Park Service operation. It is an operation of the Park Service.

Mr. CONTE. The equipment out there seems to be rented equipment.

Mr. DENTON. That is right. They have quite a bit of equipment themselves, but they contract much of this work.

Mr. CONTE. I really think that the Pyramids in Egypt were built a lot faster than they are going to build the road through Rock Creek Park.

Mr. DENTON. I am sure you could not be far wrong in that.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman. Somewhere in this budget there is \$10,000 for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts. I cannot find it. Is it in the bill?

Mr. DENTON. That is in the report under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, on page 22.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. DENTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who sponsored the bill which created the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, I am very much interested in the section of the report and the appropriations relating to that area.

The spiritual needs of a civilized society must not be neglected while we provide the guns of warfare and the butter of nourishment. Today we should provide a full portion for the Nation's cultural life.

In the first place, I am concerned that there has been a reduction in the funds amounting to \$6,930,000 from the 1967 budget requests. This includes a \$1 million cutback for the endowment for the arts and the elimination of the entire \$5 million requested by the endowment for the humanities. I certainly hope there will not be a further reduction this afternoon. I think the National Endowment on the Arts is entitled to our support and to receive the full funding which the subcommittee has reported. I am sorry, indeed, that the National Foundation on the Humanities has not been funded, but I hope that the matter, when it is before the Senate will be remedied.

I am concerned about the matter referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I think we must be very careful to insure complete freedom for the arts in this country. Congress should not attempt to exercise a role which would be tantamount to Government interference in the arts, something which has been decried time and time again. Perhaps there may be a temptation for those who review the appropriations to try to substitute their judgment for the judgment of those who are highly qualified and competent in a field of the arts. We are fortunate to have a distinguished Council on the Arts to advise in this area. I believe that we should leave questions of type or style of art to its discretion.

In addition to that point made in the report, the report also strongly recommends that awards should be made "to established foundations, organizations, and institutions, rather than to numerous individuals in the field of art." It implies that future funding will depend upon emphasising grants to such established entities rather than to individuals and little known organizations which may be more inclined to engage in experimental and adventuresome programs.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts of money may be small, but the principles are weighty. One of the objectives we had when we passed the bill was to encourage the young artist, the new person entering the field of the arts. Every effort should be made to see that awards are made to creative individuals, although not recognized or established, and to newly organized groups, which will experiment and engage in venturesome programs. This in the long run will improve the cultural life of our society.

Again these decisions should rest with the Council on the Arts. Emphasizing grants to established institutions diverts the program from fresh creatives in newer fields and threatens to diminish the role of the Advisory Council.

I disagree with the rationale for not funding the Endowment for the Humanities because the program is not spelled out in detail. Testimony before the subcommittee pointed out that the distinguished Americans on the Council can be expected to develop programs in a dynamic way in response to events during the course of the year. Let us give them a vote of confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I will vigorously oppose any amendments to further reduce the appropriations, and I stress that freedom in the arts is essential for the full flowering of our creative life.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the bill, I intend to offer an amendment which I think will be highly beneficial to this legislation. There are no controls on the expenditure

of the many millions of dollars in the arts program provided by this Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215, and I believe that Congress should require, as a condition of their expenditure, that they be equitably distributed among the several States.

Last year, I believe, we appropriated more than \$7 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and I do not find any breakdown of the amounts given to each State so far under this program. This information should be supplied us at this time, so we can actually see how much each State has received, as it is supplied by other Federal departments and agencies. On pages 297 and 298 of the published hearings on H.R. 14215, it is pointed out that the proposal by the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts is to give each State \$50,000 for a total of \$2.5 million, but this is only about one-third of the funds provided last year, and being requested this year, and it will probably take some time to parcel this out to the States on an equitable basis at the rate the National Endowment is proceeding.

Sections 5(h) and 11(c) of Public Law 89-209 authorizes the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts to establish and carry out a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States with their art programs. The intent of the Congress in this section is clear, and my amendment would simply have clarified this and help in the administration of the program.

As we all know, many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and wrecking balls.

Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed. Time does not stand still, and progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values is catching up with the landmarks which remain.

The Metropolitan Opera House is an outstanding and world-famous victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

In December 1962 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall declared the Metropolitan Opera House eligible for registration as a national historic landmark, but the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., opposed such registration, and the board of directors, including Roger L. Stevens and Anthony A. Bliss, has continued to press for the destruction of the historic Metropolitan Opera House.

Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, is interested in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, as are many other well-known people including Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Leonard Bernstein, Dr. Howard Hanson, Laszlo Halasz, Leopold Stokowski, Martha Graham, Rebekah Harkness, Dr. Harold Taylor, and Phillip Langer of the Theater Guild.

My proposed amendment would simply require that, as a condition of the expenditure of the millions of dollars provided by this appropriation bill for the National Endowment for the Arts, none

of these funds would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway. The Metropolitan Opera House should be preserved and can be operated on a sound basis for the enjoyment and appreciation of generations yet to come. The Met's friends are legion, and will yet save this exceptional structure known as a landmark throughout the world.

I append pertinent material for your consideration:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]
MAYOR SUPPORTS SAVING OLD MET—AID SAYS
LINDSAY SEEKS CONSTRUCTIVE PURPOSE FOR
OPERA HOUSE—DEMOLITION SCHEDULED, BUT
SEVERAL GROUPS HOPE THAT RAZING FOR
OFFICES CAN BE PREVENTED

(By Theodore Strongin)

Woody Klein, Mayor Lindsay's press secretary, said yesterday the mayor believed that the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street "should be saved and used for some constructive purpose. He has one or two staff members working on it," Mr. Klein added.

The opera house, which was completed in 1883, is scheduled to be demolished to make way for an office building after the opera company moves out next month. In September the new Met at Lincoln Center will open.

The mayor is pleased with the efforts of various groups who are trying to save the old building, said Mr. Klein.

Among these are the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit group with headquarters in Mount Vernon; the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, whose members will testify at a meeting of the city planning commission on March 30, and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, which has asked the planning commission to institute condemnation proceedings so that the city acquires title to the Met property.

The architects' group believes that by easing certain zoning restrictions and granting special permits the builders of the planned office structure can be compensated for the loss they would incur if the present auditorium is preserved.

These matters would have to be studied, the architects concede. So they will suggest at the planning commission meeting that an impartial feasibility study be made to investigate their suggestions and, maybe, find new ones.

Roy Anderson, head of the Save the Met Foundation, said that this organization was circulating petitions to be sent to Governor Rockefeller, asking him to "introduce, support, and pass New York State legislation to preserve the famous Metropolitan Opera House." Mr. Anderson also said that he had information that could lead to a rehearing of the Met case before the Landmarks Preservation Commission or to a contest of the Met's lease to the group of real estate investors who plan to erect the office building.

TURNED DOWN LAST YEAR

In December the Landmarks Preservation Commission declined to designate the opera house a landmark, which would have saved it. At that time, the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects suggested preserving the auditorium and building the office building over it. The commission found the plan economically unfeasible.

TO TAKE POSSESSION MAY 8

The group that leased the old Met site is headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. It will take possession on May 8. The Met expects to get an average of \$485,000 a year in rentals.

A provision in the lease forbids the use of the site for grand opera or musical presentations. Anthony Bliss, president of the Met, said that the limiting provision was made for financial reasons only, so that the new building would produce the greatest revenue possible for the Met.

He said that many feasibility studies had been made over the years, and that the Met itself had investigated the possibility of building over the present house, but that all plans had proved to be financially unsound.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE
INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1966.

Mr. ROY ANDERSON,
Trustee, Save the Met Foundation, Inc.,
Mount Vernon, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Secretary Udall has asked us to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 10 requesting that the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City be designated a registered national historic landmark.

In December 1962, the Secretary declared the opera house eligible for registration as a national historic landmark. Immediately following this, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., was notified of the Secretary's action and invited to participate in the landmarks program. The association, however, declined to register the opera house because of its plans to demolish the structure. Since participation in the program is strictly voluntary, there is little more we can do.

We are in sympathy with your efforts to save the opera house and hope you will succeed in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,
HOWARD P. STAYER,
Assistant Director.

STATEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, THE
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, BE-
FORE THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COM-
MISSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1965, NEW YORK
N.Y.

My name is Martin Cohen, architect, and I represent the New York chapter, the American Institute of Architects.

The architectural quality of a building must be judged not only by its formal design in steel or concrete, but also by how well it fulfills the functions for which it was intended.

This auditorium is unique in the United States. There is no finer example here of the Louis XIV elegance characteristic of these classic 19th century opera houses. One must travel to Paris or Vienna or Milan to find a rival. But even more important, there is hardly a more satisfying interior theater space in the world. The hall has been criticized for technical stage limitations, and some seats are better located to produce revenue than to witness opera, but the fact remains that for the sheer drama of seeing, and being seen, in the exciting atmosphere of glittering spectacle, and for superb acoustics, this hall has few peers anywhere. One can hardly imagine a happier or more successful relationship between architecture and people. It must be preserved.

If the only way this great auditorium can be saved is to preserve the entire building, then the New York chapter would have to recommend the whole building be saved. However, we recognize the functional, as well as the architectural limitations, of the exterior building shell and would recommend that consideration be given to schemes in which the auditorium itself would be preserved, possibly with reconstruction of some essential spaces ancillary to the hall, within the framework of an income producing structure. We believe this theater can continue to serve New York's millions, while returning the site to revenue producing status for its owners.

It is difficult to avoid the analogy of Carnegie Hall. Also deemed redundant, technically inadequate, and slated for destruction but a few years ago, Carnegie Hall stands as an inspiration to those who believe in New York's readiness to preserve its architectural and musical heritages, and as a warning to those who would destroy our renowned halls of proven quality while chasing endlessly after elusive secrets to achieve adequate replacements.

We strongly urge the designation of this building as a landmark.

MARTIN H. COHEN, A.I.A.

[From New York Times, Mar. 25, 1966]
FANS OF OLD MET PREPARED TO FIGHT—NEW
BODY PETITIONS CITY AND PLANS TO RAISE
MONEY

Leonard Bernstein, Harold Clurman, Aaron Copland, Agnes de Mille, Gian Carlo Menotti, Tony Randall, Artur Rubinstein, George Szell, Jennie Tourel, and Peggy Wood are among the figures in the world of music and drama who have declared themselves in favor of saving the old Metropolitan Opera House from demolition.

They have joined the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street. Leonard Altman is chairman of the group, which is now being formed.

The committee has petitioned the city planning commission to start proceedings to acquire the property by condemnation and put it up for auction. Members would raise the money needed for a successful bid and for renovation of the old house.

Bronson Binger, an architect who is the group's secretary, yesterday said some money has already been raised, but he would not disclose the amount.

There would be no cost to the city or to any other governmental body, Mr. Binger added.

MET NEEDS THE MONEY

The Metropolitan Opera will open in its new house in Lincoln Center in September. It has leased the old house to a group of real estate investors headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. The Met expects to receive an average of \$485,000 annually from site rental over the next 25 years.

In a statement released today, the committee recognizes that the rental money or its equivalent is indispensable to the Met in its new home. The income the Metropolitan Opera Association will receive from "prudent investment of a fair purchase price—will far exceed the income which it will realize from the lease," the statement continues.

The statement cites the old Met as a symbol to the entire world of the highest artistic achievement, and adds that neither New York nor the United States can afford to lose it.

Other members of the committee to date are Stella Adler, Mrs. Douglas Auchincloss, W. H. Auden, S. L. M. Barlow, Thomas S. Buechner, Walter D. Binger, Robert Cordier, Kenward Elmslie, Barbara Epstein, Jason Epstein, Mrs. Mario Fratti, Robert Fryer, Hugh Hardy, Mrs. Gaston de Havenon, Mrs. Vladimir Horowitz, Mrs. Howell Howard, Charles E. Hughes, James Hulse, and Alan Price Jones.

Also, John Koch, Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan, Miles Krueger, Lucy B. Lemann, Leo Lerman, Sylvia Marlowe, Joseph Papp, Will Petschek, Perry Rathbone, Henry Hope Reed, Mrs. Artur Rodzinski, Ned Rorem, Gertrude Rosenstein, Mrs. Remi Saundar, Mrs. Thomas Schippers, George Schneider, Daniel Selznick, Leo Silber, Mrs. Dario Soria, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Strasberg, and Sherman Sullivan.

In addition, Harold Taylor, John S. Thatcher, Mrs. Lawrence Copley Thaw, Virgil Thomson, Charles Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Wager, David Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. Meyer Weisgal, and Herschel Williams.

Richard Caine Striker is secretary and Nathan L. Goldstein is general counsel.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 30, 1966]
DRIVE TO SAVE MET JOINED BY STOKOWSKI
(By Sally Hammond)

Leopold Stokowski has enlisted in the campaign to save the old Met.

One of the music world's towering figures, the dynamic, long-haired conductor added his name to the growing list being compiled by the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, whose headquarters is at 33 East 61st Street.

Leonard Altman, who heads the new committee, is a trustee of the Carnegie Hall Corp., and a veteran of the successful campaign that saved and renovated Carnegie Hall when it faced a similar fate as the Metropolitan Opera. He looks on his new job, he says, as "my second saving."

THE NEW MEMBERS

Along with Maestro Stokowski, Altman announced the following new adherents to the cause:

Martha Graham, Virgil Thomson, Henry Lee Munson, Leonard Rose, Rebekah Harkness, Raymond S. Rubinow, Mr. and Mrs. George Atkinson Braga, Mr. and Mrs. B. Rionda Braga and Marya Mannes.

Another leading maestro, Sixten Ehrling, conductor of the Detroit Symphony, recently added the committee from Detroit asking to be put on the list, Altman said.

Altman and his committee have been concentrating, however, on drawing up a report to be presented today at a hearing of the city planning commission where several plans for saving the old opera house will be considered.

"Everyone is waiting for our report," Altman said. "It is rather an exhaustive document which we think will lend weight to our belief and prove that the opera house is very definitely useful and can be self-sustaining."

TAX RECORDS CITED

Another organization devoted to the Met's rescue, the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., has charged that income tax records show the Metropolitan Opera Association has been operating at a profit and not at a deficit as Met spokesmen have claimed in their case for demolishing the building.

Roy Anderson, editor of the magazine Choral and Organ Guide, who organized the foundation in 1961, has publicized his findings that Internal Revenue Service records here show that the Met declared surplus income of \$3,573,411 for the 3-year period ending with the 1963-64 season.

In reply, Anthony Bliss, president of the Met's board of directors, called Anderson's conclusions absolutely inaccurate.

"Mr. Anderson has confused as 'surplus' funds that have been received for advance subscriptions and for special purposes," he said.

"For example, we received in 1964 funds for the new opera house, funds for productions for future years, subscriptions for the year 1965. None of these moneys can be truly counted as money received and available."

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Feb. 12, 1966]

THE OLD MET MUST BE SAVED (By Louis Biancolli)

While there is still time, and while the subject of landmarks is in the air, let me make one last, probably hopeless, appeal to save the Metropolitan Opera House.

No argument for the demolition of the old house, and I have heard and read all of them, can shake my conviction that this most significant of all the city's landmarks should not yield to the inroads of business.

At all costs, at whatever cost, this building must be saved. Let Mayor Lindsay, Governor

Rockefeller, yes even President Johnson, step in and with their power of office safeguard this symbol.

For symbol it is, a symbol of spiritual growth. It is shameful that in all the practical and emotional commotion by good people over the preservation of this mansion and that public building, no meaningful official effort has yet been made to save the Met.

Don't get me wrong. I am thrilled over the magnificent new house at Lincoln Center, thrilled, too, at the prospect of several more years of the farsighted and daring leadership of Rudolf Bing.

I have no quarrel with institutions that like to better themselves. Like men of vision they must move on. But a house cannot move. It either remains where it is or it is torn down. But some houses are institutions too.

Such an institution is the Metropolitan. The house is of the city's very organic make-up. Removing it will leave a hole, a hole to be filled up by still one more office building. Every city in the world, large or small, has office buildings.

Only New York has a Metropolitan Opera House, a lodestone of artistic glamor for generations, a refuge for the millions hungering for great singing. After 8 decades of service the Met deserves better than to be destroyed like an old horse.

Other cities have their own opera houses, valued, cherished, preserved, even subsidized. None but New York has the Metropolitan. It belongs to the world. Among all opera houses this has a special sacredness. No other house has such memories to enshrine.

Berate its exterior for the aging warehouse that it seems. Enumerate the places in the house from which it is hard to see. Itemize the signs of physical deterioration. They amount to nothing beside the grandeur of its interior.

Our renovators, given the money and signal, could go in there and redo everything in one long summer. Given public and official interest, they could turn every office into a museum of opera. That part of the house could be a world center of mementoes.

The rest—so hospitable for singer and listener alike, so commodious, yet so friendly from seat to seat, row to row, aisle to aisle, level to level, would remain New York's guest room for the great visiting ensembles.

I am convinced that, with unbiased effort, 40 weeks of ballet and opera, from outside or inside New York, could be booked into a preserved Metropolitan. If not profitably, at least deservedly, New Yorkers deserve that break.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 31, 1966]
THE OLD MET'S FRIENDS FIGHT ON TO SAVE IT
(By Sally Hammond)

With the clock ticking closer to midnight for the old Met, a host of its would-be rescuers were given a sympathetic hearing by the city planning commission.

Commissioner Ballard stretched a point yesterday to hear all the arguments that a "constructive purpose" could be found for the historic building, to use Mayor Lindsay's hopeful expression.

Ballard put the rather tense witnesses at ease, saying: "We of the commission would certainly applaud if you can figure out any way to do it." But he added that his commission could not settle the matter.

THIRD FORCE OPERA

Among the most effective speakers was Laszlo Halasz, the distinguished conductor who 20 years ago helped found the now flourishing New York City Opera and was its first general manager.

Just returned from conducting engagements in Europe, Halasz said he was "sad-

dened" to find plans for the Met's demolition going ahead "in spite of all efforts."

Speaking as a practical artist, Halasz insisted that the old Met could be operated with very little money with a different approach. In a statement he brushed aside the theater's so-called shortcomings and suggested smaller scale productions, stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting.

The city is ready for a third force opera, he said, with the new Met on one hand with its name stars and \$14 top and the New York City Opera on the other with its emphasis on the contemporary. The old Met could present standard opera and offer a livelihood for young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe.

HUROK IS QUOTED

Leonard Altman, who announced that Isaac Stern, the "savior of Carnegie Hall," had just joined his Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, submitted a 21-page statement ending with a quote by Sol Hurok: "Give me a 4,000-seat house and I'll keep it going 52 weeks a year." The committee claims that private funds are available to purchase and renovate the building and that it can be made self-sustaining.

Altman petitioned the commission to recommend to the mayor that he place the matter of preservation of this house before the proper civic authority so that proceedings leading to the city's taking title to the property at the earliest possible date can be initiated.

Martin H. Cohen, speaking for the American Institute of Architects, New York chapter, said: "To destroy the Met's auditorium would be tantamount to civic vandalism." And Mrs. Katherine Thayer Hobson, secretary of the Fine Arts Federation, said, "The amount of mail we have been getting is tremendous. If we do not save the Met we will be failing our duty to the whole country."

Roy Anderson, president of the Save the Met Foundation, charged again that the Metropolitan Opera Association was running a surplus and did not need to lease the site. Anthony Bliss, of the Met's board of directors, called his statement scurrilous. "Our books are open to all," he said.

[From the New York World-Telegram & The Sun, Feb. 9, 1966]

THE MET DOES WELL

In the "Closeup" column by Hope Johnson February 1, Mr. Bing is quoted as saying, "The Met will never make money, neither will any other opera not State subsidized."

The Save the Met Foundation would like to point out that, according to statements issued by the comptroller of the Metropolitan Opera Association, Mr. Bing had the following excesses after expenditures for 1961, 1962, and 1963:

1961	\$1,423,825
1962	1,812,080
1963	337,506

This amounts to \$3,573,411 balance in excess of expenditures during the past 3 years. The total income for the same 3 years was \$24,873,574.

Therefore, Mr. Bing appears to be doing quite well, even without a State subsidy. If any commercial, profitmaking corporation could make a 14.3 percent profit after taxes during a 3-year period it would hold up its head in pride.

In case your readers are interested we are continuing the fight to save the historic Metropolitan Opera House from demolition, and still have high hopes for success.

ROY ANDERSON,
Save the Met Foundation.

COMPARISON

Comparison of contributions filed by Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., on 990-A filing for year ending June 30, 1964, with contributions claimed by other organizations on their 990-A fillings for same period ending June 30, 1964:

Organization	Amount of gift claimed	Amount filed by Metropolitan Opera Association
Kathryn Long Trust	\$13,584.78	\$20,000
Metropolitan Opera Endowment Trust	7,889.45	1,964
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts	75,520.61	(1)
Cornelius M. Bliss Memorial Fund	4,300.00	2,600
Metropolitan Opera Guild, Inc.	261,000.00	276,100
James Foundation	100,000.00	50,000
Oaklawn Foundation	500.00	500
Cecil Blaifner Hudson Foundation	(2)	5,500
Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation	25,000.00	25,400
Gramma Fisher Foundation	(2)	71,000
Preservation Society for New- port County	(2)	5,000
Youths' Friend Association	(2)	1,000
Ford Foundation	600,000.00	(1)
Do.	25,000.00	25,000

¹ None.

² No filing of 990-A.

In that certain of the organizations contributing to the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., have not filed 990-A forms, the above schedule is incomplete. However, there appears to be at least eight organizations whose 990-A filings contain a different amount than shown on the 990-A filing submitted by the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]
PLAN WOULD KEEP MET WITH NEW BUILDING OVER IT—ARCHITECT WANTS CITY BOARD TO DEFER DECISION ON A REPLACEMENT

(By Theodore Strongin)

A full exploration into ways of saving the auditorium of the present Metropolitan Opera House, by building over it rather than demolishing it, was suggested yesterday to the city planning commission.

The proposal was made by Martin Cohen, representing the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, at a commission meeting in city hall. Mr. Cohen asked the commission to delay action for 3 months on an application for a special zoning permit, submitted by the builders of a 40-story office building planned for the site when the Met moves out on May 10. The delay would allow time for the study to be made.

The Met will open its next season in September in its new house in Lincoln Center. The opera company has leased its old site for 50 years to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers, who plan to demolish the old house and erect the new building after the Met moves out on May 10.

The delay was opposed by Samuel Kramer, attorney for Keystone Associates. He said it would be unfair to ask Keystone to wait longer before starting the project, in view of the valuable time, effort and money already spent in engineering and architectural studies.

Mr. Cohen suggested a number of ways in which the developers could be recompensed for the loss of money-earning floor space and for added construction costs should they decide to include the auditorium in their new building. The city could allow them to build higher, and it could waive the requirement by which buildings must be terraced back from the street at certain heights.

Besides the architects' chapter, several other groups as well as individuals made strong pleas for saving the Met. William F. R. Ballard, chairman of the commission, ruled these out of order, saying that they did not bear on the business at hand, which was specifically the special zoning permit application. For the most part Commissioner Ballard let the pleas be heard anyway.

Among those testifying were members of the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, who proposed that the city acquire the building at no cost to itself, and let the committee renovate and run it as a hall for music and dance. The committee would raise the needed money.

Roy Anderson, speaking for the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., declared that the Met's lease to Keystone was invalid, and that so were many of the Met's financial statements, which it used as evidence in getting permission from the courts to make the lease.

Several others testified mostly for saving the Met but one was against.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 3, 1966]

SAVE THE MET FOR SHAKESPEARE

Shakespeare in the old Metropolitan Opera House?

Philip Langer, speaking for the Theater Guild, would very much like to see the historic Met with its capacious stage saved from demolition for just that purpose.

In a letter to City Planning Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote:

"We urge and entreat you to make every effort to preserve the Metropolitan Opera House. There are not enough large auditoriums in New York City to handle the large number of Shakespearean and other classical spectacles that would like to come here."

ISAAC STERN AGREES

Citing the same need, Isaac Stern, the violinist whose efforts helped save Carnegie Hall, wired the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera to say, in part:

"Theaters of this large size and with (the Met's) purposefulness are much too rare and can be of enormous value to the artistic expansion of the city of New York.

"I feel that this hall could operate 40 weeks a year with absolutely no detriment or competition whatsoever to the new auditoriums now being completed."

In the Theater Guild's plea to Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote that several times in recent years the Guild has tried to engage the Met for a season of Shakespeare. But the hall was never available, except in May, a notably poor time for legitimate presentations.

NO PLACE TO PLAY

Also, efforts to bring productions to the New York City Center found that, too, unavailable and the productions were thus unable to come to New York.

"If the Metropolitan Opera House were to be saved," Langer summed up, "we feel it is evident with a large number of opera, ballet, and theatrical producers in the city that the Metropolitan Opera House could be filled throughout the season with exciting productions that otherwise cannot come here, and have not come here through the years."

STATEMENT OF LASZLO HALASZ IN FAVOR OF SAVING THE METROPOLITAN AUDITORIUM, TO NEW YORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, MARCH 30, 1966

The Metropolitan Opera House should be saved. Its historic and esthetic values should be assessed by experts in the field.

I shall limit myself to the question of the constructive purpose for which it should be preserved, a point raised by Mayor Lindsay

in his endorsement of rescuing the Metropolitan from destruction.

The Met is the only theater in Greater New York which could serve as a true Stadttheater, or municipal theater, and, because of its central location and large seating capacity, which could be managed economically as well. If this auditorium were destroyed, decades might pass before another theater of its capacities could be constructed, and at a frightful cost.

The so-called shortcomings of the theater do not really furnish arguments against the preservation of the opera house. Although 600 seats allegedly have obstructed views, this does not seem to prevent their being sold for almost every performance. And if scenery and staging were designed to occupy a more central portion of the stage, the angles of visibility (even from obstructed-view seats) would be improved considerably. Moreover, the 600 seats could be used by the blind, increasing their so-limited opportunities to attend live performances. Similarly, the so-called inadequacy of backstage storage space for scenery, props, etc., is also closely connected with the requirements of large-scale productions, which emphasize the grand rather than the opera. With a different approach to production problems, drawbacks could be overcome by stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting. (The crucial and ever-present question of costs might also be resolved by this kind of reassessment of the basic philosophy of operatic production.) Although I concede that office space is very cramped, the dedicated Met staff has functioned well within these limitations. A different operation resulting in the reduction of personnel occupying the theater could provide more elbow room. Lastly, the present lack of air-conditioning in the house is the problem most easily dealt with. Since New York is a summer festival, as we are continually reading, an air-conditioned Metropolitan would draw large audiences and quickly amortize the initial cost of the installation of equipment, incidentally adding immeasurably to the meager local summer theater facilities.

The following theater arts should comprise the saved Metropolitan-City Theater:

OPERA

Greater New York City is ready for a third force in opera. The Metropolitan is more and more becoming an organization which concentrates on the presentation of name stars in performances available to the few who can obtain tickets and afford to spend up to \$14.00 apiece for them; the City Opera Co. focuses on American, contemporary, and the lesser known operatic works. The standard operas, however, which still appeal most to the operagoers of the world, including those of Greater New York City, with its large ethnic groups, offer the best chance of livelihood for the young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe. This standard repertoire is simply not available to the masses of New York during the main seasons.

Therefore, I visualize another opera company in addition to the Metropolitan and the City Opera, one leaning heavily on the established repertoire and devoted to presenting higher quality performances in new scenic productions by thoroughly rehearsed ensembles featuring the cream of American singers and creative artists, those in the United States and others who should be repatriated. The main consideration in the attainment of this goal is finding a suitable theater which could be used not only on the days and evenings of the performances, but also for the essential and sometimes extensive preparatory work and rehearsals.

CLASSICAL OPERETTA

The people of New York's melting-pot crave the operettas of their various national

heritages. The "Viennese Operetta" from von Suppe to Lehár draws sold-out houses wherever and whenever it is performed. The French Can-can-esque masterpieces a la Offenbach are not heard at all, and our steadily mounting Spanish speaking population is entitled to hear and enjoy the numerous Zarzuelas which are completely neglected in our city. A company concentrating on these musicals could fill a large part of the available season of the saved Met, and with stunning financial results.

BALLET

New York is the ballet city of the world, but outside of the New York City Ballet, no company has a home. Martha Graham's company, the Ballet Theater, the Joffre Ballet, Jose Limón's Troupe, etc., must perform in theaters and at times not of their own choosing, but to suit what is available. These companies, together with the visiting foreign ballets (Hurok attractions), could represent another large portion of the booking of the newly formed Stadt Theater.

DRAMA

There are historical plays which we do not see and hear in New York because they require mammoth stages, large casts, and commensurate seating capacities in order to equalize the cost. Robert Whitehead and Elia Kazan, both of whom have been in favor of saving the Met, could formulate plans for such a division.

To summarize, the growing population of greater New York and the cultural expansionism so evident these days require a theater which could house all of these art forms under one roof. The present Metropolitan Opera House is the only theater which can make such a project possible. Our city, our country, and our people are crying for it. With the dynamiting of the Met such a project would be demolished before it could even be discussed. Selfish interests or fear of competition (and healthy competition is after all one of the keystones of our national life) should not be permitted to interfere with progress.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Feb. 23, 1966]

DON'T DESTROY THE MET

As a lover of opera, a Metropolitan subscriber, and as an architect, I cannot help but contemplate with dismay the impending destruction of the present Metropolitan Opera House.

The old house has its faults but they are not acoustic, and experience with the two completed music theaters at Lincoln Center should cause the Opera Association's directors much concern. The City Opera Company's move to the New York State Theater (which will establish it as the first major company unable to sing unassisted in its own home) is but another compelling reason to save the old Met—not as an archeological artifact but as a vital and essential component of New York's life.

HERBERT KAUFMAN.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Mar. 26, 1966]

THE MET'S DESTRUCTION

One of the saddest aspects of the impending destruction of the hallowed Metropolitan Opera House is the ghoulish abandon with which gala performances are scheduled to celebrate the dismal deed.

But possibly even more cynical is the public hearing of the city planning commission scheduled for March 30 at city hall, at which will be considered the granting of special exceptions to the zoning laws modifying height and setback regulations for the opera house site. Thus the developers of the proposed office building request the public's permission to make a more intensive use of this crowded site—use which the zoning resolu-

tion enacted only a few years ago was expressly designed to prevent.

Not only is the community to be bereft of this noble portion of its history and heritage, but the community's laws are to be legally violated so that the bereavement may be profitable.

HERBERT KAUFMAN.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Mar. 14, 1966]

"BARBARIANS" THREATEN THE MET

A few days ago it was announced that the great golden curtain of the Metropolitan Opera House will be cut in scraps by RCA and sold as souvenirs with long-play records.

Here is another example of cultural vulgarity in keeping with the whole idea of demolishing the Met. Governor Rockefeller states that the Met (built in 1883) is antiquated and inadequate and that the real estate is far too valuable to permit the continued existence of this venerable building.

The Paris Opera House was constructed in 1864-74. Though it has an imposing exterior and marble foyers, the auditorium is ugly and insignificant. That the Paris Opera House is antiquated and inadequate cannot be doubted. Located in the center of Paris, it occupies a piece of real estate that is unquestionably one of the most valuable in the entire world.

But would the French dream of demolishing it to erect office buildings that would yield a fantastic revenue? Never. Instead they recently commissioned Marc Chagall, one of the world's greatest living artists, to paint the ceiling. The French possess cultural values that transcend francs and centimes. These values we have not yet acquired.

The demolition of the Metropolitan Opera House with its incomparably beautiful auditorium and acoustics constitutes an act of vandalism and those who sanction this sacrilege enhance our reputation as cultural barbarians.

LUCY B. LEMANN.

THE HOME OF THE DIAMOND HORSESHOE—AN ANALYSIS

(By William H. Edgerton¹)

(Architecture is the printing press of all ages, and gives a history of the society in which it was erected.—LADY MORGAN)

On the 15th day of May 1880, a certificate of incorporation was recorded in the office of the secretary of state of New York. The corporation designated in this certificate was the Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. As reported in Harper's New Monthly magazine of November 1883:

"In what other cause of charity would it have been found so brief and easy a manner to induce 70 men of business to subscribe \$20,000 each, in order to raise the \$1,400,000 which the Metropolitan Opera House was estimated to cost? Here there was not only the certainty of no pecuniary return, but the additional prospect to the stockholders of paying their admission into their own building like the undistinguished throng. One of them has computed that it will cost him \$20 to lend his box for an evening. When we compare this alacrity with the struggles of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, it shows that whatever may be the nature of the hold of Italian opera upon the high-dizened, select populace, it is at least very powerful."

Apparently the number of boxes in their existing opera house, The Academy of Music, were in short supply. In fact, the demand became so great for these boxes that

¹ William H. Edgerton is editor of the Dow Building Cost Calculator published by F. W. Dodge Co., a division of McGraw-Hill Inc. He is the author of the "Building Costs & Trends" section of the Appraisal Journal.

they "quite lost their character of unprofitable investments. Just before the project of the new opera house was undertaken, \$30,000 was offered for one of them."

An abortive attempt to locate the new opera house on a 200- by 200-foot plot near Grand Central Station was made by the committee only to discover after accepting the design of architect J. Cleveland Cady that adjoining property owners held a guarantee restricting the proposed site to uses other than those of public amusement, and that unanimous waiver of this restriction could not be obtained, even in the case of Italian opera. Thus thwarted, the committee made a more enviable decision when they chose the current location, a truncated rectangle of land bounded by Broadway, 40th Street, 7th Avenue, and 39th Street, in an area now referred to as Manhattan's garment district. This site allowed 60 additional feet in depth, and allowed the architect to realize the full potential of his designs.

In their 19th century prose alternating between awe and gentle criticism, Harper's new monthly magazine justifies the design of the new opera house thusly:

"The design of an opera house is at every point a compromise between conflicting claims. Fortunately, there was no question between the two great divisions of the house, the stage and the auditorium. The auditorium is quite the largest in the world, exceeding its closest rivals, San Carlos at Naples, and La Scala at Milan, by some feet in every dimension. The stage is exceeded in area only by two, that of the Imperial Opera in St. Petersburg and that of the New Opera in Paris. But it is evident from the plan that the dependencies of the auditorium have been in some degree sacrificed to the auditorium itself. This sacrifice is not of the stairways, by any means, but simply of the corridors, which are in some places narrowed beyond what an architect would probably think desirable for the free circulation of an audience between the acts. The number of occupants in each tier of the boxes is so small, 222 being the maximum, and only the male half of these being liable to engagements between the acts, that the narrowing of the corridors does not threaten any physical inconvenience, but only some impairment of the character of dignity and spaciousness which it is desirable to give to the corridors. The entrances and exits, indeed, are entirely ample, almost beyond example elsewhere. It has often been pointed out how far inferior modern public buildings are in means of access and departure to those of the Romans. It would not occur to anybody to call the doorways of a modern building vomitoria, even if modern notions of verbal propriety did not restrain him. Here, however, with the rare good fortune in New York of a building standing free on all four sides, it was comparatively easy to contrive ample and separate entrances to all parts of the house, at no greater inconvenience than that of an increase in the number of ticket takers. The great double staircase, which is gained from the Broadway entrance, through a vestibule 63 by 37, in two flights, each of 12 feet in width, gives access to all parts of the house except the gallery. There are also large vestibules midway down each side, that on 39th Street 70 by 33, that on 40th Street 50 by 33. To each of these entrances carriages may drive under cover of a permanent veranda of metal, and from each a winding staircase, contrived in the space between the curve of the amphitheater and the rectangle in which it is inscribed, gives access to the boxes; while from each of these side entrances a staircase rises to the balcony, and two to the gallery.

"The interior form of an opera house is distinctly established by experience as the amphitheatrical, and very few innovations

upon this typical form are possible. The amphitheater in this case seems elongated beyond what is usual, and then widens at the stage end so as to give it more nearly the form of a lyre than of the glittering horseshoe's ample round, which belongs to the conventional temple of the lyric drama. There is a more important departure from the conventional opera house for the proscenium is altogether omitted. In the 14th Street Academy the proscenium boxes have been objects of desire, to achieve which there have been given whole seasons of intrigue and social politics. Inasmuch as the proscenium could not be extended so as to include the amphitheater, a widely splayed opening of a very few feet in depth, decorated with large pilasters at the reentrant angle, and still for convenience called the proscenium, is the only representative of the abolished feature.

"The purpose of making any box as desirable as any other box has by no means been attained, however, when the proscenium has been abolished; and the study of sight lines and acoustics, so as in some measure to bring this about, is one of the chief of the many problems which beset the architect of an opera house. In the present case, sight lines were drawn from every part of the house in each tier to the sides and the rear of the stage, to ascertain how much of the view of the stage would be lost from that point, and the contour of the auditorium and the pitch of each tier were modified in conformity with the results of these studies to the arrangement actually adopted. The result has been so satisfactory that it is safe to say that there is no theater in which there are fewer bad seats in proportion to its size, nor any opera house in which the difference between the best and the worst boxes is so small.

"The seating capacity of the house seems arranged with a liberality almost extravagant. The total number of seats is 3,045, divided as follows: parquette, 600; baignoir, 72, parterre, 216, first tier, 222; second tier, 222; balcony, 735; gallery, 978. And yet the New Opera in Paris, which occupies nearly if not quite as great an area, has only 2,156 seats.

"The facilities for emptying the opera house, while they are beyond those of almost any other theater, are less needed than in almost any other theater. Their amplitude is a matter of inconvenience, not a matter of safety. The destiny of a theater almost proverbially is to die by fire, and there is scarcely a famous theater in the world which has not been rebuilt more than once. Here it has been attempted to construct not merely a slow-burning but a really fireproof theater.

"The only combustible material it contains, outside of the stage, is the wood used in the floors and their farrings, and in the fittings of the galleries. The stairways throughout are of iron in brick wells; the partitions, apart from the main walls of brick, are of fireproof material, the construction of the floors of fireproof arches turned between iron beams, the flooring of the corridors of tiles.

"The ceiling is a great sheet of metal hung from metal bars, and its dome a great saucer of the same material hung from the roof. The roof rests upon the elliptical walls of the auditorium, which are the main constructional walls of the building, and the roof construction is of iron trusses. The supports of the gallery are iron beams anchored in the walls of the auditorium. Many difficulties arose in applying this construction to the ever-varying lines and forms required in an opera house, and many interesting expedients were adopted to overcome them. In order to gain an easy descent from the corridors to the front of the boxes, for example, it was found necessary to interpolate two steps, and this necessitated a double bending

of the rolled beams which were to carry the galleries. Moreover, as both the pitch and the slope were continually changing, no beams would require exactly the same bending, except the pairs opposite each other in the same tier. The contractor found it necessary to erect a mill of his own in which the beams could be bent as well as rolled. The proscenium wall is continued 25 feet above the auditorium, and required to be supported from the walls on either side of the curtain opening. A brick arch was not practicable from lack of abutment. The expedient adopted was a truss some 80 feet in length by 15 in depth, upon which the gable wall of the stage stands, and to which it is additionally secured by rods built in the brickwork. A smaller truss spans the curtain opening.

"The stage is required to be an open space from top to bottom and from side to side. The end wall of the building thus becomes an isolated piece of brickwork, unstrengthened by floors, 125 feet high from the street, and 106 feet wide. It is an unbroken surface within, but on the outside is reenforced by two massive buttresses 5 feet deep. The roofing of the stage is also an interesting piece of construction, for it is not often that a roof of 106 feet clear span is required to be set upon walls 101 feet high. This is effected here by an iron truss, set upon rollers to provide for the expansion and contraction of the metal throughout so great a span.

"As the stage is the point of any theater especially vulnerable to fire, it is of prime importance to confine to the stage any fire that may originate there. This is accomplished not only by making the rest of the house incombustible, but by converting the stage itself into a flue, inclosed in the brick walls which rise above the rest of the house. A large skylight in the roof of the stage is weighted so as to fall open when its fastenings are removed, and these fastenings are arranged to give way at a comparatively low temperature, and thus open the top of the chimney of which the walls are the sides and the proscenium opening the hearth. To put out fires which may arise on the stage, reliance is placed, beyond the ordinary precautions, upon a novel automatic appliance. A network of small pipes is hung above the stage, filled with water from a tank in the roof, and pierced at frequent intervals with holes stopped with soft solder, which melts readily, and drenches the stages as from a great shower bath.

"Among the novelties the arrangement of the orchestra deserves mention. It is placed in a brick bowl sunk below the parquet, and floored at a level which will leave the musicians visible only from the upper tiers. The sonority of this reservoir is expected materially to reenforce the volume of tone.

"Another novelty is the system of supporting the stage. The supports of the stage must be readily removable, so that any point underneath may be utilized as it may be called for by the varying exigencies of the drama. Ordinarily this requirement is fulfilled by the use of a wilderness of timber supports, any section of which may be knocked away as the space it occupies is needed. This arrangement is hardly compatible with a fireproof building. Here a light iron construction has been devised, containing some 4,000 members, which has all the facility of removal and reconstruction of the carpentry. The cellar of the stage is 30 feet deep from the floor, and this depth is divided into three stories, of which any one, or any section of all three, can be made available at once.

"The exterior of the building is considerably less like the stereotyped treatment of an opera house than the interior. Costly as the building is, it is so very large as to limit the

expenditure upon its external architecture. And this limitation seems to have determined the architect, together with other considerations, to seek for the effect of the great building through simplicity and expressiveness of general composition, and the utmost delicacy of such decorative detail as he must somewhat sparingly employ. The style, in deference, possibly, to the purpose of the building, is Italian, and in the Broadway entrance, which is more copiously decorated than any other part, is a correct and academic Italian Renaissance. This style has more elegance than vigor."

And today, more than 82 years later, this elegance—though much in need of a good cleaning—is a welcome relief from the monolithic verticality of New York's more recent architectural mediocrity.

COST OF AN OPERA HOUSE

The cost of a building is always of prime interest. The figures shown in table I were reported in American Architect and Building News of February 28, 1884.

The cost of the building, exclusive of land and items of personal property not reported in the above list, was \$1,024,061.15. According to historical cost information maintained by the Dow Building Cost Calculator, today's replacement of the building would cost the princely sum of \$45 million.

The first owners of the opera house were 70 men of business who each subscribed \$20,000 to raise the then estimated \$1,400,000 cost of the building and its real estate. These 70 men united themselves into the original Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. Originally there were 74 opera boxes—70 for the stockholder families and 4 to be disposed of by the manager. Democracy of ownership was so strong that the heads of these families drew lots to achieve impartial allocation of the boxes. Then, on September 21, 1883, the Metropolitan Improvement Co., Ltd., was formed and held its first meeting. Ownership of this corporation was identical to the Opera House Co.; the Improvement Co. was formed "to purchase, lease, own, hold, and sell real estate, improving the same by the erection of buildings, do the management, and conduct of such buildings for the purpose of a hotel or apartments, with restaurants and other facilities connected therewith."

TABLE I.—Original construction costs

Amount paid for real estate	\$622,191.44
Excavation	54,002.44
Masonry, plastering, tiling	401,664.59
Iron-work	272,539.70
Carpentering	80,271.61
Roofing	11,382.00
Plumbing	15,050.65
Gas-fitting and fixtures	21,694.62
Terra-cotta	16,510.00
Electric wiring	5,172.38
Stage, rigging, loft	28,343.84
Seating	23,044.75
Ventilating and heating	35,344.31
Decorating	14,349.68
Architects' fees	44,690.58
Total	1,646,252.59

When translated into action, this resulted in the construction of 70 bachelor apartments in twin towers flanking the entrance of the building. Ownership was divided equally among the 70 families: freehold of premises on the opera boxes and bachelor apartments above.

Opening in the fall of 1883 with Gounod's "Faust," the opera house immediately became an international symbol of the cultural excellence of New York City. However, even in those early days there was an indication of the hassle of real estate and financial affairs to come.

ENTER: MISFORTUNE

The first disaster was of major import; on August 27, 1892, fire came to the opera. If a sleepy patron had been in his seat, it might have seemed to him that the closing scene of Mozart's "Don Giovanni" was suddenly and forcefully coming true. A fortnight later, the American Architect and Building News carried the following story in their issue of September 10:

"The detailed accounts of the fire show that a most extraordinary use was being made of the building at the time. Apparently, a sort of scene-painters' festival had been going on there for some time. Not only was the scenery belonging to the opera house piled about in all directions, but new scenery for two other theaters, Hoyt's and the Casino, was being painted on the stage; and immense numbers of huge, freshly painted canvases were stacked in the flies and in the wings, while others were in process of preparation on the stage floor, as rapidly as the decorators and carpenters of the other two theaters, with the help of a part of the opera house staff, could paint them and put them together.

"To make this enormous accumulation of dangerous material as dangerous as possible to the building, the iron curtain between the stage and the auditorium was pulled up to its full height, so as to expose the whole interior to fire from the stage; and this notwithstanding that, by a piece of inexcusable carelessness, a temporary wooden floor, which was built over the whole area of the auditorium, on the occasion of a ball held in the building last spring, had been left in place.

"In some unexplained way, very likely by the lighting of a pipe among the easy-going individuals in charge of the place, the fire caught among the paintpots and varnish, and spread like a flash over the fresh, oily canvases and pine wood stretchers which were stacked or piled in enormous masses on all sides, as well as overhead. As might have been expected, it did not occur to any of these vigilant guardians of the great property to lower the iron proscenium-curtain, but all hands fled, every one escaping without injury from what must have been a blaze so sudden and violent as to have been little short of an explosion, with the exception of a boy, who had been sent on an errand to the fourth story, and, terrified by the sudden burst of flames, jumped down a shaft to the first story, and was taken out with a fractured skull.

"Meanwhile, the different portions of the construction behaved just as they were intended to do. The great skylight over the stage was shivered immediately by the heat, giving bent to the flames, and, by its powerful draft, holding them away from the auditorium. If the iron curtain had been down, it is not likely that the least damage would have been done by fire to the auditorium; but, with the proscenium-arch open, in a room 90 feet deep, 100 wide, and 150 high, filled with blazing oil and canvas and pine wood, it was hardly possible that the heat should not have had some effect; and the temporary floor took fire, smoking and staining the ceiling, while the balcony railings were partly destroyed, and the ceiling itself, which is of metal suspended from the iron roof, was somewhat injured.

"At this moment the firemen came in, and wrought, with streams of water from 25 engines, the havoc which seems to be unavoidable in such cases, soaking the walls, floors, and upholstery, with what remained of the scenery, and even the books in the manager's library, and the dresses in the wardrobes. It did not take many minutes of this sort of work to complete the destruction of \$200,000 worth of property, consisting mostly of

scenery and dresses; the building, with the exception of the stage roof and fittings, and the decorations of the auditorium, being little injured. No doubt, the skill of the New York firemen had a good deal to do with keeping the loss within such reasonable bounds; but it is certainly highly creditable to the architect that his building should have resisted so well the fury of such a conflagration."

In the beginning, the Opera House Co. had given a mortgage for \$600,000 to the Bowery Savings Bank, and when the Improvement Co. was formed to build the bachelor apartments, a mortgage of \$210,000 was given to one of its directors, Adrian Iselin. To reconstruct the building after the fire, together with his desire to clear title to the property and to consolidate the mortgages, Iselin forced a sheriff's sale. A new company was formed in March 1893, to purchase the assets of the two original companies at the sheriff's sale on March 22, 1893. Its name was the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.; its capital stock consisted of \$1,050,000, being 10,500 shares each with a value of \$100; and its directors included notable men of great wealth such as J. P. Morgan, William K. Vanderbilt, and William C. Whitney. Land conveyance to the new company was by referee's deed, and reconstruction of the building was commenced.

This reconstruction produced a slightly different interior arrangement; since the new corporation was formed by 35 of the original 70 owner-families, only 35 boxes were reconstructed, with title again termed freehold of premises. The new company leased the auditorium to various outside production companies for operatic productions, thus relieving the 35 owners from further financial obligation in case the productions operated at a loss. To insure absolute control over the affairs of the corporation, in their request for corporate status the directors of the real estate company included the following statement: "No transfer of stock shall be made except to a person or persons previously approved by the directors."

Then, in October 1889, when some operatic patrons wished to formalize the emerging social activities in connection with the production of opera, the Metropolitan Opera Club was formed as a membership corporation for the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music, the encouragement and support of operatic and musical performances, and the promotion of social intercourse among its members. The Opera Club has functioned throughout the years, though it now is no longer a corporate entity. There are several unanswered questions regarding a possible interest in the opera real estate held by the Metropolitan Opera Club that will be developed below.

The year 1903 saw the formation of still another company, the Conried Metropolitan Opera Co., organized solely for purposes of operatic production. Its name was changed in 1908 to the Metropolitan Opera Co., with an assent to the name change given by the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. The latter then entered into a lease with the former, for the production of opera in the building. The original lease was due to terminate May 31, 1911, but contained self-renewing 5-year options.

In 1932, the owner-families organized what is now known as the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., a membership corporation, and began production of opera in the opera house, replacing outside production companies. No doubt, one of the replaced companies was the Metropolitan Opera Co. whose lease was allowed to expire. With the advent of national radio networks, several years previously, it became quite apparent

that opera productions were becoming a subject of great public support and interest and that operatic productions might well be placed on a paying basis. Thus the owner-families returned to direct operation of the auditorium.

By this time the freehold family ownership was being held, in several instances, by the heirs of the original families. Further, many of these heirs did not like opera and, in order to add to personal income, began to rent or lease their freehold to individuals who were more interested.

Because of the confusion brought about by the actions of the box owners, it was decided that the owner-family controlled Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., would buy the now-famous building from the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. (also under the same owner-family control), but the former claimed that it was without sufficient funds to effect the purchase.

Therefore, beginning in 1938, the Real Estate Co. began threatening its sister company, the Opera Association—both controlled by the same family-owners—that it would sell or demolish the building unless funds would be found for a purchase, thereby forestalling demolition. The Opera Association made a wide and dramatic public appeal for funds on their weekly radio programs "to help save this historic building." By 1940 the Opera Association had realized more than \$1 million in gifts for the purpose of buying the opera house, and an announcement was made that "the public has saved the opera house."

It would appear that the association then paid its self-controlled Real Estate Co. \$1,970,000 and acquired title to the opera house subject to a demand mortgage of \$470,000 (which still stands today) with the Morgan Guarantee Trust Co., as well as acquiring a warehouse used for the storage of scenery, located at 209 West 40th Street, New York. Immediately upon acquisition of the building the association gave a "purchase money" mortgage in the amount of \$1 million to the Title Guarantee & Trust Co. This mortgage was, and is represented by 4-percent bonds \$467,000 of which have been redeemed. At this point the Metropolitan Opera Co., the old production company, was dissolved, followed a few days later by the dissolution of the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.

NOW, TO THE PRESENT

On February 27, 1961, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., petitioned the New York Supreme Court, under the provisions of the membership corporations law of New York State, as follows:

"Your petitioner desires to lease the said Metropolitan Opera House site for the purpose of demolishing the present improvements thereon and replacing the same with a modern building for office and other commercial purposes, and has entered into an agreement of lease, dated February 16, 1961, for the lease of the same to Jack D. Weiler and Robert H. Arnow, as tenants, for an initial term of 50 years, with two renewal terms of 25 years each, at a net fixed annual rental during the 50-year term, as follows:

"During the first 4 years: \$200,000 per annum.

"During the next 6 years: \$400,000 per annum.

"During the second 10 years: \$450,000 per annum.

"During the third 10 years: \$500,000 per annum.

"During the fourth 10 years: \$550,000 per annum.

"During the fifth 10 years: \$600,000 per annum.

"The net fixed annual rental during the renewal terms will be a sum equal to 6

percent of the fair market value of the land as of the commencement of such respective terms, but in no event less than \$500,000 per annum."

Among the several reasons given in the petition as to how the interests of the petitioner would be promoted by the lease, were the following:

"The board of directors of your petitioner has heretofore approved the participation of your petitioner in the Lincoln Center project which involves the creation of a unique cultural center in the city of New York to house a complex of constituent institutions each serving an important area of interest in the broad field of the performing arts. A principal feature of the Lincoln Center project is the construction of a new Metropolitan Opera House for use by your petitioner. It is anticipated that the new Metropolitan Opera House will be ready for occupancy by May 1, 1964. At such time the present Metropolitan Opera House site will no longer be required by your petitioner.

"The revenue to be derived by your petitioner from the net fixed annual rental provided for in the aforesaid agreement of lease is necessary to enable your petitioner to meet its obligation in connection with the new Metropolitan Opera House to be erected in Lincoln and to otherwise carry out its objectives and activities.

"The possibility of the Metropolitan's continuing to operate the opera house building for rental to producers of musical and theatrical attractions was rejected because of the administrative burdens and expenses involved, the uncertainties and financial risks entailed in theatrical rental, and the fact that even under optimum conditions the estimated net return would not approximate the return which might be obtained from other dispositions of the property."

The lease specifically prohibited grand opera or concert hall performances.

In an appraisal of the opera real estate and improvements submitted with the above petition, made by Brown, Harris, Stevens, Inc., on December 30, 1959, a statement was included:

"The building is obsolete and adds nothing to the value of the land at this time, and that if the property were offered for sale and made available for a new improvement, a higher price could be gotten for the plot if the building had been removed."

The appraisal concluded that the value of the property was \$7 million and that a fair annual net rental would be \$420,000. This happens to be the 50-year annual average of the lease payments as outlined above.

Two years later, in 1963, the opera association petitioned the New York Supreme Court for permission to amend the lease requested in the first petition. The amendment was necessary for two reasons: to postpone possession of the premises by tenants due to delays in the construction of the Lincoln Center project, as well as to anticipate and allocate among the parties a condemnation award that might stem from public efforts to preserve the building. The petition stated that:

"The tenant would not be entitled to any portion of the condemnation award unless the landlord received at least \$9 million as compensation for the land value and consequential damages to the landlord's fee interest."

TABLE II.—Comparison of amounts, lease versus condemnation award

Years:	Lease	Condemnation
1 to 4.....	\$200,000	\$450,000
5 to 10.....	400,000	450,000
11 to 20.....	450,000	450,000
21 to 30.....	500,000	450,000
31 to 40.....	550,000	450,000
41 to 50.....	600,000	450,000

The petition was subsequently granted. One might conclude that the opera association had appraised their building, exclusive of land, at \$2 million.

QUESTIONS OF YIELD

The above petition presented a capsule history of the opera, but failed to mention that there were "freehold of premises" owned by members of the Metropolitan Opera Club within the history of the real estate transactions, such "freeholds" having been signed over to management. Therefore, it is a moot point whether or not any part of the lease payments outlined above will accrue to the owners of the opera boxes or their heirs. It is possible that income realized from the lease would go in part to the boxholders or their heirs in payment for relinquishing their possession. This gives rise to the question that if the city of New York acquires the building via a negotiated sale (as was the case when Carnegie Hall was preserved) or by condemnation proceedings, how will the proceeds be divided between the association and the club? The answer to this and other related questions would not be apparent without an examination of the books and records of the opera association. Such a search is impossible at this time.

But more important, how will the Metropolitan Opera Association benefit under the two alternatives, the lease or condemnation-negotiated sale? (To beg this question for a moment, it is necessary to observe here that the use of present value analysis to value a stream of income in the future, like the use of any other formula or tool of analysis must be applied correctly to advance one's supposition or statement.)

Robert Landry, reporting in *Variety* on May 5, 1965, indicated that:

"1. A condemnation award of \$9 million invested at 5 percent per annum by the Metropolitan Opera Association, would yield \$450,000 per year.

"2. The existing lease not yet in effect, with payments of from \$200,000 to \$600,000 over the 50-year term, would yield these various sums per year, since it was a net lease."

Thus, the figures shown in table II could be drawn, showing amounts per year.

Mr. Landry then concluded that only from the 21st year onward would the association lose under a condemnation award. This conclusion is logical if one is not prepared to say that moneys to be received in the future are worth less than their face value today (this being the *raison d'être* of present value analysis). In fact, the present value of the leased fee is \$6,381,650, and the present value of the condemnation, invested at 5 percent, is \$8,892,900—over \$2,500,000 more.

Therefore, because their wish is to lease the property and raze the building, one can only conclude that the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., is particularly desirous of reducing competition in the field of operatic presentation as much as is possible. And this, with over 96 percent of available seats filled throughout the season.

WHY SAVE THE OLD MET?

What are some of the practical reasons for saving the Metropolitan Opera House?

1. It has the lowest fire insurance rate for any building of its type in New York City.

2. There is more storage space in the opera house than exists in any opera house in the world.

3. It has more stage space and scenery and costume storage space than that in the plans for the Lincoln Center Opera House.

4. There are more auditorium seats and more space in the orchestra pit than in the new Lincoln Center Building.

5. As it now stands, the old Met has more rehearsal space than in all Lincoln Center buildings combined.

6. The Met's acoustics are excellent—considerably better than the acoustics of the already completed Philharmonic Hall.

7. It has complete carpentry and tailor shops.

8. The 70 apartments can provide a substantial rental income to offset costs of operation.

For several years, Mr. Roy Anderson, a music magazine publisher of Mount Vernon, N.Y., almost singlehandedly has been carrying on an attempt to save the opera house. In 1961 Mr. Anderson formed a non-profit corporation entitled the Save the Met Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Anderson suggests that there is room in New York for standard operatic productions at popular prices, as well as a need for an auditorium to be available for ballet, repertory theatre, concerts, film premieres, and even large stockholders meetings. He suggests that if it were operated on an ownership and not a producing basis, the building could become quite financially successful; and that there are enough opera-goers in the metropolitan New York area to support a second major opera house, particularly if prices average \$5.00 per seat as Mr. Anderson projects. With the recent appointing of a permanent Landmarks Preservation Commission by Mayor Wagner, the likelihood of saving the building by public means has been materially increased.

The Metropolitan Opera Association has stipulated that it may back out of the Lincoln Center opera house if possession is not obtained or if the building should prove unsuitable for the production of operatic performances.

The possibility then exists, that, should the Save The Met Foundation, Inc., actually save the building against the wishes of the Opera Association, as well as if the association should find their new building unsuitable for the production of opera, then the association would have to lease the old building from its saviors—a grossly ironic thought.

[From Save the Met Foundation, Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y.]

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO INDICATE INCORRECT REASONING IN PARAGRAPHS 8 AND 9 OF THE MAY 5, 1965, VARIETY ARTICLE ON SAVE-THE-MET MOVEMENT

(By William H. Edgerton)

On May 5, 1965, Mr. Robert Landry reporting in *Variety*, indicated that the Metropolitan ground lease to be executed in 1 year, contains the following scale of payments: \$200,000 per year for 4 years; \$400,000 per year, next 6 years; \$450,000 per year, next decade; \$500,000 per year, third decade; \$550,000 per year, fourth decade; \$600,000 per year, fifth decade.

Alternatively, should the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., obtain enough momentum, Mr. Landry indicated that the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid \$10 million, and this sum invested at 5 percent would yield \$450,000. We assume a misprint here, i.e., the interest rate should have read 4½ percent. Mr. Landry continued "and only after 20 years would the Met lose under such an exit settlement."

The following analysis will show that the Metropolitan Opera Association will benefit more from the second alternative, herein-after called condemnation, than under the ground lease, as now written. The analysis will be conducting using the present worth or present value method of valuing a stream of equal or unequal payments to be received in the future. Present value analysis assumes that money in hand today is worth more than the same amount to be received in the future due to the fact that interest is accrued in the interim. Present value analy-

sis is the only approved method in use today to determine the value of lease payments, and it is the only realistic method in use to determine the value of an income stream; such as would be received under the condemnation alternative.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE GROUND-LEASE ALTERNATIVE

Assumptions are as follows:

1. Lease payments to be made at the end of each year.

2. The applicable interest rate is 6 percent, basically due to the fact that the ground would be improved with a high-rise office building, thereby creating a very secure lease position. Referring to the graduated lease payments above:

Present value of \$200,000 per year for 4 years, at 6 percent: Inwood factor of 3.465 times \$200,000 equals \$693,000.

Present value of \$400,000 per year for 6 years at 6 percent: Factor for 10th year equals 7.360; less factor for 4th year equals 3.465; difference equals 3.895 times \$400,000, or \$1,558,000.

Present value of \$450,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 20th year equals 11.469; less factor for 10th year equals 7.360; difference equals 4.109 times \$450,000, or \$1,849,050.

Present value of \$500,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 30th year equals 13.764; less factor for 20th year equals 11.469; difference equals 2.295 times \$500,000, or \$1,147,500.

Present value of \$550,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 40th year equals 15.046; less factor for 30th year, equals 13.764; difference equals 1.282 times \$550,000, or \$705,100.

Present value of \$600,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 50th year equals 15.761; less factor for 40th year equals 15.046; difference equals .715 times \$600,000, or \$429,000.

Total present value of leased fee is \$6,381,650.

These calculations indicate that an individual could invest \$6,381,650 now, at 6 percent interest, to obtain the 50 years of payments as outlined. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 6 percent interest.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE CONDEMNATION ALTERNATIVE

Under the anticipated terms of the condemnation, the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid \$10 million. Invested at an interest rate of 4½ percent, annual interest would be \$450,000, assuming that no investment management fee is paid or other expenses deducted. An income stream of \$450,000 per year for 50 years at 4½ percent, has a present value factor of 19.762 times \$450,000, or \$8,892,900.

This indicates that an individual could invest \$8,892,900 at 4½ percent interest to obtain repayments of \$450,000 per year for 50 years. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 4½ percent interest.

In the case of the Metropolitan Opera Association, no value has been placed on a return of the principal of \$10 million for it is assumed that this sum would remain invested. Similarly, it is assumed that the ground-lease would be continued in force, perhaps with different terms.

SUMMARY

The above calculations indicate that the condemnation alternative has a present value to the Metropolitan Opera Association of \$2,511,250 more than the ground-lease alternative. This is not a loss after 20 years as suggested by Mr. Landry.

Save the Met Foundation, Inc.—Financing alternatives

	At interest of—			
	3½ percent	4 percent	5 percent	6 percent
BORROWING				
1. \$10,000,000 amortized over 50 years, principal and interest paid each year.....	\$426,337	\$465,550	\$547,767	\$634,442
2. Annual investment required, to grow to \$10,000,000 in 50 years.....	76,337	65,552	47,767	34,442
3. Annual interest without amortization on \$10,000,000.....	350,000	400,000	500,000	600,000
BONDING				
Assume \$10,000,000 to be repaid with interest at the end of 50 years in 1 payment:				
Total repayment required.....	27,500,000	30,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000
Annual investment required per year:				
At 3½ percent.....	210,000	229,100	267,200	305,200
At 4 percent.....	181,000	196,500	229,100	262,000
At 5 percent.....	131,400	143,200	167,100	191,000
At 6 percent.....	94,600	103,000	120,000	137,500

Assuming \$10 million is needed to save the Met—\$8 million to pay off present owners (Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.) plus \$250,000 to reimburse Weiler and Arnow their costs, there remains \$1,750,000 to clean, renovate, and air condition the historic opera house. Using the opera house as collateral, the above chart indicates various financing alternatives covering a \$10 million borrowing plan. A realistic income from auditorium and apartment rentals would produce \$1,250,000 annual income. This amount is nearly double the amount of annual principal and interest payments—even at 6 percent interest.

Carnegie Hall operations for period of July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964

Rents collected.....	<u>\$812,530.10</u>
Other income:	
Hall operation.....	<u>171,801.84</u>
Box office.....	<u>23,385.00</u>
Concessions.....	<u>14,669.89</u>
Sponsored events.....	<u>15,009.86</u>
Miscellaneous income.....	<u>13,028.15</u>
Total.....	<u>237,894.74</u>
Total gross income.....	<u>1,050,424.84</u>
Contributions received.....	<u>9,410.20</u>
Adjusted total income.....	<u>1,059,835.04</u>
Total expenses.....	<u>1,000,055.10</u>
Surplus at end of year.....	<u>59,779.95</u>
Allocation of expenses:	
Compensation of officers, etc.....	<u>45,953.97</u>
Other salaries and wages.....	<u>281,486.41</u>
Interest.....	<u>1,139.50</u>
Taxes.....	<u>16,062.59</u>
Rent to city of New York.....	<u>183,600.00</u>
Depreciation.....	<u>77,219.75</u>
Miscellaneous expenses.....	<u>394,592.98</u>
Total.....	<u>1,000,055.10</u>

Improvements on Carnegie Hall since 1960:

Office furniture and fixtures.....	<u>23,502.79</u>
Painting.....	<u>79,027.20</u>
Carpeting and flooring.....	<u>51,411.09</u>
Drapery.....	<u>37,412.95</u>
Building (outside).....	<u>16,160.24</u>
Building (inside).....	<u>99,594.14</u>
Air conditioning.....	<u>343,209.21</u>
Donated assets.....	<u>66,118.59</u>
Miscellaneous.....	<u>21,962.90</u>
Total leasehold improvements since 1960.....	<u>738,399.11</u>

Balance due on above as of June 30, 1964..... 738,399.11

NOTE.—Carnegie Hall Corp. has an accumulated fund balance of \$388,015.41 as of July 30, 1964.

MARCH 25, 1966.
Re zoning application affecting present site of Metropolitan Opera House.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: One learns in life to be grateful for little things and all humanity is enriched because New York is graced with the residence of Rudolph Bing.

Were he to live in Rome, he would build an urban renewal project on the site of the Colosseum.

The destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House is no less an act of vandalism, from which mankind must recoil with horror.

New York City needs the Metropolitan Opera House more desperately and urgently than it needs another office building. All the evidence points to a growing hunger among our people for musical performance: booming sales of classical records; the vast outpouring of humanity last summer to the Philharmonic Concerts in Central Park and in Prospect Park, the continued contributions of Carnegie Hall to the culture of our city, a contribution which would have been lost had not an aroused public saved that institution from the bulldozer 6 years ago.

Just 30 years ago, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia had the vision and the courage to establish the City Center of Music and Drama. Certainly our city would today be a little poorer if it did not have its ballet company, its Christmas Nutcracker Suite, or the talents which blossomed and flourished at the City Center.

I dare say that nothing Mayor La Guardia accomplished in his many years of public service has so lasting a value or so enduring a quality. It is hopeful that Mayor Lindsay is prepared to move forward along the road taken by Mayor La Guardia.

It is a dismal fact that very few New Yorkers have ever seen the interior of the old Metropolitan Opera House. It is an equally dismal fact that very few will ever see the interior of the new Metropolitan Opera House. This is inevitable, so long as the Metropolitan engages in subscription series ticket sales and so long as it is obliged to maintain high price ticket schedules. But this is also immoral, so long as the tax pennies of the very poorest in our city help support and maintain the Metropolitan Opera.

What is desperately needed in the performing arts is the moral equivalent of the pocket book, to make the performing arts available to the millions in the same way that publishers have made the printed word available to the millions. We have made some progress along those lines at the City Center, at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, at Lewisohn Stadium, which unfortunately is now departed from New York's scene.

The Metropolitan Opera House can play a decisive role in that progress. There is no

question in my mind that what Joseph Papp did in New York City for William Shakespeare, an equally alert mind can do in New York City for Giuseppe Verdi.

Here in New York City where we detest those who burn books, deface statues and destroy paintings, we can conceive for the proscenium curtains of the Metropolitan Opera House a fate more gracious than that decreed by Rudolph Bing—bits and pieces of rag to promote the sale of RCA-Victor records, success or failure in the market place must depend entirely upon the integrity and excellence of their musicianship.

Early in this session of the legislature, I introduced a resolution providing for acquisition of the Metropolitan Opera House by the State and for its operation by the State council of arts. Unfortunately the legislature has not yet had an opportunity to consider that resolution. However, irrespective of the action that may be taken by the legislature, I am convinced that there is more than enough talent and imagination to infuse a new spirit of life into the Metropolitan Opera House.

I regret, indeed, that legislative duties during this final week before the Easter recess make it impossible for me to appear before you in person in the interests of a cause about which I feel so deeply.

I can only emphasize that New York City is not so endowed with cultural resources that it can offer to destroy the Metropolitan; nor is it so destitute of economic resources that it would prove to be unable or unwilling to support and maintain the Metropolitan.

I respectfully urge this commission to do nothing which will bring us nearer to that "sad hour, selected from all years to mourn our loss." Let us resolve to preserve the Metropolitan till, in Shelley's gentle words, the "future dares forget the past," so that the Metropolitan's "fate and fame shall be an echo and a light into eternity."

Sincerely yours,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,
Member of Assembly.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those who have already expressed the gratitude and the congratulations to this committee and its dedicated and devoted chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], for their work and for their product on this appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] has said, there is probably no one on this floor who would not add items and subtract items. I am no different from this mythical character conjured up by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr.

MARSH]. I would prefer, for instance, to see the appropriation with a subsidy to the arts vastly reduced or eliminated and I shall express myself further on that during the course of this debate.

On the other hand, I note that out of activities financed by this budget of \$1,169 million plus, revenues to the Federal Government in excess of \$992 million will be generated. These agencies are almost entirely self-supporting. This budget covers many proprietary functions of the Federal Government and one of the most important is the production of timber on which the great woods products industry of this country depends.

I and a number of my colleagues requested an additional \$1 million to the Forest Service and \$200,000 for the Bureau of Land Management to program and lay out sales of down, dead and dying timber and thinnings presently going to waste on the Federal preserves. Each such dollar invested would return to the Federal Treasury from \$3 to \$4. In addition, and probably equally as important, it would put on the market approximately 271 million board feet of timber in excess of one-fourth billion board feet—at a time when pressures on and the availability of timber supply have never been greater. These pressures are caused by the demand for wood products accentuated by the need for building materials in southeast Asia, together with the continuing pressures of log exports which this year totaled in excess of 900 million board feet. No relief from the export problem has become apparent except the possibility of increasing the allowable cut by this means which, far from imperiling the sustained yield capacity of our forests, makes efficient utilization of wood supply that will otherwise be wasted. I hope that these additional sums of money may be added in the Senate.

I also must express my regret at the failure of the committee to fully staff the forest research facility at Bend, Oreg. In both of these instances we have an expenditure that can be expected to return dividends not only to the Federal Treasury but to the economy as a whole.

I regret also the failure to include funds for research into balloon logging, a most promising development in logging technique which should not only cut logging expenses by reducing the need for the present expensive road system required, but should also greatly reduce soil erosion and the resultant turbidity of our streams, a major factor in stream pollution. Again, I hope and shall urge that the Senate restore these deficiences.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to strike the appropriation of \$7 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I do so with a great deal of reluctance and I do so only because \$6 million of the \$7 million is for expenditure under sections 5(c) and 5(h), endowment of the arts and grants to the States for the arts.

I indicated last year my support for Federal assistance to the humanities. For some time now we have had Federal

assistance to the sciences and mathematics and languages under the National Defense Education Act. This has been all to the good. In my opinion, support to the humanities is long overdue and, should a case be made in the Senate and this bill returned to the House with an appropriation for the humanities, that provision will have my support.

Last year I opposed the bill authorizing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities primarily because of what I then said was a "legislative marriage between the arts and humanities." The humanities I supported and support; the Federal assistance to the arts I opposed for, to me, art is a spontaneous and free expression of the culture of a free people. I cannot help thinking, regardless of the motives and the good intentions of those who must pick and choose, that the very fact of Federal support for some forms of artistic expression and the rejection of others will result in a dampening or an extinction of that form of artistic expression which might otherwise prosper. By the very nature of the selective process we will shape by government fiat the nature of the culture which this generation and those to follow will leave to those who follow behind us.

I feel also that the artist must be free to practice his art and the public must be free to patronize or reject those forms of which he approves or disapproves.

I also am reluctant to tax all for the artistic tastes of less than all. While to some, the opera, the ballet, and the legitimate theater are the acme of artistic expression, others have no taste for such and prefer instead folk music, Indian dancers, pop art; indeed—belly dancers and the Beatles. In my judgment, if the Government is to patronize any, it ought to patronize all.

But the Congress has spoken on this when it authorized the Foundation. I would be willing to accept the action of the Congress and vote appropriate sums of money so that the congressional will might be carried out were it not for the pressures presently existing on the American dollar. President Johnson has asked industry to forgo expansion, to reduce the inflationary pressures. President Johnson has asked his Cabinet officers to reduce spending by \$1 1/4 billion this fiscal year to reduce inflationary pressures. I cannot understand how—in view of these requests from the President of the United States—this Congress can at this time vote funds for the inauguration of a program to subsidize the arts. We have existed as a country for almost 200 years without this. Surely we could exist until the termination of the crisis in Vietnam and the return of the economy to a somewhat more stable state of equilibrium.

I have had the same telegrams and telephone calls from my district that other Members have. I realize as well as they that this is not a popular position. I realize also that Members of Congress of good will and as devoted to the public will as I will differ with me on this vote. I have said many times, however, that economy in government is a selective process; it does not mean a "no"

vote on every issue. It does, however, mean a "no" vote on those appropriations which can be denied or deferred without major consequences to the public welfare. I therefore intend to vote "aye" on this motion.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, among the many specific items of importance in this bill, I would like to call special attention to a relatively small sum which has special meaning for all who are concerned about the future of the Potomac River Basin. I refer to the appropriation of \$179,400 for the National Park Service for improvements along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Monument between Seneca and Cumberland, Md.

The C. & O. Canal is a priceless historical and recreational resource. As the Potomac Basin's population grows, and as more and more residents and visitors discover the beauty and recreational opportunities of the Potomac Valley, the C. & O. Canal will become more and more valuable.

As one who has been working for many years to preserve and restore the canal, I am pleased that the Potomac Basin task forces now at work consider the canal a central strand in the proposed Potomac Valley park complex. I am pleased that the Secretary of the Interior, in his message to Congress last week proposing a nationwide trails system, urged consideration of the 825-mile Potomac Heritage Trail as a possible national scenic trail. The towpath of the C. & O. Canal of course would be incorporated as a major segment of this trail.

I am especially pleased today that the National Park Service has shown its intention not to delay improvement of the canal until comprehensive park plans have been completed or longer trails have been designated. The \$179,400 in the bill before us is clear proof of the Park Service's desire to restore the canal, rebuild the towpath, develop bicycle trails, improve bridges and bridge approaches, and generally clean up and patch up the canal and keep it clean. With the co-operation of the many interested conservation and civic groups and organizations who enjoy and appreciate the canal, this relatively small Federal expenditure can bring exceptional results. As an investment in the future, this item this year has a value far above its cost.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the able chairman and members of his subcommittee have again demonstrated their responsibility to duty by reporting out an outstanding Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for the 1967 fiscal year. Through their patience and understanding during many lengthy hearings, they considered the funding of programs charged with the important responsibilities of developing, supervising, and protecting the great natural resources base of the Nation.

I am particularly pleased to note the recommended increase of \$6,288,000 over 1966 for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service for the next fiscal year. Many interested citizens in my district appreciate the committee's approval of \$28,000 planning funds for a

new Forest Service Range Management Laboratory at La Grande, Oreg. The new facility will replace the temporary and inadequate quarters now occupied by the scientists carrying out important research work.

Oregon's sports fisheries resources will be greatly enhanced by the committee approval of \$100,000 for further development of the new fish hatchery on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

I regret that the \$3 million reduction in the 10-year national forestry research program was not restored to allow continuation of high-priority research. This program is vital to the States whose economies are supported extensively by the lumber industry. This activity must be supported with greater appropriations in future years.

Although not included in the President's budget, a 5-year progressive land rehabilitation project at an estimated cost of \$550,000 is recommended for the Drewsey grazing unit in Harney County in my congressional district. Unfortunately, the initial appropriation of \$150,000 for the first year's operation was not made available. I am hopeful the committee will give this matter serious consideration during next year's hearings.

On March 9, I presented additional testimony before the committee with proposals to alleviate the problem of log shortages which threatens the stability of the lumber industry in Oregon and Washington. The capacity of many mills to process logs into lumber, plywood, and associated products exceeds the availability of timber. Many of these industries are dependent exclusively upon national forest timber for their operations.

This problem is complicated further by the heavy export of logs to Japan, leaving an even smaller supply to support our domestic wood processing industry. In my testimony, I endorsed Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's proposal of September 17, 1965, to accelerate the offering of timber not normally included in the established annual allowable cut. These offerings were to be made from salvage operations, silvicultural thinnings, and more efficient prelogging and postlogging utilization. Such sales would be another forward step in Forest Service practices for maximum utilization of our public timber resource under sound, sustained yield management.

In region six of the U.S. Forest Service, the annual offerings could be increased 249.2 million board feet, without any additional capital investment in roads; \$457,300 would be required in the next fiscal year for manpower requirements in preparation of the sales.

Forest Service officials have also identified 141.9 million board feet in areas now inaccessible for logging. Road financing needs to develop these sales would be \$1.6 million next year. Sale development costs for this timber would be \$266,800.

Mr. Chairman, this important lumber supply program is not funded in the bill before the House of Representatives. I consider this would have been a sound investment of Federal funds, since an

additional 2,000 jobs would have been made available in the Oregon and Washington lumber industry through the proposed program, adding strength and stability to the economy of this area. If a future opportunity presents itself, I encourage my colleagues in the House to support appropriations for this important program.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend Chairman DENTON and the committee for the great work they appear to have done in bringing this bill before the House. I observe that the committee has recommended \$34,811,000 under the 1967 fiscal year budget estimates of the administration.

I believe that the committee deserves further commendation for the additional funds it has recommended for improved services to the American Indian—a people that we have treated so shabbily in the past. The committee has also dealt intelligently with the rapid transit and conservation problems created by the booming population increases in this Nation. We now have close to 200 million people living in our country, and population experts estimate that this figure will swell to 325 million by the year 2000—an increase of 62 percent in only 35 years. The problems which this poses for the transportation and conservation experts will be staggering. Somehow, we must learn how to move larger numbers of people more rapidly while posing the least threat to our natural resources.

The challenge of building a quality society—one in which we manage to maintain a delicate balance between the needs of our people and the resources of our land—is as great as any facing us today. I believe that H.R. 14215 goes a long way toward meeting this challenge.

My first-hand knowledge of the good that one small section of this bill will do back in the State of Missouri is a case in point. H.R. 14215 recommends \$50,000 in preplanning funds for the construction of a reservoir in the Upper Big River in the Meramec River Basin. When this project is completed, facilities for boating, water skiing, swimming, hiking, and picnicking will be available in a region badly in need of such additional recreational facilities. Residents of the St. Louis area, the rapidly developing new Lead Belt region of southeastern Missouri, and southwestern Illinois will benefit greatly from this project.

This is but one example of the tremendous needs that continue to exist in the interior of this Nation. H.R. 14214 certainly cannot provide all of the answers, but it attempts to deal with some of the more pressing problems. I am grateful to the committee for authorizing a start on this project near the town of Belgrade, Mo.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1967.

I would like to commend the gentleman and his distinguished committee for an outstanding job on the legislation that they have reported to the House today.

I am gratified that the committee recognized the importance to our commercial fishermen of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act. The passage of this act in 1964 was probably the most substantial boost to our fishermen in recent years.

The purpose of this 5-year program is to stimulate research and development projects by the several States in the development of our Nation's commercial fisheries on a matching fund basis with Federal funding of up to 75 percent of the cost.

The President's budget asked that only \$2.6 million be appropriated for fiscal year 1967. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee recognized the benefits to be realized from the program and increased the appropriation to \$4.1 million. This will provide funding for distribution of allocations to States on the same level as prevailed in fiscal year 1966.

Research and development in the field of commercial fisheries, which is one of our most valuable natural resources, cannot be ignored any longer. We must move forward—we must accept the challenges and exploit the opportunities which abound in American waters.

Not to do so would be a tragic waste of our God-given heritage.

Mr. Chairman, I want particularly to compliment the gentleman and his distinguished committee on the decision to eliminate from the President's budget the item that would authorize the use of excess currency funds in Communist Poland for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler for our Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In July of last year, when I first learned that the Bureau of the Budget was urging the Department of the Interior to propose use of excess foreign currency funds for the purchase of two stern-ramp trawlers to be constructed in Communist Poland—thus bypassing the admittedly hard pressed U.S. commercial shipyards—I immediately wrote to Secretary Udall and the Bureau of the Budget, opposing this plan.

Then, in August of last year, before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce, I was privileged to testify in opposition to this proposal. It was my understanding that this radical idea had been discarded.

Therefore, I was amazed to learn that the fiscal 1967 budget for the Department of the Interior included a request for authority to obtain one stern-ramp fishing trawler with these excess Polish funds.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the merit of our Government's endeavors to find means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own, but before proceeding to utilize these funds we must thoroughly scrutinize and carefully evaluate their potential impact on our domestic enterprises and national policies.

It has long been asserted, by those in authority, that a shipbuilding capability is essential to our national welfare.

This has long been my conviction and that of many others. But, somehow, in recent days, the essentiality of that capability has suffered from a lack of

coordination among the various agencies of the Federal Government.

To illustrate. The Maritime Administrator has been actively promoting the idea of building some U.S.-flag merchant vessels in foreign shipyards. The Department of Defense is, at this very moment, negotiating the procurement of certain noncombatant vessels for the U.S. Navy from British shipyards.

In turn, the Navy Department wants to place more shipwork with the Government-owned and operated naval shipyards. And, then, the Interior Department sought authority or approval to have a fishing trawler built in Communist Poland.

The net effect of this massive squeeze play, if carried to fruition, would adversely affect large and small shipyards alike.

Once the foreign construction of American ships is permitted, regardless of size or number of vessels involved, a dangerous precedent would be established which would encourage other agencies and officials to seek foreign-built ships.

Officials advocating such policies seem more interested in effecting dubious savings than they are in strengthening this Nation's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities.

Perhaps this distinguished committee, in its decisive action on this trawler issue, has provided a key for initiating the kind of leadership needed to retain America's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities. Certainly, this committee has demonstrated a more acute awareness of our national problems and needs than some Government officials and agencies.

Since such leadership has not been provided by these officials, whose responsibility it is to protect and promote industries which are essential to our national welfare, then perhaps we are looking to the wrong source for guidance.

I submit that this committee's action has served notice that—unless these same agencies and officials abandon their build-abroad policies and begin to respect and implement the policies adequately outlined in our Merchant Marine Act of 1936—they may be forced to do so through congressional action.

I earnestly hope this will be the last we ever hear of proposals to build fishing trawlers—or any other kind of American vessels—in foreign yards.

The action of this distinguished committee should kill the initiation of any such proposal in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today leaves me with mixed emotions. I agree with those who argue that we must cut back on our spending that we must exercise more self-discipline. On the other hand, I do feel we should provide money for the use of the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Perhaps what we need is a ceiling under which the Executive branch must operate. It might be well to make them responsible for the specific decisions as to where the cuts can be made with the least impact.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is self-evident that the arts scene in

the United States today is one of great variety and richness. We are producing much for which we are honored and respected throughout the world. We do not lack for talent. We do not lack for creativity. We do not lack for public interest.

What is lacking, for almost every artistic enterprise we can mention—professional, semiprofessional, and amateur—is adequate financial support. From local little theater groups to the glorious symphony orchestras which rank among the greatest in the world and the incomparable Metropolitan Opera Society, all are in economic difficulty. Or as the Rockefeller Panel Report on the Future of Theater, Dance, Music in America reported last year:

In spite of tremendous growth and exciting promise, the performing arts as we see them today are in trouble.

By way of illustrating the tremendous growth of the past 20 years, the report cites the fact that the current total of about 1,400 symphony orchestras is more than double the number existing in 1939—but only 54 are composed predominantly of professional musicians.

Some 750 groups are presenting opera—almost twice the number so engaged only a decade ago. However, only 35 to 40 of these groups are fully professional, and not more than 10 perform more than 15 days a year.

The number of dance companies approaches 200. However, in the entire country only about half a dozen meet high professional standards and have any real degree of institutional stability; only one has a performance schedule approaching a year-round schedule.

Theatrical enterprises number about 40,000 and have grown by about 15 percent in the last decade. Yet the number of commercial theaters has dropped from 600 in 1927 to barely 200. And Broadway, the heart of our creative theater, has reduced its output from 140 productions a year in the thirties to 63 in 1963-64, while the number of playhouses on Broadway has diminished from 54 to 36 in that same span of years. Incidentally, I might mention that in my home community of Morristown, N.J., an ambitious program has been developed by the Morris Repertory Theater, now in its second year of operation. Its performances have been of high professional quality and community support for this worthwhile effort has been increasing.

Further, most performing artists, as the report points out, are poorly paid:

The miserable income of the majority reflects both a shortage of jobs and the brief duration of employment * * *. In all except the small handful of our major and metropolitan orchestras, the musicians earn an average of only a few hundred dollars a year from their professional labors.

The report further suggested that \$40 to \$60 million of new support would be required annually to meet the normal operating expenses of a professional performing arts establishment. When the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was established, its supporters did not envisage it as a major

source of funds of the magnitude which the Rockefeller panel considers basic to the healthy growth and activity of the professional arts.

Rather, proponents of this legislation envisage the Federal contribution as in the nature of seed money, designed to nurture and develop new sources of private and local support for the arts and to increase audiences for the arts throughout the Nation. Without a modest Federal contribution, the arts scene in the United States, despite all its dynamism and vitality, will continue to be in trouble. Through leadership, which the National Foundation will provide, we can hope to develop the magnitude and kind of support for the arts which will permit the development of stable, mature, and civilized activities and creations which will reflect the greatness of this Nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriations herein for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, and only regret that the timing of the bill was such that the Humanities Council was not organized in time for its programs to be outlined before the subcommittee. I am pleased that the report mentions this fact, thus opening the door for acceptance of an amendment by the other body.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Committee on Appropriations has given careful consideration to the budget requests for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities; has made some cuts; and further cuts would be disastrous.

The creation of this foundation which is concerned with the quality of American life was one of the highmarks of the first session of this Congress. It climaxed years of effort on the part of many Members, including the present occupant of the floor.

The purpose of this legislation, with its very modest authorizations was to provide seed money. Obviously the full \$5 million for the arts does not begin to meet the deficits of all of the most professional cultural activities; neither does the same small sum provide the funds necessary to finance all of the scholarly research, study, and publication needed for the humanities.

But these sums, prudently placed by wise men and women having absolutely no private nor political axes to grind, can enrich the cultural and esthetic life of America and its people.

To fulfill this function, however, the seed must be healthy.

Unless we affirm the action of our subcommittee; unless we plan to go to conference with an open mind; the seed will be dried and shrivel and will die on the vine.

Mr. Chairman, of all the programs this Congress has authorized and implemented, none is designed to be more free from the Federal bureaucratic hand than this one. This House could change all of that by requiring that one of its committees serve as the selection board for projects, place the heavy hand of legislative bureaucracy upon the program.

I, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, do not feel that I

have the competency to make such judgments.

I do feel, however, that such people as Dr. Barnaby Keeney, of Brown University, Dr. Odegaard, of University of Washington; Dr. Germaine Bree, of University of Wisconsin, and others in the humanities; as well as Isaac Stern, Paul Engle, Philip Hanes, Agnes Demille and others in the arts are all fully competent to make such judgments.

These two great councils have made excellent starts; let us give them the tools so that they may continue to get the job done.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am torn between two positions—first I would commend the committee for trying to make reductions in Federal spending, but at the same time, I feel they used very poor judgment in deciding when those cuts should be made.

They have shaved \$34.8 million from the President's budget but unfortunately the reductions have been made at the expense of important, vital programs while other fringe needs were given greater appropriations by the committee.

The committee's attempt to cut spending is excellent, but economy could have been achieved by delaying the nonessential programs, thereby leaving sufficient funds to meet more pressing needs in 1967.

The recommended budget includes reducing predator control funds by \$20,000 reducing Geological Survey water resources investigation funds by over \$600,000, and contains no appropriations for key construction projects only partially completed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

At the same time, however, research funds for commercial fisheries were hiked up by \$1.5 million and a special Appalachian project was granted nearly \$1 million. I find the committee's action most inconsistent in pulling the rug out from under half-completed projects and then pumping millions into research and special regions of the country like Appalachia which has already received two or three layers of relief and more than \$1 billion in special help.

The misplaced emphasis of the committee has resulted in no appropriations for badly needed facilities and programs. Let us take predatory animal control funds as an example. Even at the current fiscal year level of spending for this program, the problem has not been solved. This year alone there was more than a \$40 million in loss from predatory animals to sheepmen alone. Yet the committee has recommended slicing already inadequate funds by \$20,000.

As another example, the committee has placed nothing in the budget for many uncompleted construction projects by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Near Spearfish, S. Dak., the McNenny Fish Hatchery has embarked upon new building pro-

grams which will more than double their current trout production to meet the acute needs of a four-State area. The project has started, yet the committee has budgeted no funds for continuing work there. Instead, it has arbitrarily decided that more research is needed along the Atlantic coast and has increased research funds for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries by \$2.5 million.

Because of a—and I quote—"extremely low volume of sales of annual recreation permits" to cover costs of a program within the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the committee has increased appropriations to the Bureau by \$450,000 while cutting out needed funds for the Geological Survey for water resources investigations. Incidentally, I think we should remember that when the House passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act it was under the assumption that this permit system would make the program self-sufficient, but now we find that funds needed elsewhere have to be sidetracked to pick up the losses of this program which occurred because of miscalculation.

Certainly it is hard to place priorities on many of these projects, and the committee must be commended for its ardent effort to come up with the most economical and yet most comprehensive budget that could be drawn up. However, the committee has misplaced these priorities. Before we embark on more research, recreation, and nonessential regional aid programs, we must complete our present construction obligations and make certain that vital programs are not curtailed at the expense of luxury for a few.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; \$20,292,000, and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARMATZ

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ: On page 20, line 4; strike out "\$20,292,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,312,000."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to provide \$20,000 for the staffing and operation of the Baltimore Fishery Market news service office.

The Baltimore office was opened in 1958 to collect, compile, and disseminate daily wholesale fishery market data in that area. It has operated continuously since then in the most economical man-

ner possible at a total cost of about \$20,000 annually.

This has been accomplished by a small staff of two men who relay the daily data by wire to the Hampton, Va., market news office. There it is published and released to the industry the same day, along with market information collected by the Hampton staff.

The Baltimore area is an important wholesale market for fishery products. It is the main outlet for Chesapeake Bay fish and shellfish, and also handles fishery items from many other fishing ports.

The daily market information supplied by the Baltimore Market News Office has been a stabilizing factor for the Chesapeake Bay fisheries.

When combined with market news data from the other 7 market news offices throughout the Nation, another link is added to the chain of market information for U.S. fishery products.

Funds to finance the Baltimore Market News Office in fiscal year 1967 were removed from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries budget to effect savings in Government spending. In fiscal year 1966 it is being financed temporarily by diverting funds from other activities.

However, such diversions will no longer be possible, due to the overall limitation on the Bureau's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope that the authorization will be increased to \$20,312,000 for fiscal year 1967 so that the Baltimore office can continue to operate.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept that amendment.

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

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was discussed on our side, and we are willing to accept the \$20,000 item to keep a market news office open.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of fishing vessels

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss with the chairman of the subcommittee the language appearing in the report on page 23 dealing with the migratory bird conservation account. I note on that page that there was an appropriation in 1966 of \$7.5 million under the accelerated wetlands acquisition program. The estimate for 1967 and the recommended funds for 1967 were also \$6 million. This is \$1.5 million, according to the distinguished

subcommittee, less than last year. I would point out to the chairman of the subcommittee that this program was authorized at a level basis of \$107 million for 7 years, which would be an annual authorization somewhat in excess of about \$15 million. Indeed, to maintain the pace that the legislative committee intended, we would have to expedite and accelerate this program rather significantly. I would point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is my good friend and for whom I have great affection and respect, that what has happened here is a program which is regarded by conservationists and by those concerned with the preservation of our migratory waterfowl has been lagging so badly that only approximately 38 percent of the funds which were authorized by the legislative committee over these years have been appropriated.

I would point out that this legislation passed the House unanimously and there was neither a dissenting vote nor was there a word in opposition to the bill. I wondered what my good friend could tell me about the prospects for bringing this program in line with the level of expenditures that was envisaged by the legislative subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the committee is very sympathetic to this program, as I believe the gentleman understands. We accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect. There was no indication that this amount was not adequate, and that additional funds should be appropriated.

Mr. DINGELL. I wonder if my good friend is sympathetic with this part of this program? It appears that the Bureau of the Budget is not.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this is a program which has been carefully considered by our legislative subcommittee, of which I happen to have the honor to be chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], that it has the strong backing of the conservationists of the Department of the Interior, and indeed it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet we find that the program has lagged so badly that about 38 percent of the funds that should have been appropriated have not been appropriated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend additional funds.

Mr. DINGELL. But would my good friend look with any kindness upon increasing the amount of money in this item, because wetlands are vanishing very rapidly in this country, and the prospects for the propagation of several types of waterfowl for the future hinge upon what is done by the Department. They have a significantly better record of land acquisition than the legislative authorization would allow. We are only proceeding at a rate less than that which the fundamental legislation would authorize.

Mr. Chairman, what I am doing is protesting what has been done here, both by the subcommittee and by the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Of course, there was some difficulty on land purchases which held the program back. However, we are not bound by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, and we are not bound by the recommendations of the Department. What we did was to make this decision ourselves. However, when they make a recommendation, and there is no apparent reason to do otherwise, we are very likely to follow their recommendation.

Mr. DINGELL. If I can switch to more language in this committee report, I would like to discuss some language which appears in the middle of the page. The Appropriations Committee says that the committee expects that the Bureau of the Budget will continue in the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee, and thus reduce the cost of the program.

I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, that what this language is going to do is to require that the sportsmen of this country who are footing this program buy this land time and time and time again at higher and higher prices, because this is what an easement-oriented program does. It does not, I say to my friend, buy the land the cheapest. It may get a lot of land in fairly short order, but the ultimate result of it is to see to it that the sportsmen who buy the duck stamps and pay this money for the land under this program, buy the land a second time and a third time, and that their children and their grandchildren, down to the 10th generation, will keep on buying this land.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DENTON. This question has arisen from time to time.

Mr. DINGELL. What you are accomplishing is that you are imposing upon the children and the grandchildren of today's duck hunters the servitude of continuing to buy duck stamps with which to pay for the easements on the land that could better be bought by buying the title to this land in fee.

I understand full well—and I will tell my good friend this—I understand full well that there are circumstances where it is necessary to buy this land in fee, and there are circumstances which occasionally arise because of the smallness of the area, or for other reasons it becomes necessary to buy the land and buy the easement, and not to buy in fee.

But this is not the intent of the legislative committee, that we should emphasize easement purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I want my good friend from Indiana to know this, because this has come up before us every year.

Mr. DENTON. If the gentleman will yield further, this question has come up before the committee every year, and this committee is of the opinion that it is more economical to obtain easements than to buy the land. However, there was this additional fact, which entered into the consideration of this matter: As long as easements are obtained, the land still stays on the tax rolls, and in a great many places if you take the land off the tax rolls you deplete the source of revenue of the area.

Mr. DINGELL. I am aware of that. However, last year we passed certain legislation designed to take care of this particular problem, and it is very generously funded. The counties which happen to have refuge lands within their borders would participate. In fact, we passed specific legislation which would make payments in lieu of taxes to these areas, on a most generous basis.

What I am saying to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, is this, and this is by way of protest: I do not intend to offer any amendatory language on the floor today, but I want my friend to know that those who are aware of this problem do not like the idea of going in and buying large refuge acreage and buying easements instead of acquiring the same land in fee. It would be far more economical to acquire it in fee.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I resent the idea that the Committee on Appropriations should give what appears to be instructions—and I say they are not instructions—to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which are so much at variance with the intent of the legislative subcommittee, of which I happen to be the chairman.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I know how much he is interested in this program. I can assure the gentleman that a balance will be maintained so far as we are concerned between easements and purchases. I think both are necessary. I think we should have both, and we do have to take this into account.

Mr. DINGELL. What my good friend is saying to me is that this language in the report is not a direction to unduly accentuate the purchase of this land?

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Or of the easements. But my good friend will join me in setting out an attitude that there should be—

Mr. DENTON. There should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. But large acreage should be acquired by purchase.

Mr. DENTON. I would say, there should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I understand that. I recognize that but in large areas, rather in the acquisition of small potholes and things of that kind in isolated areas where they are not suitable for administration as large refuges, these lands should be acquired by easement particu-

larly where there is opposition to the acquisition of the land by fee for the Government. But in other instances, I am sure my good friend joins me in understanding that we are setting up a large wildlife refuge that should be acquired in fee by the Federal Government; is that not so?

Mr. DENTON. Speaking generally, I would say the gentleman is right about that. But a balance has to be maintained, and there are places where the easements should be used.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to discuss one last point with my good friend. The gentleman remembers that a large number of Members appeared before his subcommittee and urged the funding of the anadromous fish program which was unanimously passed by the Congress last year. Does the gentleman have any information that he can give me as to the intention of his subcommittee in regard to this program which has such heavy support here in this body and also heavy support among sports fishermen and conservationists around the country?

Mr. DENTON. There was nothing in the budget for the program. The Bureau furnished the committee this information: Legislation for this program was enacted late in the last session of Congress. It provided for matching funds by States. The department has not received the requests of the various States, and it was not able to include a request for funds in the regular estimate. There is a strong likelihood funds will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. DINGELL. I happen to be aware that the States have now placed some \$7 million to support this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; \$37,164,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 23, line 14, after "Refuge;" strike out "\$37,164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,164,000".

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that I would offer this amendment.

In view of what I said earlier and the recommendations submitted by the Department of the Interior on this blackbird and starling problem, I merely would point out the need for this amendment by reading the summary of the Department's recommendation as follows:

Blackbirds and the introduced European starling probably number about one-half

billion in the continental United States. Although blackbirds have always been with us, reported losses from these indigenous species have increased tremendously during recent years as they come more and more into direct conflict with our expanding population. The phenomenal increase and spread of the introduced starling is due to its reproductive capacity, general hardiness, adaptability to changes in land use, and the success which introduced animals sometimes enjoy in a new environment.

Losses to agriculture from birds are extremely serious and must be approached with positive action. Since the problem is varied, and includes all States, a national approach is required. Estimates show bird damage to agriculture amounts to about \$58 million annually. Damage to buildings, hazards from bird-associated diseases, and the possibility of air strikes increase this national problem.

Research has developed considerable information regarding numbers, characteristics, and management techniques. Large-scale field tests indicate the value of a compound known as DRC-1339 to reduce bird losses to field lots. The decoy trap has been improved. This device works well in and around orchards and shows promise in the grain-growing areas. Repellants and scare devices have a place in bird management and can be used by the public. However, these techniques have not as yet been perfected to stop bird damage to standing crops.

The answer to many of the bird problems may come through use of antifertility agents to reduce reproduction and through roost reduction techniques.

Both approaches need additional investigation. Greater focus must be placed on behavioral traits and physiological processes of problem species to find weak spots in their protective armor.

Known tools will not stop present losses to standing grain; however, the tools that are available will reduce damage and should be widely demonstrated to the public. It is estimated that a Federal program to do an effective job will require an additional initial expenditure of \$1 million to meet the demands in this field. Of this amount \$200,000 would be used in research and \$800,000 for supervision and demonstration of techniques.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment merely follows the recommendation of the Department of the Interior to the dollar. When we consider that our farmers suffer a \$58 million loss a year, an appropriation of \$1 million seems quite small. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish on facing up to our responsibility toward this problem.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would this fund be limited to research in bird damage to grains and other farm production?

Mr. LATTA. The amendment would merely add this amount to that already being appropriated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Could it be transferred to other agencies, or would it be used for this type of work?

Mr. LATTA. Certainly, it would be limited to this blackbird and starling problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. In this bill there is an appropriation of \$665,000 for the control of starlings and blackbirds. That amount is \$5,000 over the appropriation for last year and it is \$17,000 over the 1965 appropriation.

The difficulty is that they have not discovered the means to kill blackbirds and starlings without killing other birds. If they would kill the other birds, too, this could cause more damage to crops than the starlings and blackbirds are doing.

We pursued this matter extensively in the hearings. The agency witness testified, "We simply do not have the concrete techniques to cope with a full-scale bird control program." Until they have a program developed, they cannot effectively use any more money than the funding provided in the bill. In the committee we discussed the feasibility of increasing the appropriation for this item by \$100,000. It was decided that we would not do so, that we had provided all the money that could be used. If any more funds were needed, the request should be on recommendation of the agency and come through the Budget Bureau.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. We have a tight budget. Many want something added to the bill. If additional funding would get rid of the birds, it would be fine, but they do not have the techniques to do this. For that reason I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

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

Mr. LATTA. Is the gentleman discussing the Department's own report?

Mr. DENTON. I do not have a copy of that report. I am quoting testimony given to our committee.

Mr. LATTA. This report was submitted in March of this year. As I read just a few moments ago, research, according to them, has developed considerable information regarding these birds and how to deal with them.

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. LATTA. It seems to me that on the mere statement of the gentleman, that he recognizes the problem and that the matter was discussed in the committee shows that we should have some kind of additional research program carried on. I do not think we ought to continue to subject our farmers in this Nation to a \$58-million-a-year loss, because we do not know the answer to their problem. I think we ought to appropriate some money, go after the problem, and do away with the \$58-million-a-year loss.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. Until research reveals that they can use additional funds to kill these birds, more money appropriated now would be of no avail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE
HUMANITIES

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, \$7,000,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5(c) and 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 41, strike all the language beginning on line 7 through line 22, and on page 42, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It simply strikes out all of the money for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that the House did very well yesterday in behalf of humanity when it voted \$500 million for food and other products for India.

In this business of continuing to take care of humanity around the world, I insist we ought to save the money in this country in order to do it. Or is it proposed to load all the debt on the backs of our children?

Something has been said this afternoon about cultural programs in foreign countries. Well, bless your souls, you are also financing those programs.

There is pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee now a bill to provide for approximately another \$3 billion as a handout to foreign countries. We are taking care of them.

I know of no provision in this bill that had less justification than this arts, humanities, and culture business. I want to read to you from page 290 of the hearings some of the colloquy that took place between Mr. Stevens and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Stevens, if we know what the money is going to be used for, the agency is pretty successful. If you say, give us the money and we will decide how it is going to be spent later, then there is trouble.

Mr. STEVENS. I understand your point. We will conform, generally speaking, with this group of projects, but I think you could understand that we have a slight problem also if you understand, Mr. Chairman, and that is that these are very distinguished men that come to approve these projects, and if we gave them a fait accompli, they all would walk out on us, too. You see our problem.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Stevens, this is a very distinguished committee, too, but in the last analysis we are responsible for the appro-

priation of your funds, and we are not about to write you a blank check.

Mr. STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. DENTON. We have to know what your specific program is for the funds you request.

Mr. STEVENS. But you did say, didn't you, sir, that you did not want us to appropriate money unless we had already secured an approval?

Mr. DENTON. Let me ask you this. You knew you were coming up here to present your 1967 budget estimate?

Mr. STEVENS. Right.

Mr. DENTON. Why didn't the Council approve this program before you came to this hearing?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, the program was submitted at the last Council meeting, but we didn't approve it, X, Y, Z.

Then we come to the humanities. A Mr. Henry Allen Moe appeared before the committee on this. There had been no meeting of the Humanities Council, and the colloquy goes like this:

Mr. MOE. Now, because of what the law says in reference to the dependence of the Chairman on the advice of the Council, I could not come before you with approved programs at this time.

Mr. DENTON. What do you expect us to do?

Mr. MOE. Sir, I don't know, but what do you expect me to do, if I may ask the question? I have submitted all that I can submit.

Parenthetically, I would say he had not submitted anything. He goes on to state as follows:

I think there will be approved programs by the Council and I have been unable to put a price tag on any of them, I am sorry to say.

Mr. DENTON. What did the Bureau of the Budget do when you submitted this justification to them? What did you recommend to the Bureau of the Budget and what did they do with your recommendation?

Mr. MOE. I have no information about what the Budget Bureau did, sir.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Mark, what did you do about the budget recommendations for this agency? You have had experience in this work.

Mr. MARK. For the humanities?

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. MARK. They wrote it separately from ours.

Mr. COLLETT. The Budget Bureau determined the amounts in the green sheets.

Mr. DENTON. The Budget Bureau prepared these?

Mr. COLLETT. Yes.

First of all, who did justify the appropriation for the humanities? The Bureau of the Budget? Was it prepared in the Bureau of the Budget? Was there nothing submitted to this committee in behalf of the appropriation? That, apparently, is what the hearing record shows.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. I was going to say to the gentleman from Iowa—and I am not a member of this subcommittee but I am of the full committee—it is my understanding the committee did not appropriate any money for the humanities partly because of the fact that they did not make out a record justifying the appropriation.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. The \$5 million request for the endowment for the humanities was not approved—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. DENTON. The endowment for the humanities had a very high caliber Council appointed. This Council reviews projects and approves grants. The Council had just been appointed shortly before we heard the budget estimate for the humanities. They did not have—and they were very frank about it—their justifications prepared. So we passed over the item without prejudice, as we have done in several instances.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true with the arts, is it not?

Mr. DENTON. No. They were specific in their justification.

Mr. GROSS. They were what?

Mr. DENTON. Their justifications were quite specific.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the hearing record shows, I will say to the gentleman, and I have taken the time to read from it verbatim. So on neither count do you have any real justification for this.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it proposed to go out with this money now—perhaps this is the reason why all of these New York Members were talking in favor of this business today—and rent lofts for artists in deserted buildings in New York? Is that what is proposed to be done with some of this money? Is it another form of rent subsidy?

Mr. DENTON. Did the gentleman ask me another question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to know about the housing fund, there is \$100,000 in the bill for some preliminary expenses such as planning and design to enable private foundations to obtain loans under the FHA program to renovate old buildings. When FHA approval is obtained the planning funds are reimbursed. The \$100,000 is in a sense a revolving fund.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I intend to support the gentleman's motion primarily because of the pressure on the American dollar and the request that the President has made to help him save money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support. It is about time we in the House started cutting down on expenditures. If we are going to spend \$500 million in one day for help to India, it seems to me that somebody had better start thinking in terms of fiscal responsibility. It is

about time that we cut out items of this kind that we can well dispense with.

Somehow or other we have gotten along pretty well in this country for a good many years, for a century and a half or more, without expending money from the Federal Treasury on art and the humanities.

Let us cut out this expenditure. Let us stop it right where it is at least until we can balance the budget and see daylight ahead.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Iowa would have been more timely when Congress enacted this legislation last September.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee will recall that 114 Members of the House introduced legislation to create this program. There was no vote of record on passage of the bill, but on a motion to recommit the House adopted this legislation by a vote of 2 to 1. That settled the question. The Appropriations Committee now must determine how the program will be funded.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], read the cross examination in the printed hearings—I guess one could call it that—with reference to my colloquy with Mr. Stevens. I believe Mr. Stevens gave full justification for his budget estimate, and did it with meticulous care.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list here of the actual projects to be funded. I do not know how they could have been any more specific.

The National Council on the Arts is set up to pass on these projects. The membership of the council is listed on page 281 of the record.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to read this list into the RECORD, but the Members of the Committee will see that it is composed of very eminent men and women.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know much about art. However, I enjoy it, and I respect the people who do know something about this kind of work.

However, when it comes to passing upon the justification for the expenditure of this money, we should rely on the judgment of this fine board which has been set up, composed of these very able individuals. Personally, I intend to place great reliance on their recommendations as to just what is art, and just what types of art should be funded.

Mr. Chairman, we have many comparable situations contained in this bill. For instance, there is money for research in coal, there is money for research in water. We have boards that pass upon these projects, and we give considerable credence to their recommendations.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in another subcommittee on which it is my privilege to serve, the subcommittee which handles the NIH, we have boards composed of people who submit recommendations on cancer research projects, on mental health, and heart trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know for certain whether the various projects are good or bad, but I trust their judgment.

Fortunately we have a very able council that has made recommendations for the arts program.

Now, some people are inclined to ridicule art. I do not. I respect the arts. As someone has pointed out, we have money in this bill for fishing. Some people like to fish. A great many other people are interested in the arts.

Mr. Chairman, as other Members of the Congress have done, I have been to Rome and I have been to Greece. In the past they were great countries. Today the most notable monuments to their great past is their art and their literature.

Mr. Chairman, America has grown up. Other countries finance such projects as this. For instance, the United Kingdom spends \$38 million annually on the arts; Austria spends \$12 million annually.

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

Mr. DENTON. In just one moment I shall.

West Germany spends \$11 million annually on the arts; France, \$8.5 million, and Italy \$8.5 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a matter that does not merit further controversy. We have gone into this very carefully, because we knew that any action we took would be severely questioned on the floor.

I believe Mr. Stevens took very good care of himself in the hearings. They have this fine Council to review the projects, and Congress has decided that we will embark upon this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have expended a great deal of money on science. This is somewhat complementary to the sciences.

I believe this debate is superfluous, and that this appropriation has been justified. I hope the amendment is voted down.

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

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the British and French Governments' contributions to art and culture.

Does the gentleman have any idea how much money they owe us in terms of billions of dollars?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. GROSS. It has a lot to do with it. The fact that we have subsidized their arts and culture.

Mr. DENTON. That is not a matter for consideration in this bill. It has been said that we Americans are the craziest people in the world.

Mr. GROSS. What was that?

Mr. DENTON. There are Europeans that have said we have the better teachers than any country and they go to their country to perform. They said that we were training their performers. This would give the people in this country the same benefit of these excellent performances they have in other countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, from my standpoint they can spare us some of the entertainment which they have sent over here.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, until last year the United States was the only large progressive nation in the Western World without a systematic art subsidy.

Of all nations of the Western World England is closest to the United States in spirit and tradition.

In England national patronage of the arts is vested in the so-called Arts Council of Great Britain.

When did Government support for the arts begin in England?

Did it begin in peacetime?

No, it began in the middle of the worst war England or the world has ever known.

In the bitter war winter of 1939 a private group called the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts was formed. The committee's initial efforts were financed by a private grant of 25,000 pounds. Within 4 months, however, the British Government agreed to match private donations pound for pound.

By the third year of the war, the private trust withdrew and the financial destiny of the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts was left in the hands of the British Government.

On June 12, 1945, before the war was over the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared in the House of Commons that there was a permanent need—even in peacetime—for an organization entrusted with the encouragement and diffusion of the arts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced on that occasion that the Government had decided to incorporate the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts into an officially sponsored organization to be known as the Arts Council of Great Britain.

Thus at a time when our English friends were fighting for their very existence, they were willing to spend to preserve and improve the very thing for which they were fighting—their civilization.

At that time, Great Britain was spending approximately 59 percent of its national income to defend its very existence. Today, our overall defense expenditures amount to 8.1 percent of our national income. Ten percent of our military force is engaged in a limited war 10,000 miles from our shores.

Today, while our soldiers are fighting in Vietnam, we can certainly afford to spend less than one ten-thousandth of our national budget to preserve and improve our civilization and the quality of life to which our soldiers will be returning.

Last year we changed this.

Last September this House by an almost 2 to 1 vote pledged to all the people that there would be support for the artists and scholars of America.

Now we are being asked to renege on that pledge.

April 5, 1966

We are being asked to return to being the only Western nation without a program for assistance to the arts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am most gratified that our colleagues have so decisively rejected the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. The gentleman's consistent opposition to arts and humanities legislation is as well known as it is ill founded. The following articles and telegrams are representative of the opinion of an overwhelming number of this Nation's scholars and cultural experts and, indeed, of the people:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I hope very much that New York City delegation will support in full amount Interior appropriation for national arts and humanities. This is extremely important in New York City as cultural center of United States.

JOHN V. LINDSAY.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand House Subcommittee on Appropriations is not recommending funding next year for national humanities endowment. May I urge the importance of this funding and ask you to help in having it restored at level originally recommended by the President.

ROBERT F. GOHEEN,
President, Princeton University.

ATLANTA, GA.,
April 4, 1966.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I join with many scholars in hoping that the Congress will appropriate funds to support the national humanity foundation for the crucial next fiscal years.

HARVEY YOUNG,
Professor of History, Emory University.

ATLANTA, GA.,
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In behalf of the citizen arts panel of the Georgia Fourth District may I express sincere hope that adequate appropriations for the arts and humanities foundations will obtain approval of the House. Thank you for your efforts in this behalf.

GEORGE BEISWANGER,
Chairman.

ATLANTA, GA.,
April 3, 1966.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My colleagues and I are deeply disturbed by difficulties facing the National Humanities Foundation's appropriation. Your continued support for this essential program will be greatly appreciated.

CHAPPELL WHITE,
Chairman, Department of Music,
Emory University.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
April 5, 1966.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Western Arts Association, which is composed of art educators from 18 States, urge that you protect the interests of the arts and humanities in the current attempt to cut appropriations.

Sincerely,

FRED V. MILLS,
President, Western Arts Association.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
April 5, 1966.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It is urgent that you protect the arts and humanities legislation and resist all attempts to cut appropriations.

LUCILE F. CURTICE,
Trenton, Mich.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

TRouble for the Arts Foundation

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into congressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the \$5 million authorized by the bill for the arts endowment to \$4 million and denied the money authorized for the humanities endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the dead hand of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1966]
BALLET: BRILLIANT DANCING FITS HISTORIC OCCASION—FEDERAL MONEY AIDS THE ART FOR FIRST TIME

(By Clive Barnes)

The American Ballet Theater sweetly, effortlessly, and most splendidly made sweet, effortless, and splendid history at the New York State Theater last night.

It opened its month's New York season before a star-studded, indeed star-spangled audience, headed by Vice President HUMPHREY, and with no pain at all became the first American performing arts enterprise to appear with the help of a Federal grant. For this relief much thanks. May it be the first of many enterprises so to benefit, and may its future be at last made as secure as money can make it.

The program luckily matched the historic occasion, opening with a sensitive new production of the second act of "Swan Lake," which marks a milestone in American ballet. For this production, mounted by David Blair from Britain's Royal Ballet, is the first American a thoroughgoing reconstruction of the great Russian choreography.

The Royal Ballet "Swan Lake" traces its ancestry straight back to the famous 1894 version at St. Petersburg's Maryinsky Theater, and is, more or less, an exact transcription of the Ivanov work.

This is one of the supreme masterpieces of ballet, not only because in its dance image of the doomed Swan Queen, an aloof and poignant symbol of man's aspiration, Ivanov created a choreographic metaphor that threads its way into the mind, but also because in the symphonic patterning of the ensemble, even more apparent in Ivanov's last act of "Swan Lake" created a year later, dance took one of its most decisive steps forward.

It is right and proper that an American company should assume responsibility for this great "Swan Lake" in the United States, and one is enheartened by the understanding that this production of the second act is merely the first stage in a project to mount the complete Petipa-Ivanov ballet. It is a first stage marvelously well surmounted.

Mr. Blair's careful yet subtle staging is exemplary. Apart from a strange musical insertion from the last act, he has been consistently faithful to Ivanov, permitting himself only a few grace notes (a flurry of pas de bourrees when the Swans enter; the removal of the intrusive Benno, that long-suffered Prince's Friend, from the pas de deux; the courtly manner in which the Prince enters to watch Odette's solo) that adds up to a production that is, one supposes, currently the best in the world.

Helped by Oliver Smith's most attractive lakeside setting, properly and prettily Gothic, but perhaps, to carp, a little hard in outline for misty Romanticism, and Freddy Wittop's elegant costumes, the company looked fine.

Lupe Serrano as Odette acted with passionate incisiveness, but her dancing, for all its swift, salmonlike turning movements, lacked eloquence. Royes Fernandez was the convincing Prince, grave and ardent, only disappointing in his handling of the one or two high lifts. The ensemble, wearing Swan headdresses that too-resembled powdered wigs, had vitality without a completely cohesive style. But good already, clearly it will be better later.

The program also included last season's triumphant "Les Noces" and that old Ballet Theater favorite, "Etudes." Jerome Robbins' "Les Noces" is unquestionably one of the most important ballets to be created in recent years. It is breathtaking in its imagery, in the power of its dancing, in its sense of human compassion, and in its sheer beauty of craftsmanship and imaginative grasp.

Mr. Robbins has taken Stravinsky's "Les Noces," a dance-cantata of enormous complexity, and staged it so that his dancing and Stravinsky's music come together white-hot. It is conceived, as the composer directed, in terms of nonspecific folk dance, and it becomes a sort of savagely ritualistic epiphalamium.

The Bride (Erin Martin) and Bridegroom (William Glassman), literally thrown to-

gether by their parents and the matchmakers, show fear and reluctance, at last warming into physical love. The work, watched grimly by Oliver Smith's censorious Russian icons on the backcloth, has a joy of life, an assertion we had not previously noticed in Mr. Robbins since perhaps "Fancy Free" and "Interplay." It is a strange turn, but not one for the worse. And this "Les Noces" is a masterpiece.

* * * * *

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Nov. 21, 1965]

ARTS COUNCIL: CAUTIOUS DARING

(By Richard L. Coe, special to the Providence Sunday Journal)

WASHINGTON.—In its unprecedented task of spending Federal funds, the National Council on the Arts is moving with what might be called cautious daring.

By recognizing the need of individual artists for cheap places in which to work and live, the Council shows that it has its feet on practical earth, an area to which dilettantism rarely descends.

By aiming to help finance acting companies for the school boards of three cities, the council shows keen awareness of the congressional bill's accent on grassroots activity. One sign of this was evident at the Council's final session of its recent 3-day meeting in Tarrytown, N.Y., in the press representation from various cities.

A half-dozen other cities have been exploring an acting company scheme through their local school boards and the U.S. Office of Education. Interest in those several cities was keen enough to have reporters on hand to flash the word. Such coverage was indicative, justifying this year's congressional action.

That the word has not yet been decided is logical enough since such a scheme would be genuinely revolutionary and still will take further probing. The plan is to offer first-rate theatrical companies performing five afternoons per week to students, unfamiliar with the world's rich dramatic literatures, and three evenings per week to the general public at "reasonable" prices.

These two schemes—housing and board of education plays—are definite innovations and came about through the self-insulation the Council has chosen for its early business sessions.

Tarrytown House is the former estate of Mary Duke Biddle and is one of several private, isolated "think factories" dotting the east coast as havens for executive seminar sessions. Removed from the distractions offered by New York, Boston and Washington, such centers provide unrelieved 16-hour days to concentrate on given problems.

The Council's members include such knowledgeable figures as the heads of the Metropolitan Opera, the museums of Toledo, Houston, and New York's modern art, the American Federation of Musicians and ANTA, such lively names as Poet Paul Engle, Choreographer Agnes de Mille, Actor Gregory Peck, Director George Stevens Sr., Designer Oliver Smith, Architects William L. Pereira and Minoru Yamasaki, composer Richard Rodgers, Violinist Isaac Stern and Washington's Dean Warner Lawson and Father Gilbert V. Hartke.

The Arts Council is actually only one half of the bill enacted this last session under the Arts and Humanities bill.

Further, as all faithful legislative followers are aware, an authorization for funds is not an appropriation. Thus, in the middle of a fiscal year, the Arts Council has at its disposal less than \$3 million.

To those following how moneys are being donated to the arts in our culture conscious era, that \$3 million prompts a quiet smile. Only 2 weeks ago the Ford Foundation allocated \$85 million in a special program for the Nation's symphony orchestras.

Thus, both the initial actions and modest sums are admittedly tentative. As Council Chairman Roger L. Stevens remarked, "This is only a start. We are the first to admit that we've got a lot of fields to cover yet."

There are five other points on which the Council has decided to split its \$2,680,000 melon. These are:

An immediate matching grant of \$100,000 to the American Ballet Theater, which did not share in last year's Ford Foundation largess to dance, and an additional \$250,000 matching grant to be used for a nationwide tour.

Its 25 years of dancing to audiences all across the Nation, not simply in New York, makes the ballet theater grant not merely sensible but mandatory.

An individual competition of American contemporary artists from which 35 to 50 paintings and sculptures will be selected for a national tour to cities with populations under 250,000.

Participating artists will receive rental fees of \$100 per month for their work and co-operating cities must provide half the cost of the tour in their areas.

A \$100,000 grant will finance a study of how writers and directors can be assimilated from academic training to practical activity in the film field. With hopes toward stimulating an American film institute, the council has allocated \$500,000 to such an organization if film, academic, and other interests match that figure.

A sum of \$250,000 was set aside to finance new plays by known and unknown playwrights in community and university theaters outside the New York area. This recognizes the increasing impossibility of financing serious drama in New York's commercial theater and could further the aims of the American Playwrights Theater, founded by playwrights for the same purpose.

Nor are individuals neglected. Artists, writers, musicians, composers, and choreographers will share \$755,000 as grants-in-aid.

In most cases, the Council has refrained from making final choices itself. These will be left to panels of experts in the various fields, States arts councils and other appropriate bodies. And, also in most cases, the awards are contingent on organizations getting matching sums from their immediate supporters.

These two tactics, while seemingly complex, have been devised to overcome the notion that "the Government is dictating to the arts," one of the thornier matters in what is, for this country, a highly revolutionary step. Artists are free to ignore the whole affair and plunge onward as before. Nobody is dictating to anybody.

But the fact remains, the Arts Council's think sessions have come up with a seven-point program of imagination, moderation, and awareness that the U.S. eddies beyond the Hudson and Potomac.

And that modest \$100,000 set aside as pump priming for cheaper working space is especially provocative. For despite the flossy icing, the arts begin with paying the rent.

INTELLIGENT SPENDING TO PROMOTE THE ARTS BEGINS

(By Frank Getlein, art critic of the Star)

There are two kinds of opposition to the National Council on the Arts and its subsidization with Federal money of American art and artists. The more vocal and less important have been the congressional jackanapes who fancy themselves as razorlike wits when they rise to talk of the "fine art of poker playing. Mr. Speaker, are we-all gonna put some money into that?"

A lot has happened to America since these clowns used to speak for a presumed majority. They can now be dismissed with pity and patience.

The more serious opposition has existed within the artistic community itself and

has been voiced, thoughtfully or wildly, by artists, critics, and institutional officers. The fear is of the turning of Roger L. Stevens into a dictator of the arts. The tradition appealed to is one of considerable alienation of artists from the community at large.

GROUNDLESS FEARS

The alienation however comforting it used to be, is long over. It is time that artists of all kinds took time off from the writing of grant applications and the enjoyment of social lionization to realize that nobody hates them anymore. Everybody loves them. This condition has dangers of its own, but they are not those of the outcast of the islands.

How about Roger Stevens as artistic dictator and arbiter of culture? The fear is groundless. So is the larger fear of the Federal Government taking over the arts by spending money.

The Council had its first disbursement meeting last weekend at Tarrytown, N.Y., Washington Irving's hometown. It got through almost the whole of the \$3 million given it by Congress for the first year. And it set a pattern for thoughtful discrimination as to need and prospect in the arts. In its first major action the Council demonstrated brilliantly that it will be an imaginative force for intelligent change in the art structure of this country, as well as a quick and generous support for the truly national institutions in their moments dire.

TOUR EMPHASIZED

The moment dire alleviated at Tarrytown was that of the American Ballet Theater, a distinguished company long supported by one chief patron and this year in imminent danger of financial disaster. The Council last weekend, rushed in with \$100,000 at once, on a matching basis, plus a matching \$250,000 for a national tour.

You will note the "matching," which is part of the Council's style, as it tends to be of the Ford Foundation's. But note also the tour, for this is just as much part of the new style. The Council clearly recognizes that art is something that happens in megalopolis, a location that includes the rim of the Great Lakes, the gulf coast, and two parts of California along with the familiar Boston to Norfolk axis.

But the Council just as clearly has decided to throw a lot of its weight toward making the arts more readily available outside of the one big city most of us live in.

The invitational art competition will produce an exhibition to tour cities under 250,000 population. Thus, the Laboratory Theater project, in collaboration with the Office of Education and local school boards, will create three acting companies for secondary school students in cities where classical theater is not readily available. Thus, too, plays of merit and interest, currently unproduced because of the venality of Broadway producers will be given productions out of New York in university and community theaters.

FILM INSTITUTE PLAN

The Council has begun what could be a real breakout for the American arts from their present status as almost wholly a set of compensations for the discomfort of having to live in New York and its extensions.

Now regard the one new apparatus the council has undertaken to create, an American Film Institute. It will, in part, be archival, conservatory and restorative, three functions the idiot industry has largely ignored through the years. But it will be chiefly devoted to the training of directors and writers for the movies. Again, the vulgarians of Hollywood have ignored this necessity despite its obvious relationship to their own welfare.

The projected institute does two very salutary things. It rebukes the avarice and

stupidity of an industry which has made money hand over fist for decades and very rarely ploughed a dollar and a half back into the cultivation of its resources.

And it points out that cinema is not stars and sets, but is writing and direction, the latter term to include cutting.

The movies constitute, along with jazz, America's most important contribution to world culture. But things have reached the State where we are outclassed regularly by the Russians, the Germans, the Italians, the French, the British, the Swedes and, God help us, the Japanese. There can be no thought of "regaining" world leadership, but at least we ought to get back into the club of civilized moviemakers. The institute is of fundamental importance in that effort. Indeed, at the moment, it just about is that effort.

DETAILS DRAWN UP

Frank Lloyd Wright used to quote his master, Sullivan, that "God is in the details." Consider some details in the program drawn up at Tarrytown.

They are putting \$100,000 into planning the renovation of old buildings to make them studio-residences for artists of all kinds. The actual financing will come from Government underwritten loans as already established in realty and once the first jobs are completed, the council gets back its hundred grand and can keep on doing it.

For some years now, New York artists have been moving into the lofts vacated by the light industries driven out of town by taxes and the lack of parking space. The city, in its cultural way, has persecuted the artists because they are violating residential codes.

There is an obvious chance that in John Lindsay the artists at last have someone that will know what they're talking about. Assuming such an attitude on his part, what a brilliant stroke this revolving fund is. It will calm down the artists and eventually house them within occupancy code standards. And actually the cost is nothing at all, except getting some brains together and letting them think it out. The heart of this project is the knowledgeable fusion of parts of two formerly separate worlds, art and government.

More details: the 50 artists who will get one-semester sabbaticals are teaching in colleges and universities and hence have some kind of professional achievement. This is important because so much of private foundation aid to artists concentrates on youth. If you are an unknown painter with a beard and bad manners, you find it very difficult to avoid getting a foundation grant and an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art as a young American.

GRANTS TO COMPOSERS

But if what you have is not promise but achievement, you will often find yourself whistling up the drainpipe for either cash or museum exposure. Another fully knowledgeable choice.

Again, the composers are getting grants not just as commissions but also as money specifically earmarked for copying and related costs. This attacks what amounts to a scandal in musical composition, although it really isn't anyone's fault. But the fact is that a good musical copyist much too often makes more money out of a musical commission than does the composer. The commission calls for delivery of adequate parts for all the instruments and the composer often has to pay for copying himself. Since copyists are rare and the work is tedious, they charge high prices and deserve them. But how good to have someone besides the poor composer picking up the tab.

A REVOLUTION

By now you will have noted an exemplifying strain in the grants: the council is not only doing things, it is setting an example of

how these things ought to be done. Here's another: The painters and sculptors in that touring exhibition get paid rental of \$100 a month for their stuff and it could be away for 3 years.

This is a real revolution. It's one that the Whitney Museum once tried to pull off, namely paying artists for the use of their works just as we pay performing artists for theirs. The fact is that the art public, including those who buy an occasional picture, is as big bunch of freeloaders as the Washington press corps. We have made art a market commodity, pure and simple. But there ought to be, and at times there have been, other ways to set up a cash nexus between the man who creates art and the people who enjoy it.

Rembrandt Peale used to haul his monstrous painting, "The Court of Death," about the country on rollers and sell tickets to see it. Don't laugh. The first year he made eight thousand smackers and in the 1820's that was a lot of dough.

So there are other ways and people ought to be willing to pay for pleasure received in art as they regularly do in all other forms of pleasure. Again, the council has taken a very imaginative and possibly pattern-setting step.

NO FALSE MOVE

Unlike poor Peale's 8 grand, \$3 million is not a lot of dough with which to confront the entire national need in all the arts. Presumably and hopefully there will be more in the future. Right now you can pick up some fantastic figures in the New York rumor mills about the size of the program in a couple of years.

But in the meantime, with a paltry \$3 million, the council has made an utterly brilliant beginning. There isn't a false move. The return will be many, many times the investment. And almost every item is so beautifully constructed that it will teach the trustees, patrons, directors, and customers of the American art establishment things they should have known before.

One final, invisible blessing: a staff is beginning to come into existence working for Roger Stevens that will, within months, know just about everything that's going on in the American arts. The closest approach to this so far has been the brain of McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, but Lowry is not a public official and his information is his tools. It will work that way here, too, but the nature of our Government insures that the information will also be widely available.

President Johnson, Senator PELL, Democrat of Rhode Island, who was chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities and introduced the administration's legislation, Mr. Stevens, and a cast of thousands over the years have brought in a winner.

GOVERNMENT GIVING ARTS SIGNIFICANT PUSH (By Howard Taubman)

The Federal Government's new presence in the arts makes it almost a certainty that the mid-1960's will be a great watershed in their history in America.

Sparked by the money and energies released by the establishment of a National Arts Endowment, a host of projects are being developed.

By next fall, in time for the start of the new school year, there will be three new professional repertory companies playing Shakespeare and other classics. They probably will be centered in Providence, Milwaukee and Fort Worth.

They will be organized by the endowment and will have substantial backing from the Office of Education, working in cooperation with State and municipal authorities. Their prime function will be to serve as a living aid in the teaching of dramatic literature.

Perhaps sooner than next fall an ingenious plan to help a number of gifted writers will be in operation. About 20 who have published books that received critical acclaim will be selected.

The Arts Endowment will cooperate in buying up copies of the books. The writer will get the royalties due him, and the books will be donated to libraries that could not otherwise afford them.

The endowment also expects in the next few months to work out extensive ideas for grants to States for projects that will have local matching contributions.

All this planning reflects a salutary change in the Nation's cultural climate.

In the 1930's the Federal arts projects, which were making work for unemployed writers, painters, musicians and actors at a pitiful subsistence wage, were under frequent fire in Congress.

In the mid-1960's the Federal Government is investing directly and openly in artists and artistic institutions. Yet Congressmen today, instead of complaining, are appearing personally at the new offices of the Arts Endowment in Washington to push the claims of their constituents and communities for Federal aid.

The top men in the Government, beginning with President Johnson, have taken careful note of the Nation's upsurge in the arts. They are aware of the expanding vogue for arts councils and arts centers, of the explosion in sales of paperback books, of the wide appeal of recordings, of the new energies in regional theaters, orchestras, dance groups and museums, of massive foundation activity.

Everyone agrees that the arts are no longer the preserve of a minority or elite. It has become clear that the arts increasingly have become a necessity to many millions and that what they have to offer should be accessible to many more millions.

To modernize Hamlet's phrase, the arts are, indeed, caviar to the general public because in the Great Society the general public likes and wants caviar.

The cultural pot is simmering in Washington and across the land. The man who has done the most to get the fire going under it is Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to close friends of Johnson, the new President fixed on a three-phase strategy to move the Government formally into full support of the arts.

First, he made it clear that he would follow the Kennedy idea of appointing an arts council by Executive order.

Then in 1964 he got Congress to establish a National Arts Council.

Third, in 1965, he induced Congress, using his familiar tactics of personal persuasion by telephone, to set up national foundations in the arts and humanities backed by sizable, if not overwhelming, appropriations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: Page 42, before the period in line 2, insert the following: "Provided further, That the amounts appropriated under this paragraph shall be available to any organization, or entity, only on condition that not more than 12½ percent of the amount so made available be expended in any one State: And provided further, That no part of any amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be used to make grants to any organization, or entity, or to pay the salary of (or to cover expenses incurred by) any person who, or organization which, in his, or its, official, or unofficial capacity, participates in, cooperates with, or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure, or place, of local or national historic or cultural significance, including the Metropolitan

Opera House located at 39th Street and Broadway in New York City".

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this changes existing legislation. It provides that there should be quotas among the States when the existing legislation does not contain such a provision. This is legislation that changes existing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a type of amendment that has been accepted before on similar legislation. It seeks to protect the interests of the States in these grants and in the distribution of funds under this program. I think it is a very equitable amendment and should be accepted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment would impose new duties on the officials charged with the administration of this program in determining whether grants should be made to any person or organization which participates and cooperates with or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure or place of local or national historic or cultural significance.

For the reasons above stated, the amendment is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$7,293,000."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may speak to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the amount of appropriations in this bill. I spoke on it in the general debate, and I want again to say, and make it crystal clear, that I am not attacking any project in this bill. I am not trying to strike any project from this bill. The amendment would simply reduce the total amount of the bill by the amount added for 41 projects in instances in which the bill went over the budget.

The House in its wisdom, exercising its prerogative has said to the Department, "There are certain projects that we think ought to be in here, and we are appropriating \$1,204 million, \$30 million more than was appropriated last year."

I am convinced that the Department can and should, under this legislative mandate that these projects be funded through the amount of \$7,203,000, in a budget of one billion two hundred and some million dollars find this money and they should process these projects to take care of these Members of the House. We are not taking out any projects. We are leaving them in, and we are saying to the Department, "We, the Congress, in this appropriation bill, are sending a directive to you to fund these out of funds we are giving to you."

I say to you that if there is an agency that has that kind of money, \$1,200 million it ought to be able to find \$7 million to work out the will of Congress. We will make legislative history today—not that we want these projects taken out, but that the Congress wants them funded with the funds we are giving them. Let them take out some of the low priority programs, if it is a question of priorities. But certainly those which the House has put into this bill above the budget should be of high priority.

I would urge you, if you sincerely want to help the President in his budget effort, if you want to be in a position so that he cannot say, "You have gone over the budget in so many instances, therefore you must raise taxes," vote for this amendment. Vote for your projects in the bill, and see that the Department complies with this directive that we have put in, that they be funded from the \$1,200 million.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous agencies covered by this appropriation bill. While the executive branch has discretion not to spend this money, the proposed amendment would force the Executive to assign priorities to the various agencies. It would place discretionary action with the President and, it is the Congress who determines how funds shall be appropriated. The amendment would take that authority from the Congress and give it to the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that the gentleman from Indiana is insisting on his point of order?

Mr. DENTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment would reduce the appropriations in this bill in the amount of \$7,293,000. The so-called Holman rule provides:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of Congress to appropriate money and determine how much each agency shall receive. This amendment would take away that responsibility from the Congress and give it to the executive. Congress does not have to rubberstamp the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. It is our responsibility to determine the amount of and to whom funds are appropriated.

In this particular bill we have cut the appropriations \$41 million. In round numbers, we have added \$7 million, for a net reduction below the budget estimate of \$34 million, or 3 percent.

In addition, income under this bill will be increased by \$233.5 million in 1967. The bill increases appropriations \$30 million. Taking that sum from the \$233.5 million, it can be seen we are \$203.5 million better off than we were last year. If we can do as well as that with respect to every other appropriation bill which comes before this Congress, we will have no difficulty.

This is a most unusual motion. I have never heard one like it before—to reduce the funds, but have the executive determine where the reductions will be made.

It has been said this amendment would not take anything out of the bill. Let me cite a few items the committee added to this bill.

We added \$250,000 to reduce the incidence of trachoma among the Indians. They have been victims of this infectious disease which causes blindness.

By the use of some of this money we can conquer the disease, because we will have the means to do it.

There is also a provision for dam construction involving \$165,000, for the Blackfeet Indians. This will make the Indian lands irrigable, so that the lands can be cultivated. Some would tend to say we might take that out of the bill.

I could go on at length. There are a number of projects involving fish hatcheries, renovation and development, and other things, all of which have A-1 priorities. By next year these construction projects would cost 10 percent more. It would be penny wise and pound foolish to delete these items from the bill.

In this bill we make recommendations below the budget estimates and have added some items. We have redistributed the funding as presented in the budget estimate. Our committee spent much time on this appropriation bill, and I believe our committee is thoroughly cognizant of the items in this bill. I will stand back of every cut and every increase the committee recommends.

I would be willing to accept \$41 million any day against the \$7 million the committee has added.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

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

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with what the distinguished chairman has said. We have cut the amount requested by \$34 million. As I said earlier in the debate, some Members of the House have

said we should not be a rubberstamp. That has been said on our side of the aisle.

Now we have an opportunity to express our will, in opposition to what has come up from the administration.

We have cut the amount \$34 million, and we have added some additional projects which we believe should be provided. Practically all of them were turned down by the Bureau of the Budget.

This, in the judgment of our committee, is merely a redistribution of some of the money.

I hope the Committee of the Whole will support our position.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe that the committee in this instance has done an excellent job.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] is one of the outstanding men on our committee. He knows this subject as well as, if not better than, any other man in the House.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] is also a knowledgeable man in this field.

The committee has done a good job for economy, in cutting the budget request approximately \$34 million.

Under the "scatter or blunderbuss" amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio some \$7 million would be cut, but it would be cut by the bureaucrats downtown. If the amendment is defeated, the money appropriated under the terms of this bill will be spent the way Congress wants it spent.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the amendment of my friend from Ohio will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereon shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make it very clear in the remarks that have been made here previously that I hold the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in the highest regard. I think he is a great chairman and does a fine job in handling his bill, as do all of the members of that subcommittee, particularly the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee on this

side of the aisle [Mr. REIFEL]. My effort to reduce this spending should not be taken as a reflection on any member of the committee, but simply as my prerogative and my philosophy that we have been spending too much money. I do not think you can justify a lot of these measures by saying we have cut the bill by so much. We ought to take a look at how much more the bill is this year than it was last year. We have a continuing deficit and a mounting deficit year by year. So we had better begin to make some cuts where they are effective and not just say that the Bureau of the Budget can send up a terrifically big budget to us and then we make cuts in it and make ourselves look good although we do not really cut down on our deficit spending.

When you talk about a \$34 million cut, which is what the record shows it to be, let us look at the fact that the direct appropriations are \$30 million higher than last year.

I see the House is not in a mood now to support the President in his efforts to cut spending or the efforts of the President to keep the budget down to a proper level. Let me say that this amendment I am now offering simply provides, in effect, that during the fiscal year 1967, the President shall not spend more than 95 percent of the aggregate net expenditure estimates for the agencies in this bill as contained in the budget for fiscal year 1967. This is a limitation on spending. This provides that just 95 percent of the expenditure estimate, if they get up that high, shall be spent. It is a very simple amendment. There is nothing more to it than a limitation on spending to 95 percent of the budget estimate.

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

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In effect, is not this amendment what the President himself said last Thursday or Friday he was going to direct members of the Cabinet to do for fiscal 1966 and what he intimated he would ask members of the Cabinet and their respective departments to do in fiscal 1967? The President's statement last week in effect wiped away the validity of the budget that he submitted to us in January of this year. This amendment which you are offering today is a help to him in remedying the inadequacies and deficiencies of the budget which he submitted to us in January 1966.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The President intimated he is going to try to cut spending by \$1 billion in order to stop inflation and in order to prevent the necessity for a tax increase. We are simply trying to help him with this, and I hope that the amendment would be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order question.

Mr. Chairman, we have not had opportunity to examine this in detail, but from a quick reading it is not entirely clear to me just what this amendment would do. If the amendment has any application to funds provided in previous years which might be available for

expenditure in the fiscal year 1967, then I would suggest that the amendment is out of order. Do I understand that the amendment would hold expenditures to 95 percent of the funds provided in this bill?

Mr. BOW. It says:

The money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The moneys in this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a broadax cut of 5 percent across the board. If it is not, then we are abdicating our responsibility as Members of Congress to appropriate money and we are turning it over to someone else. If this is to be a 5-percent cut across the board, you are cutting money for the education of the Indians 5 percent; you are cutting money for the health of the Indians 5 percent. The Bureau of Land Management takes in a good deal of money. They supervise the oil interests of this Government. If you cut their budget 5 percent, you would lose a great deal of money. I do not understand why these motions are made on this particular appropriation bill. This bill was cut \$34 million. When you consider the income, we are 15 percent better off than we were last year in this bill. We have cut this budget 3 percent. It is the function of this Congress to determine how this money should be spent and where. This is a shotgun cut. It does not specify where the funds should be reduced. It leaves this determination to the executive branch of the Government, and in reality it is asking us to abdicate our responsibility and become rubberstamps by turning this decision over to the Bureau of the Budget. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation in this Act may be used for the payment of any part of a salary in excess of \$6,000 per year to any individual who is granted a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of accepting a scholarship, fellowship, or other similar plan under which such individual may continue his education under a subsidized program, financed either by a foundation, or a State or Federal Government."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this will not save a lot of money, but it will place a limitation—and I think cause not only this Department, but other departments, to reexamine the acts under which the employees are employed and educated under the Government Employees Training Act. That seems the

basis for which they are paying the full salary to people who are given annual leaves to accept scholarships, fellowships, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this came to my attention, more or less, by accident. However, I am going to cite this one example to the members of the committee.

There was an employee in the Interior Department—a grade 12; and I do not know what his salary is, but a grade 12 is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$11,000 or \$12,000 a year—who was not the type of employee that got along too well in the Department. So they shipped him from another area of the country down to Washington.

Well, he did not get along so well here. They arranged to assist him in obtaining a fellowship with which to send him off to school. They sent him across the country. The fellowship paid him enough money to the point where the average person would be delighted to have just that remuneration from this foundation, or scholarship.

But he gets his leave of absence, continues his salary of \$10,000 or \$11,000 a year, or whatever it is, plus the scholarship.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to do the man an injustice, because later from a reliable source I have learned that there are others in that Department as well as the other departments of Government who take advantage of this situation.

Mr. Chairman, the general legislation is permissive. But what I think has happened in some of the departments is that they have used that as either a directive or mandate that if a person gets a scholarship or a fellowship or some way they could go on and continue their education to better qualify themselves for a better job, a higher paying job after they get back, then they will give him this leave of absence, with pay.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment would do is that if that man makes more than \$6,000 a year we would not pay him above \$6,000 a year. If he is a person who is getting \$10,000 a year at the present time he could take a leave of absence and draw \$6,000 a year in pay from the Government, receive his scholarship or fellowship or the remuneration which he might get from some foundation that is paying for this type of education. That is all this does. It only applies to a person who gets a leave of absence, with pay. It would cut back his salary to \$6,000 a year if he gets more than that. If he gets less than that it would not affect him at all. It would affect only a fellow who is paid two salaries while receiving a benefit which would help him get a better salary later on.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Members of the House are in sympathy with wasting Government funds in that manner, and for that reason I ask that the amendment be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, one bad case should not change an entire law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENTON. No, I will not yield at this time; I will later.

Congress enacted legislation providing for training of employees to improve their job performance. This is done in every branch of the Government, not only in the Interior Department. I think you will find that private industry does this too.

Mr. Chairman, we had comment a few minutes ago with reference to cutting down expenditures. However, this amendment objects to training Government employees to accomplish this. This law has paid dividends. If it is going to be changed, it should be changed by legislation.

Certainly we should not discriminate against the Department of Interior and treat it any differently than any other agency.

I hope this amendment is defeated, because it is, in effect, legislation. It is not an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You mention the fact that we were making out just one case. I cited one case but I know on good authority that there are other cases in this department. If the House of Representatives wants to put some restriction on this at this time, I think we should add this provision to all the bills as these other bills come along from the Committee on Appropriations and we should take care of this in order to do away with this practice. I think it is a misuse of the permissive authority given under the Government retraining program.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to do that, the way to do it is to amend the Government Employees Training Act and have the change apply to every agency and not just to the Department of the Interior. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and this matter should be considered by the legislative committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you wait to do that, it will never be corrected—I can tell you that. We ought to do this today while we have a chance to save some money here and now, and at the same time let all Departments know we are in favor of stopping this gravy train.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 26, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill

(H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair the noes had it.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

In accordance with the order of the House of March 30, the vote will be postponed until tomorrow.

The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 7, 1966,
TO MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 625

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND FOR THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from April 7 to April 18, 1966, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 20, 1966, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT OF 1966

Mr. MEEDS. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to put the special milk fund on a permanent basis and to assure the continuation of this program which has helped so many of our children.

The administration is asking that \$82 million be slashed from the milk fund. It is my feeling that budget cuts that are meaningless in terms of savings would be false economy, at best. Such a cut in the milk fund would compel the Government to raise the support price of milk and to add to the inventory of dairy products already amassed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The result would be more expensive than continuing the special milk fund at its present level.

While the administration is recommending that Congress cut the milk fund, it is also sponsoring legislation to extend the school lunch program and special milk fund to more needy students.

It is my feeling that low-income children should be guaranteed an adequate milk diet. But how do you expand the program, or even continue it, if you cut its appropriation? If the cuts are approved, the increased cost per half-pint of milk will mean that many students simply will not be able to afford this fine nutritional supplement.

The administration's substitute plan would center about a poverty formula. This formula will be totally unlike the formula used in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Under title I of Public Law 89-10, whole school districts are eligible to receive categorical aid. But under the administration's plan for school milk, we may well be embarking on a "means test" for individual students. I do not think that Congress should sanction another onerous means test, such as we had under the Kerr-Mills medical care program. It would be reprehensible to segregate individual students on the basis of economic rather than educational need. All children should be able to enjoy fresh milk.

I strongly urge the Congress to adopt legislation that will fulfill our obligation to the nutrition of our children and that will prevent increases in the cost of Government agriculture programs.

A SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

Mr. RONCALIO. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill providing for a permanent special milk program for children. This bill will benefit both schoolchildren and dairy farmers. It will benefit schoolchildren by giving them at reduced prices pure and wholesome milk so necessary to growing bodies and it will benefit dairy farmers by providing a fluid milk market for their product. Our entire Nation thereby benefits by having healthier children and a stable dairy industry.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the special milk program for children has grown at a remarkable rate; however, the fiscal 1967 budget request is for a drastic cut in the funds for this program with the result that the entire program is in jeopardy. In Wyoming alone funds will be cut from \$129,000 in fiscal 1966 to approximately \$27,000 in fiscal 1967. There is nearly an 80-percent reduction in funds for this nutrition program. This reduction will most assuredly not benefit schoolchildren since they will not be able to purchase and consume as much of nature's most perfect food.

Neither does the cut benefit dairy farmers. They will lose a substantial fluid milk market and probably have to process manufactured dairy products from this milk. This will result in a large reduction in the already low dairy farmer income, and in turn will cause the increased departure of many dairy farmers from the industry.

In 1960 milk production in Wyoming was 192 million pounds. However, in 1965 it had decreased to 175 million pounds. There has also been a large reduction in milk cows. In 1960 Wyoming had 35,000, and in 1965 it had only 27,000.

This bill, which has already generated wide support and interest, will eliminate the harm done by this proposed cutback. It will restore these funds and add some additional funds. These additional funds are necessary for three reasons: The first reason is that the present funds are not enough to reimburse the schools now in the program. My bill will insure that the schools now in the program will be reimbursed. The second reason for some increase in the present program is that school population is growing and thus more children will need to be covered. Third is that more schools will continue to join the program. This bill insures that adequate funds will be available for schools joining the program. This bill will make this program permanent—realizing the benefits given to schoolchildren, dairy farmers, and society are of true and lasting value.

By continuing this special milk program for children at a rate expanding with the need, nutrition to children can be effectively promoted while drastically reduced dairy farmer income can be increased to a small degree.

INQUIRY INTO SIMPLIFYING U.S. INCOME TAX FORMS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as the inevitability of the income tax deadline fast approaches, I am sure the question is arising in the minds of all of us who are preparing our tax returns, why it is that forms are so complicated, and why do they require so much time and effort, and recordkeeping?

The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee has concerned itself with the problem of tax return simplification for some time. Members of the subcommittee are Congressmen TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Democrat, of Massachusetts; CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey; JOHN G. DOW, Democrat, of New York; DONALD RUMSFELD, Republican, of Illinois; and ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas. The Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, is chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations. The

subcommittee, of which I am chairman, is charged with evaluating the efficiency and economy of various agencies of the Government, including those of the Internal Revenue Service. If some means can be devised to cut down on the time, expense, and effort required of taxpayers to fill out their income tax forms, it should likewise cut down on the Government's costs of processing the returns.

In our efforts to seek means of simplifying income tax forms under existing laws, I have communicated with most of the major associations of lawyers, accountants, and tax experts in the country, many of whom have given the subcommittee the benefit of their thinking on the subject. I have also been in touch with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Sheldon S. Cohen, and have enlisted the aid of the General Accounting Office in the subcommittee's efforts.

Also, the staff of the subcommittee has conferred with representatives of automatic data processing equipment manufacturers to see what ideas could be obtained from their experience in streamlining and speeding up business procedures.

I mention these things to show the breadth of the effort that the subcommittee has put into attempting to obtain better and more economical governmental procedures and ways of avoiding the tediousness that all taxpayers must go through in preparing Federal income tax returns.

Our efforts are directed to bringing about improvements under present laws. The subcommittee has no legislative jurisdiction in the tax field; its purpose is to see that everything possible is being done to simplify the process under existing statutes.

All taxpayers, I believe, will be interested in the practices followed by the Internal Revenue Service in making up the forms which we will have to file by April 15.

The Internal Revenue Service maintains a full-time staff within its Tax Forms and Instructions Branch of the Technical Planning Division. The chief of that branch doubles as chairman of the IRS Tax Forms Coordinating Committee, which includes part-time representatives of each of the six Assistant Commissioners, and of the Chief Counsel of IRS. The Commissioner has told the subcommittee that these, plus others, follow tax legislation step by step and maintain continuing contacts with business and professional organizations, and also review thousands of suggestions from the general public and from internal revenue offices throughout the United States in the formulation of tax procedures and forms.

In their work, IRS officials are faced with the twin challenges of technical accuracy and ease of compliance. Their principal problem lies in the complexities of the income tax laws.

According to the Commissioner, in addition to the large numbers of individuals, committees, and task forces within the Internal Revenue Service which are constantly examining various forms, procedures, regulations, mechanical equip-

ment, and other aspects of tax administration, other studies are being made in the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, in the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and by many private and professional organizations, including the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the American Bar Association, and the Tax Executive Institute.

An interesting incident occurred with regard to the 1965 tax forms, which we are now filing. The wealth of IRS and private talent which is devoted to simplifying tax forms and procedures might seem at least adequate to deal with any form problem. Yet, in the midst of the subcommittee's study, the Washington Post, on October 19, 1965, carried a report that IRS had gone outside the Government, to a private firm and contracted for assistance in getting up its 1965 forms.

Because that meant the expenditure of taxpayers' funds—and the subcommittee was concerned with economy—as chairman of the subcommittee, I asked the Commissioner to explain the expenditure.

The Members and other taxpayers who are now filling out the revised form for 1965, on which the best minds of the Internal Revenue Service and outside experts, including private contractors, have collaborated, will be pleased to know that the Commissioner's reply disclosed full awareness of the difficulties taxpayers face in preparing their forms. The contract was made in aid of simplification—and maybe the forms are a little easier to fill out than they were last year.

Without objection, I submit the Washington Post article referred to, and the Commissioner's reply to the subcommittee:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1965]
IRS HATCHES AN EAGLE TO KEEP ITS EYE ON YOU

(By Phil Casey)

The Internal Revenue Service has a new emblem that will be printed on all the bad news it sends to people.

It's a modernistic design of an eagle, the scales of justice and an olive branch, but you probably wouldn't know this unless somebody told you.

It'll be the same old news—the IRS dunning you and reminding you and threatening you—but the old-fashioned IRS seal will be gone, replaced by the eagle, if you can make him out.

The IRS figures this emblem is better and jazzier, and it will appear on the front page of the 60 million or so income tax packages that will be sent to taxpayers about January 1.

Sheldon S. Cohen, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, says the new emblem is symbolic of the tax men. The eagle represents authority. The olive branch is for the courtesy and fairness of the IRS, and the scales represent, he said, justice and equal treatment. Yes, he's talking about the tax collectors.

Apparently the appearance of the IRS forms bugged the people almost as much as the content of the forms. There have been many complaints.

So, the IRS awarded a competitive bid contract to a New York industrial design firm to recommend format changes. A number of

changes have been made in the format of the various forms, booklets and correspondence of IRS, but the eagle is the big thing, the thing that catches the eye.

It's apparently a pretty good eagle. It cost the IRS—and us—\$20,000. One man to whom the eagle was shown was depressed. "For 20,000 clams," he said, "it should look like an eagle."

But this isn't everybody's opinion, particularly that of IRS men. It's their eagle, and they're going to live with it.

General Services Administration said that so far as can be determined, IRS has started no trend. There's no spate of requests by other Government agencies to get eagles on their paperwork and there's no rush to change whatever they've been putting on it. Thus far, it looks as if IRS can keep its eagle.

The design firm, Lippincott-Margulies, made other changes in the forms to help the taxpayers. For one thing, the forms will be easier to read, because of more modern type arrangement.

Another thing the new forms will do is make it easier to figure out what you owe the tax collectors. Nobody said they'd make it any pleasanter, though.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL,
Chairman, Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am happy to furnish you information on the contract we entered into with the firm of Lippincott & Margulies, if only to correct the impression left by local newspaper stories that the Internal Revenue Service spent \$20,000 for a doohickey.

While these stories probably were well-intended I have observed that there is something about writing about tax collectors that often encourages a jocular approach. We have learned to live with this and indeed rather enjoy most of the things we read. But where the well-sanctioned game of poking fun at the tax collector includes reference to the spending of money, then we get things like the "internal revenue eagle" stories.

In my letter of May 10, 1965, to which you referred I described our continuing efforts to simplify the tax forms and outlined the problems we face in trying to achieve success. I should like to stress that the primary concern of the Tax Forms Coordinating Committee is to develop a tax form that will reflect the provisions of the law and at the same time be reasonably comprehensible to the general public. The committee does not pretend to have the design expertise of commercial concerns that specialize in these matters. Nevertheless, we have been trying for years to simplify the appearance and layout of the 1040 to make it easier to fill out and less forbidding looking. While this obviously does not rank in importance with the actual simplification of the law itself, we felt we owed it to the Nation's taxpayers.

It had been suggested to us on more than one occasion that our internal efforts were inadequate and that we ought to go outside for help. For this reason, and because we are trying to avoid complacency and the assumption that we are infallible, we decided to give commercial firms a chance to see what they could do. (We rejected out of hand as impracticable, of course, the idea of hiring our own staff of industrial designers.) We, therefore, put out invitations to bid among design firms and eventually awarded a contract to Lippincott & Margulies, a firm with an outstanding record of success in this area and whose bid fell in about the middle range of those received.

I am attaching a copy of the contract with that firm. As you can see, we asked Lippincott & Margulies to improve the format and

appearance of the 1040, 1040A, and the corporation tax form, 1120. Secondly, we also asked them to attempt to correct other deficiencies the Service presents to the public, including the appearance of our "tax package," itself, which goes to some 48 million Americans, but, which, at a glance is indistinguishable from advertising circulars. (Indeed, I have even been told that our tax packages have been thrown away by some taxpayers who took them for junk mail.)

I know the firm found this assignment one of the most difficult they had undertaken and, frankly, they did not come up with as many changes in tax forms as one might have hoped for. Like our own staff, they discovered that the need for compressing so much information on limited space militated against producing a simple form. Nevertheless, Lippincott & Margulies did make a contribution by improving the typography and general appearance of our current 1040 and its sister forms. I think you will see this yourself by comparing the enclosed 1965 1040 with its 1964 predecessor. They also made a number of suggestions that in a small but significant way will improve the appearance of our letters, pamphlets, and office signs.

As part of its work, the design firm pointed out to us that few people could tell our official seal from the many similar seals used by other Federal agencies, and they suggested that we adopt a new emblem as a method of identifying our communications. Hence, the "internal revenue eagle," a minor part of the overall project.

While these design improvements should make it easier for taxpayers to deal with us, we realize that they are, in the end, surface improvements. We do not hope, nor is it our purpose by these designs to acquire a "new image." We fully recognize that the impression people have of us depends on how well we do our work and how fair and courteously we treat taxpayers. We continue to strive for excellence in these areas, and our effort to improve the layout and appearance of our forms and instructions is one part of this overall goal.

For long years our tax forms, especially the 1040, have been criticized by Member of Congress, newspapers, and taxpayers. We are aware also of your own interest in this matter. I just do not believe that I can sit idly by wringing my hands at the perplexities of the law without at least making an attempt for improvement wherever humanly possible. I have done my best by entering into this modest contract with a firm that had dealt with and solved similar problems. I would be the first to admit that we have not scored a major breakthrough but, while I expect no praise, I would hope at least that we would be given a modicum of credit for having made the effort.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

SHELDON S. COHEN,
Commissioner.

SOIL CONSERVATION MAKES AMERICA MORE BEAUTIFUL

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of talk about beauty in the countryside. But it takes more than talk to bring it about.

Rural beauty is nothing new to the people of my congressional district in southwestern Wisconsin. They have been working at it for more than a quarter of a century.

Evidence of their work was recently published as the frontispiece in the report of the President by the White House Conference on Natural Beauty.

This illustration was the only one of natural beauty in the entire report. It is an aerial photograph showing the Monroe County, Wis., countryside in my congressional district.

This same beauty is repeated throughout the 15 counties in my constituency. What is it that makes this landscape appealing to the eye? It is the curving patchwork of stripcropped and contoured fields, the rolling green meadows, the terraces and windbreaks, the glistening ponds. This is what we have come to know as America the beautiful.

Most important is this fact: Much of this beauty is man-made—created by the farmers who voluntarily develop their land resources in cooperation with locally managed soil and water conservation districts.

Soil conservation and its resulting beauty got its start in my congressional district in 1939 when the first soil conservation district was formed in La Crosse County. In the following 10 years, the entire congressional district—almost 7 million acres—became blanketed by soil conservation districts.

The farmers take pride in their productive land. They protect it from the ugliness of erosion and damages of floods. They stand out as leaders in planning and applying conservation measures on their farms.

They have been working at it for 27 years.

Now consider just the accomplishments they made in 1965 in my congressional district: 690 farmers became new cooperators with soil conservation districts; 7,100 farmers requested and received technical help in resource development; 30,500 acres of land were contour farmed; 29,000 acres were strip-cropped; 296 acres of grassed waterways were built; 167 farm ponds were constructed; 86,600 acres were treated with all planned conservation measures—all this in 1 year, and more.

Outstanding by any measuring stick are my constituents' accomplishments through small watershed projects designed to prevent damaging floods, control erosion, and provide recreation and beauty.

Of the 16 watershed projects under construction in Wisconsin, 14 are in the Third Congressional District.

Throughout the State, 13 watershed projects are being developed for recreation as well as flood prevention—12 of these are in the Third Congressional District.

When finished, these developments will create more than 1,200 acres of surface water in lakes ranging from 50 to 240 acres in size. In addition, they will provide other recreation facilities on 13,000 acres of adjacent land. An estimated half-million visitors yearly will boat,

fish, camp, swim, picnic, and enjoy the wonders of nature in these new recreation areas.

The motivating force behind every one of these watershed projects has been the local soil conservation districts, their leaders, and cooperating farmers.

I consider it a privilege to salute these men for their voluntary work in preserving and developing the bounty and enhancing the beauty of America. I will do all I can to encourage it—for we all benefit by it.

A REVOLVING FUND WILL NOT BE ESTABLISHED

Mr. MOORE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, some questions were raised yesterday in this Chamber as to the intent of the Moore amendment which the House adopted to S. 2729 which the House considered last Thursday. As the membership may recall, the amendment was passed by voice vote last week, despite the severe opposition from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

I offered this amendment to preserve and to help restore the historic small business program as originally envisioned by the Congress. As is known, the small business program has been defunct for many months because of a drain on funds for that program resulting from the heavy demand for disaster funds caused by Hurricane Betsy.

It is to prevent the repetition of this shutdown of the vital small business program that we in the House and the Senate approved legislation to set up separate funds for disaster and small business loans, and in addition, the action of the House in passing the Moore amendment which further reduced the possibility of administratively curtailing the small business program.

My amendment to place a \$100 million ceiling on economic opportunity loans within the \$1.4 billion authorization for the small business loan program was to prevent a drain on regular small business loan funds, from economic opportunity loans, similar to the drain caused last year by the natural disaster, Hurricane Betsy.

As I assured the House last week, there was no intent on my part to set up separate revolving fund to the economic opportunity loans. Because of a certain amount of confusion generated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], an attempt on my part to reword the Moore amendment so as to make this clear, was not accomplished. After the House followed my leadership in this matter, it would have been very easy for me to have changed the texture of my remarks under permission to revise and extend the same; however, my desire to keep good faith with the membership, a mat-

ter not commonly understood by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I chose to let the remarks stand as delivered.

I wish to advise the House that I completed arrangements Monday for two distinguished Members of the other body, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXIMIRE] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TOWER], to amend the Moore amendment in the Senate in order to carry out my commitment to this body. This amendment, which is scheduled to come today in the Senate would insure that a \$100 million ceiling would be placed on economic opportunity loans within the \$1.4 billion authorization fund set up for the operation of small business loan program.

I wish to expressly thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], for his support and his complete understanding of what goes on in this body, and his attention to the needs of the small business community of this Nation, as well as the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINOL], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] for their forceful support of the Moore amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there was never any intent on my part nor the part of those who supported my amendment to mislead the House. It may be safe to say that without the severe opposition of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that the Moore amendment would not now enjoy the general endorsement that it does. The Executive Administrator of the Small Business Administration, together with other sincere experts who speak in the interest of the small business community of this Nation support the Moore amendment or have no objection thereto.

USE OF WAR ON POVERTY FUNDS TO ESTABLISH COOPERATIVE STORES IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA

Mr. YOUNGER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, a rather strange situation has arisen in the San Francisco Bay area in connection with the operation of the Office of Economic Opportunity, especially in regard to its activities called BAND which apparently has a 1-year grant of some \$256,251 to conduct an experimental demonstration in consumer education and action. What they are actually doing is promoting the establishment of cooperative stores in opposition to local independent business institutions.

Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., wrote a letter to Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity on this

subject, to which he has received no reply. I quote from that letter:

Mr. ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: Some time ago we wrote you concerning the reported usage of war-on-poverty funds to establish cooperative stores in the San Francisco Bay area, and asked if such reports were accurate.

We have received no reply from you, but under the date of February 17 did receive a letter from Mr. Herbert Kramer of your office who stated the Bay Area Neighborhood Development Foundation has received a 1-year grant of \$256,251 to conduct an experimental demonstration in consumer education and action. The letter then goes on to say "the residents of these impoverished areas may decide they would like to establish a cooperative store." This is followed by a most remarkable statement, "We believe this is totally in keeping with the free enterprise spirit."

It is also interesting to note that literature given out at BAND offices in San Francisco states its articles of incorporation include these purposes:

"To conduct basic educational research in the field of urban consumer education directed toward the formation of consumer cooperatives.

"To provide specific information about the formation and operation of consumer cooperatives to individuals and groups interested in the formation of such cooperatives."

This literature further states that the members of the board of directors of Associated Cooperatives, and organization of local consumer cooperatives, are the sole voting members of BAND, and that they select the BAND board.

We have also noted with interest that in the San Francisco Examiner of March 6 it is reported that after the protests raised, Mr. Sanford Kravitz of your office flew to San Francisco to order the BAND group to stop publicizing their cooperative activities and to "stop dealing in specific solutions such as cooperatives and preach instead general concepts."

Mr. Shriver, at this point, on behalf of our more than 210,000 independent business proprietors across the Nation, we would like to ask a question.

Do you honestly believe that a leopard can change its spots? Do you believe that an organization controlled entirely by dyed-in-the-wool believers in cooperatives instead of free enterprise, with more than a quarter-of-a-million dollars of other people's money to play with, are going to quit agitating for tax exempt cooperatives to compete with private, taxpaying enterprises?

Also, do you believe that it is proper, or equitable, to collect taxes from private business and its employees, to furnish the ammunition needed for such groups to carry on antiprivate business agitation?

Mr. Shriver, how far do you intend to go in using the fruits of free enterprise to promote socialistic concepts?

We would appreciate an answer from you, because the independent business proprietors, since this disclosure was made, are asking these questions:

1. Is the poverty program antibusiness?

2. Information received indicates that in addition to the grant from you of \$256,000, Associated Cooperatives are also putting up an undetermined amount. Is this to be interpreted that the funds you gave will be used to agitate for cooperative stores, while money for the actual physical setting up of such cooperative stores will come from the Associated Cooperatives?

You can appreciate that these are logical questions that are being asked. In other words, they would like to know if this quarter of a million dollars plus grant was made to these people with the purpose of helping destroy private business, or was it due to a colossal administrative error.

Sincerely yours,

C. WILSON HARDER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, another letter which was written by Mr. R. W. Howard, of the Howard Enterprises, to the National Federation of Independent Business, which has its home office in San Mateo, Calif., and I quote that letter:

HOWARD ENTERPRISES,
Oakland, Calif., March 31, 1966.
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT
BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif.
(Attention Mr. Neal Heard.)

DEAR SIR: I received in today's mail 16 brochures and 1 large book on the poverty program and I was wondering if you are in possession of copies of these booklets? If not, I will gladly send them on to you there in San Mateo. Just write me. They are titled "Have You a New Neighbor?" "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as Amended." "Poverty: Quick Facts About the War on Poverty." "The War on Poverty: A Home-town Fight." "The War on Poverty: Education in Job Corps Youth Conservation Center." "Job Corps Centers for Women." "Job Corps Facts: Profile of a Job Corpsman." "Is There a Job in Your Future?" "Vista Questions and Answers." "Small Business Administration." "Neighborhood Youth Corps." "Adult Basic Education Under Title 11B, Economic Opportunity Act." "Work Study Program." And last but not least a book 9 by 12, three-eighths of an inch thick, titled "A Nation Aroused," first annual report Office of Economic Opportunity.

I have read with very much interest your March 25 release to members of the bay area, also your release to the press and frankly I can see through the entire thing from A to Z. No. 1, they want going into the cooperative business to be something to undermine little business—then another step will be communism—it is coming just as certain as taxes. I fully believe the Government is planning for it all the time to become operative within the States by directing all of our attention to Vietnam, while it is being done. If you will look back you will readily see that things that were put over on the people were done while the powers that were at the time were spending all their time and using the press to talk about just the opposite until they had gotten footing solid enough to let it be known to the public. After all just what can the little man do against government? Practically nothing.

In these so-called cooperative ventures entered into because "poor people can't read" why is Government permitting "big business interests" to put in 50 percent of the money used to start and operate them? Something is wrong somewhere.

I think that what should be done is to warn every member in plain English that it is a move of communism to take over little business and that you should warn all of your members in just so many words asking them to write and send telegrams to their various Congressmen not that it will completely stop it, but that it might stall it until such a time as you can figure out some other means of combating this scourge that is being thrust upon us again by subterfuge.

If you will tell all the membership the facts as they really are you will be more apt to get a general response rather than hint to the danger that is right here ready to take over.

Once they get one cooperative operating and the storm of the little merchants has subsided, more and more so-called can't read cooperatives will be constructed and the little man has completely left the picture.

Johnson is continually talking about more jobs, yet he is doing things that will eliminate jobs instead. How many people will be thrown out of employment when the little man has finally been eliminated from the scene?

Well I offer you a hearty good luck in your project but in the long run I am very much (after having thought quite a bit about it) afraid little business is destined for the final skids real soon—talk to them now in any section of the country and you will find that they are not satisfied with the volume of business they are getting, but the discount houses (with few exceptions) are very much satisfied.

Anyway I got it off just so you might possibly find something in my ramblings you could possibly do something with.

Yours truly,

R. W. HOWARD.

This seems to be another example of where the administration is determined to destroy the small businesses and defeat the creation of new jobs in the private sector.

A BILL TO PERMIT THIRD-CLASS MAILING OF SAMPLE BALLOTS AND OTHER ELECTION MATERIALS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1965, I introduced legislation which would permit the third-class mailing of sample ballots and other election materials by registrars of voters to be handled in the mails as first-class mail. I introduced this bill because in several recent elections, despite timely handling of these materials by registrars of voters, the necessary election materials were received after the election had been held.

I was utterly amazed to receive a copy of an adverse report by the Bureau of the Budget on this legislation which was furnished me through the courtesy of the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The Bureau of the Budget cites that the Postmaster General is recommending against the enactment of my bill, primarily because it would "discriminate against other third-class mail" and "first-class handling of election materials is unnecessary because election dates are known well in advance and the mailing of election materials can be scheduled to provide timely delivery by third-class mail."

Mr. Speaker, the ignorance of election procedures in the various States, which this statement by the Postmaster General reveals, is nothing short of shocking and appalling.

In the first place, what wrong with placing such important material in a class by itself which does discriminate against the junk mail, which most of us

do not like to get in our mail boxes anyway. Actually, the material should be mailed postage free since there is nothing more important to a democracy than the mechanics of operating an election in the most efficient manner possible. I have seen millions of pieces of mail go out from the various executive branches, particularly the Office of Economic Opportunity, which have been at the taxpayers' expense. I think the timely receipt of a sample ballot is much more important than some of the propaganda with which Great Society public relations experts have recently been flooding the mails.

The statement that first-class handling is unnecessary because election dates are known well in advance shows an abysmal ignorance of election procedures. In my own State of California, we are growing so rapidly that precincts never remain constant and are changing from year to year. Unfortunately, the precinct boundaries cannot be finally established until such time as registration is complete. This creates a time interval problem which makes it impossible to mail a sample ballot to each voter until shortly before an election.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the adverse report on the part of the Post Office Department and the Budget Bureau is shortsighted and definitely adverse to the best interests of democracy.

EVERYBODY LIKES SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, just recently, the Gallup poll reported the city that most Americans want to live in. It came as no surprise to me, of course, that "the city" is San Francisco. I am delighted, however, that the Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion confirmed what San Franciscans have long known, that our city is everybody's favorite city.

San Francisco has rightly been called the Paris of the West, the Gateway to the Orient, and by one of its distinguished citizens, Columnist Herb Caen, as a Bagdad by the Bay.

San Francisco can rival Rome for its hills; Paris for its cosmopolitan atmosphere; Hong Kong for its touch of the exotic East; and even London for its fog. It has no rival, however, for the warmth and friendliness of its citizens.

The San Francisco Chronicle ran an article, "Everybody Likes San Francisco," which follows:

EVERYBODY LIKES SAN FRANCISCO

Sexy, swinging, lovely, and a gourmet's paradise—above all, the one city Americans most want to live in—that's San Francisco, according to the Gallup poll.

The city's repute has been climbing swiftly over the past decade, and it is obviously headed for overwhelming leadership among all American metropolitan centers.

These conclusions emerged yesterday in a special survey conducted by Dr. George

Gallup's prestigious American Institute of Public Opinion.

The Gallup poll queried a sampling of adults all across the country about their impressions of American cities. The climatic question was: "Which city would you most like to live in?"

Ten years ago Los Angeles was in first place, followed by New York. San Francisco ranked only third.

But this year's survey awards the top honor to San Francisco. It ranked first as America's favorite city, followed by Los Angeles in second place and New York in third.

It's obvious that San Francisco has no peer as the city with the most beautiful setting. It ranked first 10 years ago, and first again in 1966. Ten years ago Los Angeles and Miami ranked second and third; this year the second and third spots for beautiful setting are held by Los Angeles and Washington.

WOMEN

Most beautiful women? Ten years ago San Francisco didn't rate among the top six as a city of stunners; it drew only an honorable mention. Los Angeles, New York, and Dallas were the first three in this category in 1956.

But this year's poll shows San Francisco on the move: it ranked third in female pulchritude, just behind New York and Los Angeles.

The Gallup surveyors asked Americans which city has the gayest night life—and came up with something of a surprise. Despite topless North Beach and jazz all over, San Francisco ranks only fourth in the night life department.

The first three cities for "gayest night life" are New York, Las Vegas, and New Orleans.

Ten years ago San Francisco ranked fifth in its night life; New York, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and Chicago were the top four.

FOOD

Most Americans consider New York as the city with the Nation's best food, but San Francisco ranks second this year. New Orleans, Chicago, and Los Angeles follow.

Ten years ago the image of San Francisco restaurants was a little lower: the city ranked only fourth in the "best food" category. At that time the leaders were New York, Chicago, and New Orleans.

The Gallup pollsters added two new categories in their city survey this year. They asked which city is the most interesting or different; and which is the healthiest.

As an interesting, different city San Francisco ranked second, just behind New York and just ahead of Los Angeles.

HEALTH

As for health, the rank order goes: Phoenix, Denver, Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco. Apparently strangers don't realize the salubrity of San Francisco's fog.

Here are the Gallup poll ratings in each category:

Which city would you most like to live in?

Year 1956: (1) Los Angeles, (2) New York, (3) San Francisco, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) Chicago.

Year 1966: (1) San Francisco, (2) Los Angeles, (3) New York, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) Phoenix.

Honorable mention, 1956: Detroit, Seattle, Washington, Boston; 1966: Chicago, San Diego, Seattle, Washington.

Which city has the most beautiful setting?

Year 1956: (1) San Francisco, (2) Los Angeles, (3) Miami, (4) New York, (5) Washington, (6) Denver.

Year 1966: (1) San Francisco, (2) Los Angeles, (3) Washington, (4) Miami, (5) Denver, (6) New York.

Honorable mention, 1956: Seattle, Chicago, Salt Lake City, New Orleans; 1966: Seattle, Salt Lake City, Chicago, Phoenix.

Which city has the best-looking women?

Year 1956: (1) Los Angeles, (2) New York, (3) Dallas, (4) Atlanta, (5) Chicago, (6) New Orleans.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) Los Angeles, (3) San Francisco, (4) Dallas, (5) Atlanta, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention, 1956: San Francisco, Miami, Salt Lake City, Houston; 1966: Miami, New Orleans, Houston, Salt Lake City.

Which city has the best food?

Year 1956: (1) New York, (2) Chicago, (3) New Orleans, (4) San Francisco, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Boston.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) San Francisco, (3) New Orleans, (4) Chicago, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Miami.

Honorable mention, 1956: Miami, Philadelphia, Detroit, Kansas City; 1966: Atlanta, Boston, Milwaukee, Philadelphia.

Which city has the gayest night life?

Year 1956: (1) New York, (2) Los Angeles, (3) New Orleans, (4) Chicago, (5) San Francisco, (6) Miami.

Year 1966: (1) New York, (2) Las Vegas, (3) New Orleans, (4) San Francisco, (5) Los Angeles, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention, 1956: Houston, Dallas, Pittsburgh, St. Louis; 1966: Reno, Miami, San Diego, Dallas.

Which city is the most interesting or different? (A new category this year.)

(1) New York, (2) San Francisco, (3) Los Angeles, (4) Washington, (5) New Orleans, (6) Chicago.

Honorable mention: Miami, Boston, Philadelphia, Seattle.

Which city is the healthiest? (A new category.)

(1) Phoenix, (2) Denver, (3) Miami, (4) Los Angeles (5) San Francisco, (6) New York.

Honorable mention: Tucson, Seattle, Chicago, Salt Lake City.

HORTON EMPHASIZES THE NEED FOR A CONVENTION OF NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

Mr. HORTON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, I introduced a joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations. Today, I rise to urge support for this resolution, House Joint Resolution 999. The Government and the Congress of the United States have been preoccupied in recent months by the struggle this Nation is waging on behalf of the people of South Vietnam. While this preoccupation is understandable, we must not allow ourselves to forget that there are other areas of the world that require our attention.

For too long now, it seems to me, our Government has allowed affairs in the Atlantic world to drift. It is almost as if we took the North Atlantic Treaty Organization for granted, confident that problems in relations between Europe and the United States would take care of themselves in the long run. Our policies have been narrowly conceived to preserve what exists; they have lacked the boldness and imagination that should be displayed by the most powerful nation of the North Atlantic Alliance. Above all, we have been overcautious in defining future goals toward which the Atlantic nations could work.

One consequence of our policies has been to leave the initiative to others. Should we really be very surprised that General de Gaulle has seized the opportunity to advance his own views of how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization should be reformed? A new U.S. initiative in Atlantic affairs is overdue. It is my conviction that we must stop reacting and begin leading, lest the crisis we face today lead to the piecemeal dismantling of all that has been built up over the past 17 years.

One of the purposes of the resolution which I have introduced would be to express congressional interest in defining and working toward the goal of federal union for the nations of the Atlantic world. Neither I nor the other sponsors of this resolution believe that a federation of the Atlantic nations can be achieved in the near future. But we are all deeply convinced that this is the long-term goal toward which the 15 members of the Atlantic Alliance, and other interested nations, must work if they are to meet the challenges of the world in which we live. If we do not set this long term goal for ourselves, I am fearful that Europe and North America will gradually drift apart. Indeed, in the crisis we face today in NATO, we can see that this is not an imaginary danger.

But the drifting apart of Europe and North America must not be allowed to happen. Have we not learned through bitter experience that the fate of North America and the fate of Europe are so intertwined that 19th-century conceptions of sovereign independence are outmoded on both sides of the Atlantic? Have we not learned over the past 20 years that unity of purpose and policy is best achieved within the framework of common institutions? And who would deny that unity of purpose and policy are even more necessary today than at the birth of NATO in 1949 if the Western nations are to play a constructive role in the world we know today. Have we in the United States not also learned that boldness and imagination in foreign policy reap success?

The resolution that I am proud to sponsor in this House is at once bold in the goal it would set and modest and realistic in the steps it proposes for the present. It would direct the President and Congress to appoint an Atlantic Union delegation of eminent citizens who would be authorized to organize and participate in a convention of similar delegations from other NATO nations. The task of this convention would be exploratory. It would determine what measure of agreement exists on the goal of federal union, and what practical, interim steps could be taken toward this goal.

Four years ago, in January 1962, a similar convention of delegations from Atlantic nations met in Paris. At the conclusion of their meetings, the delegates adopted the Declaration of Paris, in which the need for an eventual Atlantic union was eloquently set forth, and some gradual steps toward this union proposed. The work of the convention was widely praised in the press of this country and of other NATO countries. And the declaration gained the support

of prominent citizens and statesmen on both sides of the Atlantic.

Since that time, however, we have been standing still. Perhaps for a while we in this country became too fascinated with the movement toward European unity, and did not realize that by promoting unity only in Europe we might also be promoting division in the Atlantic world. Today, I think we are wiser. There are many people in the United States and Europe who are convinced that European unity is not enough and that Atlantic unity is a necessity. The purpose of the resolution I have introduced is to continue the work begun by the Atlantic Convention of 1962. It is imperative that we regain a sense of direction in our Atlantic policies. Now is the time for Congress to show its interest in moving forward with purpose in the Atlantic world.

ELECTED REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to believe firmly in the importance and equity of providing meaningful popular representation for the citizens of the District of Columbia. If true home rule, in the form of an elected municipal government, cannot be achieved this year, it is crucial for us to institute District representation in Congress. As long as Congress legislates for the District, the people of the District need a representative on Capitol Hill.

In the past I have sponsored bills to establish the office of nonvoting delegate to the House from the District of Columbia. On February 8 the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and I introduced identical bills, H.R. 12690 and H.R. 12693, entitled the "District of Columbia Election Extension Act." This measure would establish the office of delegate from the District of Columbia in the House, would specify the powers and privileges of the delegate, would provide for his biennial election, and would make necessary changes and improvements in the voter registration and election laws of the District. The bill also would provide for special primary and general elections in the fall of 1966 to choose a delegate to serve in the 90th Congress.

I would like to emphasize two points. First, I consider nonvoting congressional representation for the District a first step, not a final goal. I do believe that the citizens of Washington should have voting representatives on both sides of the Capitol, and will support an appropriate constitutional amendment toward that end. I also believe, however, that a transitional period is necessary—first, because ratification of a constitutional amendment is not a rapid process; second, because the Congress has not yet

fully explored questions such as the number of Senators and Representatives appropriate for the District, and whether the District should be included in the apportionment of Representatives among the States; and finally, because the voters of the District need time to become accustomed to the processes and procedures of elections. H.R. 12690 is vital, therefore, as an interim measure which would establish the required electoral machinery in Washington, and provide a degree of representation until full voting representation can be secured.

Second, I do not consider representation in Congress for the District in any way an adequate substitute for home rule. Representation here is especially important in the absence of home rule, but the establishment of elected municipal government in Washington will make congressional representation for the District no less significant or just.

Mr. Speaker, the great majority of citizens of the District of Columbia have displayed extraordinary patience and a willingness to seek responsive government through traditional channels. It is time that the Congress acts to extend to Washington residents the democratic rights enjoyed by all other Americans.

I wish to include in the RECORD at this point a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12690:

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION
EXTENSION ACT

(Section-by-section analysis of H.R. 12690
(MATHIAS) and of H.R. 12693 (UDALL),
89th Cong., 2d sess.)

(These bills are identical and have been referred to the House Committee on the District of Columbia. For convenience, the two bills are referred to simply as "a bill," or "an act" in this memorandum.)

SECTION 1

Section 1 states the title of the act.

SECTION 2

The existing District of Columbia election laws, which establish the present 4-year cycle between election years, require that all voters in the District have to reregister anew in each quadrennial election year. The present law also requires that registration operations be shut down a full 45 days before each election.

This bill provides a number of changes in these existing election laws, including substantial changes in the provisions relating to registration of voters. These changes are contained principally in section 2 of the bill. The third section of the bill provides for the election of a delegate to Congress every 2 years, and it is because of this speed-up in the election cycle that it is practicable thus to modify and improve the registration process.

Subsection (a) of this section 2 amends the existing election law so as to establish and maintain a permanent system of registration. At the same time it requires the Board of Elections to keep the registration accurate and current, and provides for the removal of the names of registrants who have failed to vote in two successive general elections and who have not reregistered. Subsection (b) removes the present requirement that the voter reregister anew in each election year.

Subsection (c) provides for longer periods of registration than under the present law, and shortens to 30 days (from the present 45 days) the period before each election in which the registration office is closed. It also broadens slightly the Board of Elections'

power to issue regulations with regard to times and places of registration, and clarifies its power to set reasonable deadlines for filing documents with the Board where deadlines are not established by the statute.

SECTION 3

This section sets up the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, and provides the basic statutory framework for his election by the voters in the District of Columbia.

Subsection (a) of this section 3 specifically establishes the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be represented by a Delegate in the House, elected by the voters of the District. The Delegate will have a seat in the House Chamber with the right of debate but not of voting. His term would be for 2 years, along with the Members of Congress. The committees to which he would be assigned would be determined by the House under its rulemaking power. The District Delegate must be at least 25 years old and have lived in the District for at least 3 years, and must continue to live in the District during his term of office. He must remain a qualified elector under District law in order to continue in office.

Subsection (b) adds the definition of "Delegate" to the existing District of Columbia election statute. Subsection (c) adds three new provisions to the existing election laws so as to establish in general the manner in which the District Delegate will be elected. It provides that the Delegate shall be elected by the District of Columbia voters in a general election, in the usual case after first winning a primary election. The candidate for a primary election for Delegate is to be nominated by a petition containing at least 500 signatures of registered voters of the same political party as the nominee, and accompanied by a filing fee of \$200. The primary election of candidates for Delegate will, as in the case of existing District of Columbia law, be by a closed primary, but the general election of the Delegate will be an open election which will permit voters to cross party lines.

Subsection (d) further amends the District election laws in a number of respects, first to assure that the timing of the primary and general elections of Delegates will coincide, in presidential election years, with the May primaries and the November general elections under existing law. The Delegate would be elected every 2 years, of course, and in nonpresidential election years the Delegate would also be chosen by a May primary (followed in some cases by a runoff election) and by general elections in November.

Subsection (d) of this section 3 also amends existing law to provide for a party runoff election, which would be required if no one candidate in a primary election for Delegate received as much as 40 percent of the total vote of his party in that primary. Generally speaking, the candidates in the party runoff would be the two top vote-getters in the preceding party primary. Under this same section the Board of Elections is given the power to set the dates for these party runoff elections and generally to prescribe terms and conditions for their conduct.

Subsections (e), (f), and (g) change the present election law, so as to provide that the polling places in all elections will be open from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. on election day (present law is from 8 to 8) and to modify the existing provisions with regard to breaking tie votes so as to make it clear that those provisions will apply only when it is necessary to break a tie in order to affect the results of an election.

Subsection (h) provides for filling vacancies in the office of Delegate, and also in the position of candidate for Delegate in the event that a candidate wins in a May primary, or later party runoff election, but dies

or resigns before the general election in November. In the latter case the local political party committee selects the successor. If a vacancy occurs in the office of a Delegate who has already been elected, the Board of Elections is required to hold a special election to fill the vacancy, except toward the end of a term of Congress.

SECTION 4

This section makes a series of changes in existing statutes relating to the operation of the Congress, to put the Delegate from the District of Columbia into a position or status in the House of Representatives essentially comparable to that formerly held by the Delegates from Hawaii and Alaska, and presently held by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico. Most of these changes in law are required simply because the present laws refer to Delegates "from the territories." Since the District of Columbia is not a territory, these changes are required.

As a result of the enactment of these 10 subsections, the Delegate from the District of Columbia would receive the same annual salary as a Member of Congress or Resident Commissioner—\$30,000 (subsec. (a)); and when elected to fill an unexpired term, his salary would begin with the date of his election and not with the date on which the vacancy occurred (subsec. (b)).

Similarly, the provisions of law relating to the payment of unpaid salaries in the event of the death of a Member of Congress during his term of office are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (c)), and the privileges of participating in the retirement benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act which are applicable to Members of Congress are made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (d)).

In the same way, subsection (e) makes applicable to the District Delegate, and to his office, the provisions of law relating to allowances for stationery, telephones, the hiring of clerical help, and the furnishing of office equipment which now apply to Members of Congress and to the Resident Commissioner. The statutory provisions for congressional office space are also made applicable to the District Delegate (subsec. (f)).

The provisions of Federal criminal law which relate to Members of Congress, to their activities, and to their elections, are also made applicable to the District Delegate. Thus, the Federal Corrupt Practices Act is made applicable to the Delegate's position (subsec. (g)), as are also the provisions of law making it a Federal crime to intimidate voters (subsec. (h)), as well as those punishing the use by Federal employees of influence or authority to interfere with elections (subsec. (i)).

Subsection (j) contains the changes required in existing law to assure that appointment of candidates to the armed services academies from the District would be made by the elected Delegate, rather than by the appointed Commissioners.

SECTION 5

This section contains the definitions which are used throughout the bill, and also a number of miscellaneous provisions which will be important in administering the law. Subsection (a) contains the definitions. Subsection (b) simply brings up to date the provisions of the existing law with respect to the current name of the former municipal court. Subsection (c) changes the deadline date for filing nominating petitions for candidates for local party elections, so as to give enough time for the operation of the new procedure for challenging nominating petitions, established by subsection (d) below.

The new subsection (d) amends the existing District of Columbia election law so as to give the Board of Elections authority to accept initially the signatures on duly filed

nominating petitions, but sets up a mechanism by which the petitions can be timely challenged, and the challenges resolved by the Board of Elections, with a right of later review in court. It also provides that the order in which the names of candidates will appear on the ballot shall be determined by choosing lots.

Subsection (e) amends the existing law slightly to clarify the authority of the Elections Board to issue regulations to accept some ballots which have been cast outside the precinct in which the registrant lived—as one example, in the case of a person who was registered in one precinct but on election day is in a hospital in another precinct and is voting as a "shut-in."

Subparagraph (f) changes the existing elections law slightly so as to require that only one of the officials in the polling place will be needed to accompany an illiterate or handicapped voter into the voting booth in order to carry out the voter's directions with respect to recording his vote (present law requires the presence of two officials). The change would also provide that the voter can, if he so desires, have a second official of the Board of Elections to witness the recordation of his vote in accordance with his directions.

Subsections (g) and (h) will shorten and simplify the party "primary" ballots under the 1955 Election Act, by eliminating the election of alternates to the various party officials. The party primary ballots have been widely criticized because of their length and complexity. The elimination of the election of alternate officials will substantially shorten the ballots in a number of cases. At the same time, the alternates can, of course, be selected by the parties themselves, by caucus or other means not involving the use of the citywide primary election machinery. The party officials themselves (national committeemen and women, delegates to the presidential nominating conventions and, when designated by the parties, members and officials of the local party committees) would continue to be elected by ballot under the present election law.

Subsection (i) amends the existing election law to make it clear that if the local political party committee so desires, the party primary ballots may contain presidential preference questions to be answered by the voters. The bill requires that the local party committee furnish the potential presidential candidate with written information to the effect that it is so proposing his name to go on the ballot. At the same time the bill provides a mechanism by which the potential candidate may, if he chooses, remove his name from the ballot without the necessity of stating a reason for his decision in this respect.

The right to have these presidential preference questions on the ballot under the present law has been sharply disputed ever since the act was passed in 1955, and a 1964 court decision cast a further cloud on the authority of the board of elections to permit presidential preference questions under existing law. With this amendment, these presidential preference questions would also replace the so-called party questions. These party questions have been criticized as diluting the powers of the elected party officials to formulate party policies, and also because the questions add further to the length of the ballot.

Subsection (j) would remove an ambiguity in existing election law by establishing a clear deadline for filing the designations of the offices of local party committees to be filled by the party primary elections.

Under the existing election law each candidate on the ballot has the right to have one watcher at each polling place. Subsection (k) would change this arrangement slightly in the light of the length of the party primary ballots (in the 1964 election,

for instance, there were over 250 candidates on the party ballots), to give the Board of Elections authority to issue regulations reasonably limiting the number of watchers in each voting place, and reasonably to regulate the scope of the watchers' activities, while at the same time preserving their rights to perform their important duties.

Subsection (l) would give the Board of Elections clear authority to declare that duly nominated and unopposed candidates for party office are elected without opposition. The fact that they have been so elected would appear on the party ballot, together with the names of all the candidates who are opposed and whose election is to be determined by the voters. This change will further simplify and shorten ballot forms, without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of the elections under the act.

Subsection (m) changes the method of compensation of the members of the three-man Board of Elections. They are now paid \$25 per day while performing their duties. With the enactment of this act there will be two elections in every even-numbered year, with occasional special or party runoff elections to be expected from time to time, thus substantially increasing the activities of the Board of Elections. The amount of time spent by Board members in an election year is substantial, and the changeover to some modest, fixed annual compensation is desirable and appropriate under all the circumstances.

Subsection (n) amends the law so as to give the candidates a period of 30 days after each election in order to complete and file their financial reports. At present they have only 10 days in which to perform this work, a period which is insufficient and unworkable.

Subsection (o) tightens up the enforcement provisions of the present law so as to make it clear that any false statement by a registrant with respect to qualifications for voting will render him subject to penalty, whereas the present act limits the applicability of the penal provision to false statements as to the registrant's residence or voting privileges outside the district. The bill also makes the enforcement provisions of the act applicable to the restrictions on contributions and requirements for reporting expenditures.

Subsections (p) and (q) amend the title, and the first section of the existing law, so as to reflect the fact that the act provides for the election of the Delegate to the House of Representatives in addition to the other officials elected under the existing law.

SECTION 6

Enactment of the first five sections of this bill would have the effect of converting the present quadrennial election cycle in the District of Columbia to a biennial cycle—that is, there would be two elections in every even-numbered year, whereas at the present time there are two elections only in every fourth year—in presidential election years.

Enactment simply of these first five sections in an election year such as 1966 would raise some operating problems. It takes several months to get ready to run an election well, and funds have to be made available for the purpose.

In order to take care of these initial starting problems, section 6 has been added which authorizes special elections in the autumn of 1966 to elect a Delegate to the House to serve in the 90th Congress, which convenes next January. This section 6 specifically validates for purposes of these 1966 elections all the 1964 registrations (approximately 200,000 of them were made at that time) to the extent that the registrants prove that they continue to meet the qualifications required by the District of Columbia election law.

Section 6 also provides for additional registrations for these 1966 elections, and gives the Board of Elections flexibility in scheduling the dates for the 1966 primary and general elections for Delegate, and for party runoff elections also, if such additional elections prove to be necessary. The section provides a time limit in which the Board is required to complete the installation of the new permanent registration system to replace the present periodic registrations now required. The deadlines prescribed will assure that the permanent registration system will be in full operation for the 1968 elections.

Technical note: The bill has been drafted to meet the codification requirements of the District of Columbia Code and also, in sections 2(a) and 4, the codification requirements of the United States Code.

A CONSERVATION JOB TO DO AT HOME

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. 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 gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, across mid-America the land blooms, communities prosper, and there is great confidence in the future. We must trace this good fortune to the basic resources of the region—to the good earth, the water, and the hardworking and skilled people on the farms and ranches and in the towns.

We have done more than build—we have rebuilt. We have conserved and developed our resources and made them work for us. We are proud of this heritage. But we know that we can sustain our prosperity only by continued dedication to the principles of sound resource conservation and development.

We know, too, that all is not well with the land and the waters that flow across it. The soil still washes and blows where it should be held secure by vegetation. The streams are polluted with wastes that limit or destroy the value of this needed water.

While we have accomplished much in conserving and developing our land and water resources, we have much yet to do.

In Kansas, soil conservation districts embrace every farm and ranch, and the majority of these districts have signed modernized agreements with the Department of Agriculture to permit broader and more useful development of the rural lands and waters of the State.

Yet, only 34 percent of the needed soil and water conservation work on Kansas farms and ranches has been completed, and at the current completion rate of about 1½ percent per year the job clearly will take a long time to finish.

Of a total of 236 watersheds that need project-type action in Kansas, 40 have been authorized for planning assistance, and of these 21 have been authorized for installation of works of improvement.

These examples are a brief indication of basic soil and water conservation work that remains to be done in Kansas. A similar picture could be drawn for every

State, for every State has a great backlog of watershed protection and other conservation work waiting to be acted on. This is a challenge we cannot ignore.

We must move resolutely forward in programs to conserve and develop our soil and water and related resources—to clean our streams and curb further pollution of them; to prevent damaging floods; to save the soil from washing and blowing away; to make the best possible use of our water resources through impoundment and distribution as needed for building sound local economies; to preserve the woodlands from heedless exploitation; to enrich the lives of our people by continuing to make the countryside a more beautiful as well as a more useful place for the benefit of all Americans.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8282 which is pending on the important matter of unemployment compensation, is of a good deal of interest to all of us in the House. I have been in contact with a constituent of mine, Mr. Richard H. Barry, a well-known financial and business consultant, who has some ideas pertinent to the revision of this legislation. They are embodied in a resolution from the Fargo Chamber of Commerce, which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point for the study of those interested:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Fargo Chamber of Commerce:

1. Is strongly in favor of an equitable system for both employees and employers in administering the mechanics and financing cycles of temporary and seasonal unemployment in the permanent work force as distinguished from part time or occasional workers, and

2. Recognizes the need and advisability to update the unemployment compensation insurance system from time to time in the light of experience and changing conditions, such as the premise in most States that the employer should pay 100 percent of the cost of unemployment insurance; and

3. Is unalterably opposed to H.R. 8282 in its present form, as it is woefully inadequate insofar as the need for an up-to-date system of unemployment insurance is concerned; and

4. Suggest that the time has come for the Congress of the United States to redefine the following:

4.1 The purpose and scope of unemployment compensation insurance; and

4.2 The respective financial responsibilities of the employer, the employee and the general public to pay the insurance premiums, first for cycles of temporary and seasonal employment of the permanent work force, and second, the much higher cost of insurance programs embracing part time and occasional workers, plus cycles in excess of 6 months; and

4.3 The duties and compensation of the State and Federal administrators of the pro-

gram, plus the mechanics of how such regulators and administrators are appointed; and

5. Suggest to the Congress of the United States that legislative bills such as H.R. 8282 are frequently drawn and sponsored by civil service employees of the United States Department of Labor giving to them, through the office of the Secretary of Labor, unwarranted and excessive bureaucratic control without sufficient regard for the following:

5.1. The full context of what is in the best interests of the public; and

5.2. For the tax inequities caused the majority of employers; and

5.3. For the excessive financial burdens for the majority of small employers with stable payrolls; and

5.4. For the denial to all employers of effective recourse to the judicial branch of government to establish the intent of the law; and

6. Suggest that the foregoing preamble to the resolution summarizes the attitude of the vast majority of employers in describing their concern with the implications of H.R. 8282 to grant to a few unidentified key employees in the vast U.S. Department of Labor under the guise of authority to issue routine regulations or bring about uniformity, a wide range of excessive control over the rights of employers and in effect making such Federal administrators the sole proprietors of all knowledge; and

7. Suggest that the Federal advisory commissions appointed in the past exclusively by the U.S. Secretaries of Labor to represent labor, business and the best interests of the citizens as a whole have failed to function effectively in that capacity; and

8. Suggest that a specific instance of the failure of a recent Federal Advisory Commission to function for extended periods of time and failure to issue reports at reasonable intervals is shown by the attached letter dated August 2, 1962, from the office of the late Congressman, Hjalmer C. Nygaard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress in its evaluation of H.R. 8282 be hereby urged to take into consideration the foregoing preamble and take affirmative action to have the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate appoint a full-time bipartisan three-man Unemployment Compensation Board of Administration of which the Secretary of Labor would be an ex officio member to deal more knowingly and equitably with the employee and employer in the full context of what is in the best interest of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the following Members of Congress for the State of North Dakota with the request that each of them evaluate these recommendations and if they are in accord with them that they write their colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives encompassing their thoughts on the substance and spirit of this resolution: Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, Congressman MARK ANDREWS, and Congressman ROLLAND REDLIN.

FARGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1962.

Mr. RICHARD BARRY,
Fargo, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. BARRY: Unfortunately I am not able to come up with the material you wanted relative to S. 3411 and H.R. 12385, copies of which are enclosed.

I am advised that the Federal Advisory Commission under the Bureau of Employment Security is not functioning at present. The terms of the past members have expired and new members have not as yet been appointed. It is expected they will be named within the next 10 days or 2 weeks at which time I will send you the names. The last

report published by this Commission came out in 1954 and is now out of print. I have been put on a waiting list for any new report which may be forthcoming.

This is a rather vague and cloudy reply, but it is the best I can give you under the circumstances. Under separate cover, I am sending you a 1962 Congressional Directory. On pages 516 and 517 you will find the make-up of the Bureau of Employment Security which may give you some information that will be helpful. I am holding copies of the two bills and the information you gave me over the phone for Mr. Nygaard.

Sincerely,
IRENE MARTIN EDWARDS,
Assistant to Congressman Hjalmer C.
Nygaard.

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken so often of this matter that I feel a little redundant. However, the issue is too vital, so important to our Nation, that I feel compelled to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the public until something effective is done about it.

My reference is to the need of blockading Haiphong and other North Vietnam ports in order to keep the British and other free world ships particularly from carrying in supplies to the Vietcong. I am happy the Greek Government no longer permits Greek-flag ships to engage in this trade; so, perhaps we are making progress, even if it is slow.

It has been noted that Soviet Russian vessels are carrying the latest Mig-21's to Haiphong for unloading; one ship we have been informed, arrived just the other day. Yet the propaganda line is to paint the Russians as the "good guys" and the Red Chinese who are presently doing far less for the Vietcong as the "baddies."

While I do not pretend to be an authority on this subject, others are. By unanimous consent, I introduce an editorial from Navy, the official publication of the Navy League of the United States:

HAIPHONG, THE SANCTUARY THAT HURTS

The question of when or whether the United States should take decisive steps to shut off the flow of arms and war supplies into Haiphong, North Vietnam's biggest and busiest port, continues to gnaw at the Johnson administration.

Pressure for such action has mounted in recent weeks, as American aircraft losses and the number of North Vietnamese regular army troops infiltrating into the south increase. The principal methods advocated are these: (1) bombing from the air; (2) laying of minefields in the harbor, and (3) the establishment of a partial blockade or quarantine of the type ordered by President Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, a former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and now a Presidential adviser on Vietnam, told Con-

gress early last month that he believed it was time to do something about Haiphong. He said he thought mining the harbor would be the simplest way to discourage shipping from entering that port.

About a week later, a raft of interpretive stories came out of the Pentagon—indicating that a background session for reporters had been held by official spokesmen—which said that the Joint Chiefs want to bomb some of Haiphong's industrial and petroleum storage areas as part of a general expansion of the air war against North Vietnam.

Several leading Republicans, including Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN and former Vice President Richard Nixon, have been advocating a blockade of the Communist port. A number of influential Democrats in Congress, Senators RUSSELL and SYMINGTON, for example, also favor such a step.

EXPLOITING OUR FEARS

The thinking behind these recommendations for ending the de facto sanctuary status of Haiphong goes like this: It doesn't make sense to bomb North Vietnam at all if the Communists are allowed to import anti-aircraft guns and missiles and the shells and bullets which make the bombing more expensive in American lives and money and increase the casualties among our forces engaged against the enemy in the south.

The administration, however, is fearful that if we attack Haiphong, or blockade it, we might risk a serious crisis with the Soviet Union and/or Communist China. The Russians and Chinese are well aware of this fear and have exploited it. The Russians reportedly have passed the word through diplomatic channels that if we strike either Haiphong or the capital city of Hanoi (also a sanctuary) they will have to take some kind of counteraction. The Chinese have said the same thing publicly. According to a member of the Philippine Senate, who had just returned from a visit to Peking, the Chinese told her that they would feel justified in entering the Vietnamese war if the United States attacked the two big cities in the north.

State Department and Pentagon leaders have played down the heavy military aid the Soviet Union has been giving the North Vietnamese aggressor, presumably on the theory that good relations with Moscow should be maintained so that it might, one day, persuade Hanoi that it should come with us to the peace table. As a consequence there has been a tendency on the part of the administration to downgrade the importance of Haiphong to the war effort against us and also to entangle it with the question of bombing Hanoi, for which there is far less pressure.

Accordingly, there must have some red faces in Washington late last month when a copy of a letter purportedly sent by the Kremlin to Communist parties around the world found its way into print in the Western World. Dealing with the Moscow-Peking split, the communication for the first time gave the American people a fairly detailed account of the kind and scope of the military aid the U.S.S.R. has been supplying our enemy. Here is what it said, in part:

"The Soviet Union delivers large amounts of weapons to the DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam), including rocket installations, anti-aircraft artillery, airplanes, tanks, coastal guns, warships, and other items. In 1965 alone, weapons and other war materiel worth about 500 million rubles (\$550 million) were placed at the disposal of the DRV."

"The DRV is receiving support in the training of pilots, rocket personnel, tank drivers, artillerymen, and so on. Our military aid is being rendered to the extent the Vietnamese leadership itself thinks necessary."

Figures on the value of Chinese military aid to North Vietnam are not available, but it is doubtful that it would match the Soviet's half-billion dollar annual rate, a rate the Kremlin makes clear may go even higher—Hanoi only has to ask.

BULK OF IT GOES BY SEA

With China and the U.S.S.R. assaulting each other so bitterly that some observers believe the two Communist giants are near a complete break, it may be assumed that the bulk of this Soviet aid reaches North Vietnam by ship, through Haiphong. Again, the Kremlin letter referred to above sheds some light. It said:

"The Chinese Communist Party leadership hindered the implementation of the agreement of the Government of the U.S.S.R. with the Government of the DRV on an immediate increase in military aid for the DRV. The CCP leaders did not permit Soviet transport planes with weapons to fly over CPR (Chinese Peoples Republic) territory.

"Then, Chinese personalities also placed obstacles in the way of the transportation of war materiel to Vietnam by rail. Thus, at their request, an additional shipment of military equipment, including anti-aircraft artillery, which is needed so urgently to protect the Vietnamese cities and villages against the United States air pirates, was recently delivered to the Vietnamese comrades. The Chinese authorities refused for a long time to relay the freight, under the pretense that the papers for its transit had not yet been filled out and that they did not know whether Vietnam needs this war materiel."

It is clear that the port of Haiphong is vitally important to the North Vietnamese war effort and that this importance will increase as Soviet and East European Communist aid expands. Militarily, it would make sense to disrupt this lifeline that helps sustain our enemy. We control the sea and the air and could do so. There are, of course, diplomatic and political factors that the President must weigh. But the American people now know, ironically from the Kremlin and not from the White House, how vast the Soviet military aid to North Vietnam is and how necessary Haiphong is to its delivery. The pressure for a new decision by the President is bound to increase further. Should he decide to allow Haiphong to remain a sanctuary, he will have to make a new case. His present one is not convincing.

DISRUPTIVE CCC CORN SALES SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY INVESTIGATED

MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1966, I sent the following letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, calling his attention to the recent policies of the Commodity Credit Corporation which have initiated a potentially disastrous situation in the Minnesota corn market:

MARCH 8, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the face of departmental predictions to the contrary and

drastically dropping corn prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation has dumped nearly 175 million bushels of corn on the market since the first of this year. During the past 9 weeks, the Commodity Credit Corporation has disposed of about one-third of the total CCC reserve supply.

Can this be the same Government agency which predicted in December that corn requirements this year could "be met largely out of the 1965 crop, with only limited amounts of corn expected to be made available from (Government-owned) stocks"? On December 17, the USDA announced that sales in 1966 would be less than last year's total of 417 million bushels. Nevertheless, in the first 9 weeks of 1966, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold a total which already amounts to 42 percent of the entire 1965 total. In January, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 62 million bushels of corn, compared to only 8.4 million bushels in December. The February total of 140.2 million bushels dumped was the highest for any month in 4 years and more than double the amount for February 1965. The Commodity Credit Corporation seems bound and determined to break their newly established record this month. Last week, they unloaded 72 million bushels of corn.

In 2 days of last week, the Commodity Credit Corporation dumped 40 million bushels of corn in Minneapolis; nearly five times the amount sold in December on all markets. These sales in Minneapolis were made at 6 to 7 cents under the level of the futures contract in Chicago for March. The closing prices of corn futures after these two days were from 6% to as much as 10 cents below the February 14 level.

Most of the unloaded grain was purchased by domestic users. In February, for example, the Government sold 122.9 million bushels for domestic use and 17.3 million bushels for export. Why has this heavy emphasis on domestic sales occurred during a year when exporters say that total exports will exceed 700 million bushels if the supplies are available at ports, an increase of 130 million bushels over the 1964-65 total.

The answer, of course, is a concerted Government effort to drive the farmer's corn prices down. This effort has succeeded, as it always has. Prices on No. 2 yellow corn in Chicago have dropped since mid-February from \$1.33 to \$1.27. Prices on corn sold for future delivery on the Chicago Board of Trade closed last Friday at \$1.23 a bushel, down 8 cents from mid-January.

It is very discouraging to farmers that, at a time when the parity price ratio shows signs of creeping upward, the heavy hand of the Commodity Credit Corporation would shatter this reviving trend with its dumping practices. It may be that as in the recent cases of actual or threatened dumping of aluminum and steel, the official excuse will be that of curbing inflation. However, someone will have to prove to me how a segment of our economy can be held responsible for our growing threat of inflation when they only receive 80-some percent return on their contribution to our economy.

A better explanation for these recent dumping practices just might be tied in with their timing. This happens to be the time of year that farmers are being asked to sign up for acreage-retirement programs. As some corn traders have suggested, "we can only suspect the corn disposal has the aim of discouraging a large corn acreage this year." This amounts to no less than economic assault being used to force farmers into programs which Congress clearly intended to remain voluntary.

I would hope that through your leadership, the House Committee on Agriculture will act quickly to halt this misinterpretation of congressional intent and insure the

In response to Chairman COOLEY's request for my comments on the letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker, I have today sent the following reply:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1966.

Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House
of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the farmers, country elevator operators, and the grain trade in general in Minnesota, I take this opportunity to thank you for your interest and concern regarding the plight in which these people now find themselves due to the recent actions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The many letters which I have received certainly indicate that there is valid cause for such concern, and I know that all of these people will sincerely appreciate any actions which you and the committee decide to take to investigate these policies of the CCC.

I was disappointed to note that in the reply from the Department which was signed by Under Secretary John A. Schnittker, it was suggested that my letter to you contained "inaccurate or misleading statements." I regret this because it would seem to indicate that whoever was responsible for the reply you received did not read my letter very carefully. As a result, the information contained in the reply was inadequate and thus, misleading.

The reply is filled with high-sounding phrases like "ever-normal granary principle" "orderly movement" "adequate and reasonably steady supply" and "releasing stocks when the market flow is inadequate." The reply, however, neglects to comment on the effects on the market price that the recent sales in Minnesota have had. It seems more important to me to know how much grain the market will bear in any particular year in each area rather than to try to equalize the annual volume irregardless of other circumstances. I fail to find the element of "orderly marketing" in the fact that the CCC sold only 8 million bushels of corn during October and November when the market receipts were the lowest, and then they turned around and sold 140 million bushels in February. I might mention the fact that if the Department of Agriculture didn't realize until February that Minnesota corn farmers harvested a wet crop last year, then they were the last to find out.

In spite of the high-sounding phrases, the reply is inadequate if it pretends to successfully question my figures regarding the price-depressing effects of these sales policies. I realize that this is a pretty ticklish area in view of the now-famous statement of Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers: "We're trying to hold down the price of corn." I protest strongly the increasing efforts of the entire administration to make the farmers pay for the growing threat of inflation which is clearly not their fault. Even so, these recent actions by the CCC are poorly designed if they are to carry out the directives of Mr. Ackley. They are doomed to backfire.

This entire effort is designed to lower feed costs and thus bring down the prices of pork and beef products. However, the way these corn stocks are being handled, the ultimate effect is going to be just the opposite.

The handling of the approximately 47 million bushels of corn which were sold by the CCC to terminal operators in the Minneapolis market on March 2 and 3 completely and flagrantly violates the charter which established the CCC. In the charter, Congress directed the CCC to use the "usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade" in its sales policies. Because of the violation of this provision, the cost of

feed grain to the livestock raisers is going to increase, not decrease. In turn then, we will have higher, not lower meat prices.

The livestock growers have traditionally relied on their local country elevators to supply them with feed grains when needed. Now we find the CCC removing this source of supply in order to fill the orders for which they contracted in the early March Minneapolis sales. These country elevator operators would buy this grain immediately if given the chance. Instead, they were given a chance to purchase only 40 percent of the CCC stocks which they were storing. The rest will be shipped from the feed deficit areas in thousands of boxcars (which are already in short supply) to the terminal markets. If the local warehousemen are forced to buy this same grain back, they will do so at higher prices due to freight and commission expenses. These higher prices will then, of course, be charged to the livestock feeders, and ultimately to the consumers.

I have received many telephone calls and letters from distressed country elevator operators outlining these problems. I referred one such letter to Secretary Freeman and received a reply on March 30 from Mr. E. A. Jaenke, Associate Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. Mr. Jaenke admitted that the usual "ship or buy" option was not offered on the current loading orders being issued to country elevators. He then claimed that adequate stocks were available for local needs. Since this information seemed to be in direct contrast to the information I had been receiving from the country elevator operators, I contacted the local warehousemen and asked them to furnish me with details on their particular situations.

The first response I received from this request was in the form of a special bulletin published by the Northwest Country Elevator Association for its members. The bulletin points out that the latest loading orders did not include the usual "ship or buy" option. The grain must be shipped as soon as possible to the terminal markets. Thus, the CCC has replaced the country elevator as the principal supplier of the terminal markets. It was also noted that since the elevators in drought-stricken counties were not affected by the earlier loading orders which included the option to buy, the new total-supply loading orders would hit these beleaguered areas even harder.

The bulletin includes a prediction which will undoubtedly upset Mr. Ackley: "Since CCC corn is no longer available in these areas, it means that these local elevators and their feeder customers are going to be faced with substantially higher corn prices, inasmuch as they will have to come to the terminal market or go to other areas where corn is available and buy it and move it into their area. This would not have needed to be done, in most instances, had the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks remained available to country elevator operators, as has been the practice in the past."

For your information I am enclosing a copy of the associations' bulletin and the letter from Mr. Jaenke.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the matter to your continued attention. The abrupt and disruptive nature of the March 2-3 sales by the Commodity Credit Corporation in direct violation of the spirit if not the letter of the corporation's charter require the immediate consideration of your committee and the Congress. Hearings in your committee could be directed to develop the spurious reasoning behind the loading orders which were so destructive to the entire grain marketing system in Minnesota and so potentially disastrous to the farm economy. I fail to understand why the farmer and the farm economy should be victimized by the use of the CCC as a price fixing agency of

the Government contrary to the purpose for which it was established by the Congress.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Member of Congress.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1966.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: Further reference is made to your letter dated March 16, 1966, in which you enclosed a letter from Mr. Dale Rollag, manager, Adrian Cooperative Elevator, Lismore, Minn., pertaining to the shipment of Commodity Credit Corporation-owned corn and the adequacy of corn supplies for local use by farmers and merchants.

It is true that CCC is not offering the "ship or buy" option on current loading orders being issued to country elevators. CCC needs its country elevator corn stocks to fill outstanding to-arrive sales. However, I want to assure you that there are ample supplies of corn available in private hands and CCC stocks. Farmers and others need have no concern over a shortage of corn for feeding or other purposes, even though our sales for shipment out of the area have been heavy.

An analysis recently completed on the supply requirements situation for corn in this area, especially around Minneapolis, shows us that additional quantities of corn can be made available from CCC stocks for local use. During the past 5 weeks, approximately 8.8 million bushels of corn have been offered each week in the Minnesota-South Dakota area. Approximately two-thirds of the corn offered was sold at prevailing market prices.

In order to allay fears that corn supplies will be depleted in that area we are stepping up our sales offer to 2 million bushels per week in Minnesota and 1 million bushels per week in South Dakota. These offers will be for corn at binsites. Good quality dry corn from bins will be made available in sufficient quantities through the spring months for purchase by farmers, warehousemen, or others for blending with high moisture corn still on farms in both States. Weekly offerings from binsites could be further increased later on if required.

CCC has sales of about 33 million bushels for delivery in Minneapolis, for which no loading orders had been issued. We have about 41.9 million bushels of CCC corn in binsites in Minnesota and South Dakota. In addition there are approximately 23 million bushels of 1961 crop corn currently under reseal in these States. These two sources assure us of enough corn to meet both CCC's commitments and the increased offerings.

We share your concern over the need for high quality low moisture corn and assure you that CCC expects to fulfill its commitments to the farmers and to the grain and livestock industries by making available supplies of high quality dry corn to blend with high moisture corn currently moving off farms. If we can be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. JAENKE,
Administrator.

NORTHWEST COUNTRY ELEVATOR
ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 31, 1966.

SPECIAL BULLETIN

MEMBER FIRMS: Much interest has been shown in the recent CCC corn sales in this area. Our Congressmen have been receiving questions and complaints. We were asked to prepare some background information for use by a Congressman from this area. After preparing the material, it was decided that

many Members might find it useful, so it is being sent to you as a special bulletin.

CCC CORN SALES—ORDERLY MARKETING?

The sale of approximately 47 million bushels of corn by CCC to terminal operators in the Minneapolis market on March 2 and 3 was a most unusual sale—of a type which the Minneapolis ASCS Branch Commodity Office had not previously made. This brought the Minneapolis branch office's sales for the year 1966 to 73 million bushels. This 73 million bushels consisted of 64 million bushels of corn sold for unrestricted use, 7 million bushels of Durum for export, 1.5 million bushels of flax for export, and 500,000 bushels of barley for export.

It is interesting to compare this 73 million bushels sold in the first two and a fraction months of 1966 with the total sales for the calendar year 1965 made by the Minneapolis Branch ASCS Office. Both figures total 73 million bushels. Of the 73 million bushels sold in 1965, only 18.9 were corn and practically all of this was sold at country elevator level and none was sold to terminal operators on the basis of the recent sales.

Early in January 1966, the Minneapolis branch office issued loading orders to Minnesota and South Dakota country elevators, storing CCC corn, for approximately 20 percent of the inventory located in those elevators. The exception was that no loading orders were issued in those counties that last year were drought counties. Of this 20 percent loading order, almost all of it was purchased by the storing warehouse. At the end of January, another 20 percent loading order was issued to these same elevators and again practically all of it was purchased by the storing elevator.

A typical situation is the Becker Grain & Lumber Co., of Northrop, Minn. Their CCC corn inventory on December 31 was 106,775 bushels. On January 7, they received a loading order for 22,671 bushels of sample grade corn. This was purchased on January 12 when the Minneapolis cash market closed at \$1.28. The purchase price paid by this firm was \$1.15 $\frac{1}{4}$, arrived at as follows: 1 cent was added to the Minneapolis price because the corn was dry and 5 cents in discounts was allowed because it was sample grade. The freight was 7.28 cents per bushel and the commission 1.28 cents for a total of 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

On January 30, they received another loading order for 22,775 bushels, which they purchased on February 1. The Minneapolis close on February 1 was \$1.22. The price paid by Becker Grain & Lumber Co. was \$1.11 $\frac{1}{2}$. This was No. 4 corn on which they were allowed a 2-cent discount and there was again 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents for freight and commission. I talked to Mr. Becker on March 30 and he told me that he would gladly have purchased the balance of the corn on his inventory, as he needed it for mixing locally with the high-moisture, high-damage 1965 crop.

Of the 40 percent loading orders issued in January, only about 5 percent was actually shipped and 95 percent was purchased by the storing elevators, as it was needed for local feed use or for blending with the high-moisture 1965 crop. Much of the 1965 crop is so high in moisture it cannot be safely shipped to market unless it is blended with old, dry corn and, of course, this means it must be done at the country elevator before shipment.

When CCC made the sales of 47 million bushels on March 2 and 3, they issued loading orders for the balance of the corn stored in country elevators and advised those elevators that they could not purchase any of the corn because it all had to be moved to market to satisfy these sales. This procedure was contrary to previous practices which CCC had followed. It might be said

that, in making sales of this type, CCC deviated from the intent of Congress in that they did not use the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade as provided in the CCC charter. In this instance, they usurped the position of the country elevator operator and commission-man, inasmuch as they became the suppliers of the terminal market and deviated from previous practice wherein they had disposed of their corn as near the point of production as possible.

Although all country elevators involved were hurt by this action on the part of CCC, those hurt the most, in many cases, were the elevators located in the drought counties, as they had not previously received any loading orders. Therefore, their entire inventories were ordered shipped and many needed this corn for local use and would gladly have bought it if it had been offered to them.

Another rather interesting aspect of this sale is that this corn was sold for unrestricted use at the market, inasmuch as it was deemed to be nonstorables—a rather strained interpretation of the definition of nonstorables. Up to this time, CCC had always considered grades Nos. 1, 2, and 3 as storable corn and only grades Nos. 4 and 5 and sample grade as nonstorables. The big sales of March 2 and 3 were made on the basis of No. 3 corn with No. 4 and No. 5 to apply at a discount. Grade No. 1 and grade No. 2 cannot apply on these contracts, inasmuch as it is considered storable and under the law would have to be sold at the feed grain formula price, which in most instances would be somewhat higher than the price at which this corn was sold.

Rightly or wrongly, country elevator operators had been accustomed to CCC's method of selling corn. This method being that, under most circumstances, the country elevator operator would have the opportunity of buying corn once it was placed on loading order. Many country elevator operators, particularly in areas that had a bad corn crop last year, depended on the CCC grain as a source of local corn. It is badly needed for feed in many areas and, if the 1965 crop is to be marketed successfully, of necessity it must be blended with dry, heavy corn. The 1965 crop was high in moisture, rather immature, and low in test weight and is basically unmarketable unless it can be blended with dry corn. The main source of dry corn and, in many cases, the only source of dry corn available were the CCC stocks located in country elevators. It is true that a substantial quantity of CCC-owned grain is located in binsites and some of this corn has been put up for sale on a bid basis in certain localities and, it is my understanding, is still being offered for sale in certain localities. A check with the Minnesota ASCS Office this week revealed that so far this month (March) they had sold about 1.1 million bushels of binsite corn, of which 282,000 bushels was nonstorables and 805,000 bushels was storable.

However, it should be kept in mind that CCC does not have binsite corn at all places and the country elevator operator, in areas where there is no binsite corn, has no other sources of supply of dry corn except the stocks of CCC grain stored in his own elevator. A good example of this is Dakota County where a dealer advised me there were no Government stocks of binsite corn and only 171,000 bushels of CCC-owned country elevator stored corn, which of course has all been ordered out even though it is badly needed locally.

At the time CCC made the big sales of March 2 and 3, they had in their inventory, in this area, approximately 15 million bushels of corn stored in country elevators in Minnesota, approximately 5 million bushels in elevators in South Dakota, and about 33 million bushels of uncommitted corn in Minnesota binsites and 18 million bushels of un-

committed corn in South Dakota binsites. This totals 71 million bushels and, since No. 1 and No. 2 cannot apply on contracts, it seems logical to expect that practically all of the CCC corn will be used to fill these big sales. It should be kept in mind that the Minneapolis Branch ASCS Office has direct control of and makes direct sales of warehouse-stored corn, whereas the State ASCS offices, acting through the county ASCS offices, have operational control of CCC corn stored in binsites and are the agents of CCC in selling the binsite corn. When binsite corn is moved on ex-bin loading orders, the county ASCS office supervises the removal of the corn from the binsites, including the securing of samples, supervision of weighing at the elevator, and payment of charges for removing and transporting grain to the warehouse.

Both Minnesota and South Dakota State ASCS offices reported that, according to their own figures, they had about 14 million bushels each of No. 1 and No. 2 corn located in their binsites. If this corn actually comes out of the binsites and grades as high as the State indicates it should, CCC will have to wait until takeover of corn starting August 1, in order to fulfill their contracts.

It is interesting to note that over half the binsite corn in both States is from the 1956 or earlier crop years. Some Minnesota binsite stocks are from the 1951 crop and some South Dakota stocks are from the 1952 crop. In fact, over 25 percent of the South Dakota binsite stocks are from the 1953 crop. Basically, this corn is in excellent condition and could probably have been stored for several more years. In fact, on the basis of a sample taken from each bin last December, South Dakota reports show that they consider over 85 percent of the 1953-crop corn would still grade No. 1 or No. 2.

As far as the CCC-owned corn, both elevator-stored and binsite-stored, is concerned there was absolutely no need to sell the corn because it was nonstorables. It had kept for years and was in no danger of spoiling. The fact that the corn was sold as "nonstorables" was a strained use of the term and had no relation to the storability of the corn.

There is no question in my mind that CCC could have sold practically all of the elevator-stored corn back to the storing elevators at a net price considerably in excess of what they sold it for on the sales of March 2 and 3, provided the sales had been spread over a 2- or 3-month period. I say this because in many instances corn was needed locally. Since CCC corn is no longer available in these areas, it means that these local elevators and their feeder customers are going to be faced with substantially higher corn prices, inasmuch as they will have to come to the terminal market or go to other areas where corn is available and buy it and move it into their area. This would not have needed to be done, in most instances, had the Commodity Credit stocks remained available to country elevator operators, as has been the practice in the past.

Another particularly distressing aspect of the big sales of March 2 and 3 by the Minneapolis branch ASCS office is that it compounds an already very serious shortage of boxcars in this area. At the time of the sales, this area had been suffering from the most serious boxcar shortage old-time grainmen could remember and it was already several months old. The terms of the sale require delivery at terminals. Most of it will come to Minneapolis. This will require the equivalent of about 25,000 boxcars. Currently, the Minneapolis branch ASCS office is completing plans to move some of this corn by truck and by using open-top hopper cars, which will be fitted with a cover. Much of this transportation would not have been needed had CCC sold the corn to the storing elevators, as it would have been used locally.

The transportation problem is further compounded by the fact that corn will have to be shipped back to many of the country elevators to satisfy local feed requirements.

In this area, CCC had never previously made the type of sale used in this case. The sale of over 47 million bushels of corn in 2 days was 2½ times the entire total sold in this area during the entire year of 1965. The sale bypassed the country elevator operator who had traditionally bought corn when it was placed on loading orders. The sale complicated and added to an already serious boxcar shortage. The sale took away supplies which were needed in local areas and, based on past CCC practices, could logically be expected to be made available locally. The sale was made when CCC stocks were lower than they had been the previous year.

In view of these facts, it seems reasonable to ask, Why?

PETE STALLCOP,
Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident that there is now an administrationwide campaign to bring the struggling agricultural economy to its knees. As the above documents show, part of this campaign is being led by the Commodity Credit Corporation through its corn dumping activities. These actions even if isolated, are deplorable. When viewed in the proper context, which would include efforts by the Department of Commerce to force down livestock prices through the guise of hide export limitations, and the Department of Agriculture's recent actions to lower the dairy market prices by allowing imports of foreign cheese, the total effort is clearly designed to charge the inflation-causing Great Society spending bonanzas to the American farmer.

The true purpose of these strangely consistent actions has been steadfastly denied by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, although admitted by other administration spokesmen. However, the effects have now been candidly cheered by Mr. Freeman. In a ridiculous example of inconsistency, Mr. Freeman has maintained that there has been no effort to lower farm prices, and then he could hardly contain his joy when it was revealed that these efforts would do the job they were clearly intended to do.

A headline in the April 1 issue of the New York Times read as follows: "Freeman Elated Over Price Drops—He Predicts Further Cuts in Cost of Farm Products." The story was written by William M. Blair from Mr. Freeman's comments during a news conference held in Washington on March 31. Mr. Blair continued:

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices.

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I include the New York Times article at the conclusion of my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

FREEMAN ELATED BY DROP IN FARM PRODUCT PRICES

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman expressed pleasure today with the fact that the prices of farm products had dropped recently.

It was the first time in the memory of Federal farm officials that a Secretary of Agriculture indicated that he was pleased with a decrease in farm prices. Like Mr. Freeman, the officials were happy to note that consumers would benefit from lower prices by this summer.

"If the food marketing industry will respond quickly to lower farm prices over the next several months," Mr. Freeman told a news conference, "retail prices also can be lower sooner."

PRICE SUPPORTS RAISED

Not only have farm prices fallen since February 15, Mr. Freeman said, but the average prices of all farm products should be 6 to 10 percent lower in the fourth quarter of the year than they are now.

The Secretary's prediction came as he announced an increase in the Federal support prices for milk and soybeans to encourage production of these products, now in short supply. Both increases are aimed at preventing runaway prices and resulting higher costs to consumers.

He increased the support for milk used in manufacturing butter, cheese, and other dairy products 26 cents per 100 pounds to a level of \$3.50 for the new marketing year starting tomorrow.

The new prop is below the current market price of about \$3.79, resulting from low milk production and a surge in the demand for some dairy products, particularly cheese.

The new support level for butter will be 61.6 cents a pound compared with 59.4 cents. Mr. Freeman said butter prices already had dropped 2 cents a pound since February 15.

Mr. Freeman revoked the suspension he had announced on March 1 on fluid, or bottling milk, prices in Federal milk marketing order areas. The revocation, he said, would be effective April 10 and would tend to peg fluid milk prices about 22 cents higher per 100 pounds through June than the Federal orders would have provided.

In addition, Mr. Freeman said he would lift the quota on the import of Cheddar cheese to help overcome the imbalance in manufacturing milk supplies.

This imbalance has developed as cheese and butter manufacturers compete for existing supplies of manufacturing milk and divert milk from butter production.

Many small creameries face "disaster" from the cost-price squeeze resulting from the imbalance, the Department said. The increase in butter prices also threatens to hurt the market for butter and in the long run injure those dairy farmers who produce mainly for butter production, it said.

Mr. Freeman said President Johnson was directing the Tariff Commission to report on the advisability of high Cheddar cheese import quotas for an extended period.

The present yearly quota of 2.78 million pounds will be raised by 926,700 pounds, one-tenth of 1 percent of the annual U.S. consumption, Mr. Freeman said. This will extend through June 30. Canada and New Zealand are the main importers present.

Mr. Freeman gave this rundown on farm price decreases since February 15:

"Hogs down 4 cents a pound, followed by a 10- to 13-percent decline in the wholesale price of bacon and pork. Lambs also down 4 cents a pound. Butter down 2 cents a pound. Soybeans and corn oil down more than 6 percent.

"Fresh lettuce down 35 percent, cabbage, celery, and onions down more than 20 percent. Fresh oranges and grapefruit off 7 percent. Eggs down 3 cents per dozen."

He predicted the following declines by the end of the year:

"Poultry and eggs, down 15 to 20 percent; vegetables, down 20 to 25 percent; potatoes 10 percent; meat animals, 5 percent."

EXTENDING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO DEPENDENT OR SURVIVING SISTERS

MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. 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 gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which would provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of insured individuals who are living and who suffered disability which did not end prior to the month in which the insured became entitled to old-age or disability insurance benefits, or who have become deceased.

In order to qualify as a dependent or surviving sister the insured must have provided her with at least one-half of her support, proof of such support to be filed within 2 years subsequent to the time when the insured sustained disability or died.

The amount of money which would inure to the benefit of the dependent or surviving sister under my bill would equal 50 percent of the insured's primary fund, and where the insured has died, 82½ percent would be allowed one sister or 75 percent each for two or more sisters. A dependent or surviving sister would not receive any benefits if the insured has a wife, husband, child, widow, widower or parent entitled to benefits under existing law.

The revenues needed to support this program amount to .01 percent of the employers' payroll tax. This amount, while small in comparison to total tax subtracted from the employer and employee, is sufficient to insure security for many individuals who otherwise would, because of the death or disability of an unmarried brother or independent sister, be without support.

The Advisory Council on Social Security stated in their 1965 report that for the vast majority of Americans the social security program gives assurance that old age, total disability or death will not mean the end of a regular family income.

Prompt action on this bill would assure benefits to even a greater majority of Americans by including a group who are among those most in need of the security the act provides.

WHO'S ON FIRST, WHAT'S ON SECOND

MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once in a while the agricultural program mess sounds a little bit like the old Abbott and Costello colloquy "who's on first" and so forth. This one is encouraged to plant, the next farmer not to plant, and on and on. Winthrop French, of Wakeman, Ohio, wrote a very interesting letter to the New London, Ohio, Record. If the Members will read it, I am sure they will get the point.

The letter follows:

DEAR EDITOR: Oh happy, happy day. We farmers are winding the Maypole, and Orville is queen of the May. Uncle Sam's going to pay us for growing flowers. Sunflowers, that is. According to a March 10 letter from the boys at the Huron County office of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee of the USDA, we can grow sunflowers on the acres that we sign up to not grow corn on. We can't grow soybeans on these diverted acres, but we can grow sunflowers on them, and Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman will pay us 20 percent of the amount he would pay us to not grow corn on them.

So now instead of collecting \$1,170 for not growing 30½ acres of corn and \$860 for growing 30½ acres of corn, or a total of \$2,030 as originally promised to me, I can collect \$234 for growing 30½ acres of sunflowers where I don't grow corn, and \$860 for growing 30½ acres of corn where I don't grow sunflowers, or a total of \$1,094. Thus, for a sacrifice of \$936 of subsidy payment which really didn't belong to me anyway, I can collect \$1,094 for planting and harvesting 30½ acres of corn and 30½ acres of sunflowers, and help flood the bird seed market.

Or I can resist the bait and escape this Socialist trap—go ahead and plant corn or soybeans or oats or barley or sunflowers or cucumbers as I see fit—only to get clobbered with the club of Government control of our grain market.

The peasants of Russia's collective farms raise sunflowers because sunflowers stand the drought better than soybeans. They make their oleo from sunflower oil and whale oil, and their toilet paper from sunflower stalks. In America we make our oleo from corn oil and soybean oil, and our toilet paper from straw pulp. Sunflowers are "for the birds," and the birds will sing Orville's praises forevermore.

Sincerely,

WINTHROP FRENCH.

WAKEMAN, OHIO.

MANDATORY OIL IMPORT PROGRAM HARMFUL TO COAL INDUSTRY

MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the decision of this administration to once and for all end for all practical purposes the mandatory oil import program is indeed tragic for a number of families from Appalachia that live the life of coal.

The action of the Johnson administration in revising the program for controlling imports of residual fuel oil is another significant step toward liquidating the market for coal and other

domestic fuels on the east coast. Regardless of how the changes in the program might be interpreted, it can mean only one thing and that is an almost unlimited supply of imported oil during the coming year.

I would like to point out that the new order removes the limitation on the amount of residual oil which can be imported. The sky is now the limit. In addition, the new order broadens significantly the number of firms which will now be eligible to import oil for the first time, and it will make consumers of oil, including Government agencies, eligible to go before the Oil Import Appeals Board and secure an allocation for importing oil directly.

In other words, this new order says in effect, "Go out and scare up the customers for imported oil. We will guarantee that you will be given the right to import the oil."

This is not an import control program. Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was absolutely correct when he stated that the changes in the program "makes the retention of controls merely a fiction." He added that this being the case, all vestiges of controls should be abandoned. I say that since controls are now a fiction the administration should abandon its masquerade of protecting the domestic fuels industries and announce its real intention, which is to deliver this entire east coast fuel market into the hands of imported oil. At the very least, if the administration would adopt a position of stating frankly and publicly just what its new program will do, the coal industry, and the domestic oil industry, could prepare for what lies ahead. Not even the famous Johnson "treatment" can convince the affected domestic industries, and their workers, that the program as revised will be good for them.

However, this latest step in further diluting the control program started by President Eisenhower in 1959 as essential to national security should come as no surprise when viewed in the light of the history of the past two Democratic administrations. Under this and the preceding Democratic administration, the import control program has been completely emasculated. At the beginning of 1961, when the Democratic administration took office, imports were running at the rate of 154 million barrels a year. By 1965, they had been increased through repeated liberalization of the program and the total had reached 267 million barrels—an increase of 113 million barrels.

This means that under two Democratic administrations, which have been pledged to the economic revitalization of Appalachia, annual residual oil imports have been permitted to increase the equivalent of some 28 million tons of coal.

The production and transportation of this amount of coal, displaced from its traditional markets by increased oil imports, would have created 12,500 jobs, with an annual payroll of \$75 million annually. The possibility of creating these additional jobs in West Virginia and other Appalachian States were de-

stroyed by the oil import policies of these two Democratic administrations at a time when they were paying lip-service to the need for doing something for Appalachia.

Yet, these administrations were content to substitute job training for well-paying jobs. They were content to accelerate the export of jobs of American miners and railroad workers to Venezuela as a means of bolstering the economy of that country. The damage which increased oil imports caused to the economy of Appalachia apparently is a matter of secondary concern, the victim of our foreign policy.

This whole thing smacks of politics. The announcement was made by the Democratic speaker in the presence of Democratic Senators and Congressmen from New England. Perhaps it will be good politics in New England, but in West Virginia and other coal-producing States of Appalachia it is bad economics. The people of our area will pay the price in reduced job opportunities and lost payrolls.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE—WATERSHED AND PLANNING CONSTRUCTION AND RELATED PROGRAMS

MR. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

MR. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I have been very concerned at the prospect of the severe cutback in funds for the Soil Conservation Service as evidenced by the President's budget request. The concern in this respect has prompted me to appear before the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the House Appropriations Committee and request that additional sums of money be appropriated in order that this distinguished program, and particularly, the watershed and planning phases of the same could be continued.

Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks the statement that I made before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, House Appropriations Committee:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ARCH A. MOORE, JR., BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about several items in the budget proposals for the Soil Conservation Service, and I appreciate this opportunity to discuss them.

One hundred percent of the land units in the State of West Virginia are in organized soil conservation districts. These conservation districts have broadened and changed their activities and assistance as new needs have been encountered by both rural and urban landowners. I feel the current budget recommendations do not adequately reflect these needs. Therefore, I make the following suggestions:

WATERSHED PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION
I recommend an increase in Public Law 566 watershed planning funds to \$10 million.

and an increase of \$12 million for watershed construction.

West Virginia now has 36 watershed projects completed, under construction, or in the planning and application stage. I'm very enthusiastic about this program because I've seen the tremendous economic impact they have on the surrounding communities.

For example, in my district, the Upper Grave Creek Watershed at Cameron was completed about a year ago. Last summer there was a violent rainstorm in the upper watershed area. Previously, the farms and community of Cameron would have suffered severe damages. But, thanks to this watershed project, the storm water was "walked down" the tributaries and there was no damage at all.

Local people and soil conservation technicians are now working on a plan for the Wheeling Creek Watershed, where considerable destruction and the loss of one life have resulted from floods in the past few years.

I feel these are the kinds of projects we should continuously try to move forward, not retard. Under the proposed budgetary limitations, new construction starts will be reduced from the current total of 80 per year to only 35 in 1967. This will hurt both the people in West Virginia and throughout the Nation.

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

I recommend an increase in the overall appropriation for conservation operations to \$120 million. Part of this increase—\$3.6 million—is needed to restore the proposed reduction for soil surveys. These surveys have always been a basic tool of rural conservation planning. More recently, they have proven their value for nonagricultural use by such groups as State highway departments, real estate developers, health departments and planning commissions. Wider use of surveys is growing as West Virginia grows and I am disturbed to see a cutback in an activity so essential to sound land use planning.

Further increases are needed for staffing to provide technical programing and installation services to soil conservation district cooperators—West Virginia's 14 soil conservation districts report a need for a minimum of 35 man-years of additional SCS help. Nationwide, the need is for more than 1,500 additional man-years.

I also wish to urge that the \$1,028,000 proposed for assistance in land use planning related to income-producing recreation be appropriated. This is especially important in West Virginia, where we are long on scenery and somewhat short on first quality farmland.

In the past few years, soil conservation service personnel have assisted in establishing a number of income-producing recreational enterprises in West Virginia. Soil conservation districts have also completed a recreational inventory for the entire State. This leadership is helping landowners recognize opportunities for recreational use of their land and water resources to improve their income. Increased Soil Conservation Service assistance is essential to help these landowners arrive at sound decision in planning recreational developments.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A project plan is now being developed for the Little Kanawha resource conservation and development project, which includes Calhoun County in my district. This project has tremendous local support and I heartily endorse it. In fact, I strongly believe there should be more projects like this to help local people plan for the orderly development of their resources. I recommend that the \$312,000 proposed for resource conservation and development project planning be at least doubled so as not to curtail this worthwhile program.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE—VIETNAM

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, whose national chairman is Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, retired, a highly respected authority on military matters, has issued a statement which ought to be read by the greatest number of citizens of this country.

In brief, General Fellers demands to know why U.S. forces, controlling the air-space over Vietnam and the seas bordering that country, continue to fight a sanguinary jungle war and on terms largely dictated by the Communist Vietcong.

The statement follows:

By July 1945 in the war against Japan, the XXI Bomber Command had burned out 66 cities and destroyed many of Japan's greatest factories. In 9 months B-29 raids inflicted 806,000 casualties of whom 330,000 were killed. Pre raid evacuations and mass migration after attacks caused a population displacement of 8,500,000 persons. In March the Emperor, watching a Tokyo bombing, had resolved to stop the war regardless of what might happen to him personally.

Near the close of the war MacArthur's medium bombers showered leaflets on some of the cities, warning that before a certain date these cities would be destroyed by the Army Air Forces. The leaflets explained their purpose: to urge families to evacuate and survive, to enable the people to appeal for help so as to learn how powerless the Japanese militarists were to defend them.

After the surrender, evacuees from the cities which had been destroyed were interviewed. Our leaflets had created stark panic. Cities had been immediately and completely abandoned; no lives were lost.

No people were ever more thoroughly indoctrinated to resist surrender than were the Japanese. Two million frontline troops stood ready to defend their shores against landings. Yet bombing and blockade forced these tough warriors to lay down their arms without a single hostile incident. General MacArthur flew into Japan with 1,100 men.

Here then is the pattern to superimpose on North Vietnam. Warn military target areas—mostly supply centers—that total destruction will soon be inevitable. Urge populations in these military target areas to evacuate to designated tropical sanctuaries. Then destroy every military target. Blockade the coastline. Deny munitions and weapons to the enemy; the end will come quickly and long before Red China could intervene. Red China intervened in Korea only when it was known that the Yalu and Manchuria would be sanctuaries. Moreover, Red China is ill-prepared for a major war and Chiang Kai-shek's invasion threat is a deterrent.

Why fight a war of attrition on enemy terms in tropical jungles? Why trade American youth for Asiatic hordes? Military assistance, making full utilization of our fleet and air power, is the only prompt, humane way to end the war.

DIVERSION OF ANTIPOVERTY FUNDS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Min-

nesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 21 of this year, I cited the Women's Job Corps Center in Charleston, W. Va., as an example of extravagant diversion of antipoverty funds into the pockets of Democratic politicians. Two days later, March 23, 1966, at hearings on the war on poverty, the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, challenged the accuracy of the figures put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by me.

At that time he said, "Congressman QUIE, the figures that were given to you and through you put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were inaccurate."

On this same day, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] addressed the House and stated that there were misstatements about the cost and expenses of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center contained in my remarks on March 21, 1966.

During the past several days, our investigator, Mr. John Buckley, studied financial aspects of the Charleston, W. Va., Women's Job Corps Center, and I can report the figures I used in my presentation were correct and the figures used by the Office of Economic Opportunity were inaccurate.

As I previously stated, the lease for the hotel provides a payment of \$7,900 a month or \$94,800 a year, and I will be placing a copy of the lease in the RECORD with the amount of rent shown in article III. All taxes, insurance, utilities, and repairs are paid by the sponsor, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. In addition, the sponsor, with Federal funds, transported the Kanawha Hotel's furniture to a storage building at a cost of \$2,800.25 and has contracted to pay \$4,800 a year for the storage of this property. In this connection, it is noted the sponsor, again with Federal funds, has paid personal property taxes to the State of West Virginia on this stored furniture as well as personal property taxes on accounts receivable the hotel had listed in a previous business property statement.

I initially reported more than \$225,000 of Federal funds had been expended to renovate the hotel building. This figure was challenged by the Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity who stated the rehabilitation costs were \$187,400.

The costs were actually more than \$187,400. In fact, they were considerably more than the conservative figure I had used, of \$225,000.

Our investigator found \$290,026.60 was expended in repairs to the hotel and installation of the equipment necessary to the operation of the Women's Job Corps Center. In addition, a total of \$30,586.14 is outstanding in mechanics liens against the property and \$24,936.77 was spent on electric heating and plumbing items prior to January 4, 1966, under the item "Maintenance." The total of repairs, equipment installation and maintenance prior to January 4 of this year is \$345,549.51. The sponsor has indicated only \$187,377.31 has been charged to rehabilitation of the hotel. I submit, Mr. Speaker, regardless of what bookkeeping terms

Packard Bell Electronics Corp. and the Office of Economic Opportunity choose to follow, that nearly \$350,000 in Federal funds have been obligated to put the rundown hotel in a condition suitable for a Women's Job Corps Center.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the hearings. The gentleman from Minnesota presented his facts on the total amount of money spent to rehabilitate and renovate the rundown Kanawha Hotel. Will the gentleman repeat the amount he stated in the hearings which was contradicted by Mr. Bernard Boutin, Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. QUIE. I had said that more than \$225,000 was used to renovate the hotel.

Mr. GOODELL. The Deputy Director objected. He then flatly said that your facts were inaccurate and incorrect. The true figure was about \$187,000 according to Mr. Boutin.

Mr. QUIE. One hundred eighty-seven thousand four hundred dollars.

Mr. GOODELL. The actual figure now developed by the investigator shows \$345,000?

Mr. QUIE. Two hundred ninety thousand twenty-six dollars and sixty cents was spent on repairs and installation of equipment, \$24,936.77 for electric, heating, and plumbing items which they call "maintenance" and \$30,586.14 for outstanding mechanics liens.

Mr. GOODELL. In round numbers, \$345,000, as contrasted with \$187,000 that the Director of OEO said had been spent to renovate this rundown Kanawha Hotel.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Examples of some items which OEO did not include under rehabilitation were the installation of new kitchen equipment at a cost of \$36,813.10, permanent installation of air conditioning equipment and ducts, and the installation of window air conditioners.

The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity went to great lengths to show the market value of the hotel in 1965 would have been \$438,000 and in 1966, \$508,250. He stated they assessed at 40 percent of real value in Charleston, W. Va. On March 25, 1956, the Kanawha County tax assessor advised our investigator that the assessed valuation of property in that county is equal to 50 percent of the true and actual value. He cited chapter 18, article 7(a), section 4, of the 1965 Cumulative Supplement to the West Virginia Code of 1961, which provides that the total assessed valuation in each of the four classes of property shall not be less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property. This regulation is contained in West Virginia House bill 499, passed March 9, 1963, a copy of which was obtained by our investigator. I will ask later to have that included in the RECORD.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I was present at this hearing when the gentleman in the well made the statement that the assessments in West Virginia under the law were 50 percent of the appraised valuation. I was also present when the Deputy Director of the OEO said that was incorrect and that it was 40 percent of the assessed valuation. Do I understand the gentleman's statement in the well today is based upon the investigator's report and the citation of the specific law in West Virginia and that he was correct when he said 50 percent of the assessed value?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. There was a court case in West Virginia which lead to a change in the law which prohibits any assessor from assessing less than 50 percent or more than 100 percent, which is the language that I just cited. An examination of the real property connected with the Kanawha Hotel determined that the hotel building prior to occupancy by the Women's Job Corps Center was assessed at \$87,000. It was subsequently raised to \$115,000 as a result of extensive repairs to the building. In addition, the hotel building occupies two parcels of land assessed at \$67,300 and \$21,000, respectively. The total assessment of the parcels of land and building prior to the Women's Job Corps Center occupancy was \$175,300. Using these figures as 50 percent of the assessed valuation, it might well be claimed the market value of the combined building and land was \$350,600. However, reliable real estate brokers in Charleston, W. Va., who were contacted pointed out due to the rundown condition of the hotel they would not have offered more than \$250,000 prior to the renovation. They referred to a recent sale of the Milner-Ruffner Hotel building in Charleston on February 1, 1966. They stated this building, although older than the Kanawha building, includes more ground and is located on Kanawha Boulevard, which is the main thoroughfare in Charleston. This building was sold for \$200,000. It was noted by our investigator that a large tract of property located directly opposite Virginia Street from the Kanawha Hotel is currently being developed in connection with urban renewal. It was purchased by the Charleston National Bank for \$10.50 per square foot within the past 2 years. At this rate per square foot, the value of the Kanawha Hotel land would be approximately \$154,402. You can compare this with the \$88,300 assessed valuation, half of the \$176,600, that was used in the figures as the full and true assessment based on 50 percent. It was noted further in May 1965 the Hotel Kanawha Co. purchased one-twelfth of an undivided sixty-one one hundred sixtieths of an adjoining building for \$950. The second floor of this building is being used as classrooms and offices for the Women's Job Corps Center. The Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Mr. Gibbons, made much of the claimed annual square foot rental cost of something less than \$1 and the cost of shelter amounting to \$27 per month per enrollee. I submit these figures were based on the rental cost alone, which is \$94,800 a year clear

profit to the Peyton Corp., while it should be noted the OEO claimed it to be only \$90,000, divided by the number of square feet of 100,000 and the number of enrollees in the Job Corps center of 294.

In this regard, the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mr. Gibbons neglected to include \$16,000 charged to the sponsor to settle leases of former tenants; \$4,800 being paid annually for the storage of the hotel's furniture; \$2,800.25 paid to transport the hotel furniture to storage; \$7,450 paid annually for real and personal property taxes—including taxes on the furniture in storage and the hotel's accounts receivable—\$5,740 paid annually for insurance; not to mention \$314,963.37 paid to date for repairs, building maintenance and installation of equipment, and mechanics liens outstanding amounting to \$30,586.14, making a total of \$477,139.76 which include rent of \$94,800. I submit, Mr. Speaker, these expenses should be included when figuring costs, and the figures of \$1 per square foot and \$27 a month per enrollee cited by the Office of Economic Opportunity were deceptive and misleading.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in order to clarify the situation, am I to understand from the facts which the investigator developed, that the Kanawha Hotel, in the opinion of reputable real estate agents in Charleston, W. Va., had a value of \$250,000, approximately, when the Job Corps Center went in, and that the Federal Government has since spent \$345,000 on renovating the Job Corps Center at the Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va.?

The \$250,000 was the value and they have spent \$345,000 to renovate it?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I also recall the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] making a great point about the less than \$1 per square foot cost. I take it, based upon the investigation that has been made, that the figure of less than \$1 per square foot was arrived at by taking the \$90,000 per year claimed by OEO to be the annual rental of the Kanawha Hotel, which is erroneous, and dividing it by the number of square feet and the number of enrollees in the camp?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, they should have started with \$94,800 which is the actual rental per year. In addition, there is \$4,800 that the taxpayer's money pays annually for storage of furniture. There are utilities, taxes, insurance, et cetera, which are paid for by the taxpayers on an annual basis, plus the renovation costs and the mechanics liens and other thinks which the gentleman from Minnesota has indicated as outstanding?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I offer for purposes of comparison the lease connected with the former Hotel Governor Cabell in Huntington, W. Va., which is the site of a Women's Job Corps Center. This build-

ing is being leased at the monthly rental cost of \$6,050 and the lessor is paying taxes and insurance during the period of the occupancy by the Women's Job Corps Center. In addition, the owners of the hotel were forced to sacrifice an estimated \$80,000 worth of hotel furniture when the premises were vacated. Under the terms of the lease of the Kanawha Hotel, Packard Bell Electronics Corp. is obligated to pay the Hotel Kanawha Co. the sum of \$70,000 as compensatory remuneration in the event the lease is terminated by the lessee for any reason either at the end of the original term of 2 years or within 90 days thereafter. The special concessions made in connection with the Kanawha Hotel in Charleston, W. Va., strongly suggest political favoritism to a company whose president is the commerce commissioner of that State and who, in 1964, was defeated in the Democratic primary for State senate. Mr. Angus Dayton lost to Mr. Paul J. Kaufman 13,274 to 19,462. I would add the present Democratic Governor of West Virginia was commerce commissioner of that State prior to his election in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a copy of the lease for the Women's Job Corps Center at Charleston, W. Va., a copy of the West Virginia House bill 499, relating to a computation of local share and appraisal and assessment of property, and a copy of insurance coverage furnished by Packard Bell Electronics Corp.

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

There was no objection.

The matters referred to follow:

APRIL 9, 1965.

This indenture of lease, made as of the 20th day of March, 1965, by and between the Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, party of the first part, hereinafter referred to as "lessor," and Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation, party of the second part, hereinafter referred to as "lessee," and whenever the context so admits, the successors and assigns of each of them: Witnesseth—

ARTICLE I

Demised premises: Lessor hereby leases to lessee, and lessee does hereby take from lessor, upon and subject to the terms and provisions of this lease, the following described property, together with the improvements and appurtenances thereunto belonging, situate in the city of Charleston, County of Kanawha, State of West Virginia, to wit:

1. All that certain tract or parcel of land having a frontage of 55 feet on Summers Street and running back the same width throughout with the line of the U.S. Government property used as a post office to what is known as the Arcade Building and being the same property which was conveyed to the Hotel Kanawha Co. by F. M. Staunton and wife, by deed dated the 30th day of April, 1903, and recorded in the office of the Clerk of the County Court of Kanawha County, W. Va., in deed book No. 90, page 25.

2. That certain tract or parcel of land adjoining the above tract having a frontage of 7 feet on Summers Street and running back with even width about 115 feet to what is known as the Arcade Building and the same conveyed to Hotel Kanawha Co. by Mary E. Wagner, by deed dated May 31, 1902, of record in said clerk's office in deed book No. 88, page 403.

3. Those two certain parcels of land conveyed by Mary E. Wagner to Hotel Kanawha Co. by deed dated December 14, 1904, and of record in the clerk's office aforesaid in deed book No. 95, page 448, the first tract fronting 55 feet on Virginia Street and running back with Summers Street and in a line parallel thereto, equal width throughout, to the property above described owned by the Hotel Kanawha Co., the second tract, being all right, title and interest formerly owned by said Mary E. Wagner in and to a private alley fronting 12 feet on Summers Street and running back to the said Arcade Building; in the said deed of December 14, 1904, said Mary E. Wagner dedicates for a private alleyway a strip 5 feet wide fronting on Virginia Street adjacent to said 55-foot lot, said alley running from Virginia Street back to the line of the property of the Hotel Kanawha Co. and by said deed the Hotel Kanawha Co. likewise dedicates off of the 55-foot lot so conveyed to it a strip 5 feet wide adjoining the above described 5-foot strip for like use as a private alley, making an alleyway 10 feet wide for private use, the right and interests of said Hotel Co. in said alley are also hereby leased.

4. All right, title, and interest of the Hotel Kanawha Co. in and to the lot of land 25 feet square adjoining the 10-foot alley above mentioned and other property formerly owned by Mary E. Wagner to be used upon the terms and conditions set forth in a deed dated the 9th day of June 1906, between Mary E. Wagner and the Hotel Kanawha Co., which deed is of record in the clerk's office aforesaid in deed book No. 103, page 130.

5. All of the second floor of that certain two-story building known as the Wagner Building fronting 50 feet, more or less, on Virginia Street and extending back therefrom a distance of 70 feet, more or less, abutting on the Hotel Kanawha Building, and designated as 70½ Virginia Street, East, containing 3,500 square feet, more or less.

It is the intention to hereby lease what is generally known in the city of Charleston as the Kanawha Hotel located at the corner of Summers and Virginia Streets and on the Post Office Square in the city of Charleston, W. Va., together with all of the furniture, furnishings, dishes, silver, machinery, lighting and heating fixtures, refrigeration, and equipment of every kind and description now in, on or belonging to said premises (but not including food, other perishable inventories or linens as provided in article IX, sec. 3); and the second or top floor of the building known as the Wagner Building which is immediately adjacent to the said Kanawha Hotel.

Also, all and singular the tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances belonging or in any wise appertaining to the aforesaid premises and all thereof, together with all income, rents, issues and profits in all the aforesaid premises or property.

ARTICLE II

Term of lease

Section 1: The term of this lease shall be for a period of 2 years commencing with the "date of contract" of contract No. OEO-138 which is under negotiation between the Office of Economic Opportunity and lessee. It is mutually agreed that the commencement of this lease is wholly contingent upon the successful negotiation and execution of said contract No. OEO-138. Lessee shall send lessor written notification of the "date of contract" as soon as practicable.

Section 2: Lessee shall have the right at the expiration of the original term hereof to extend the original term for 3 successive periods of 12 months each, such extensions to be on the same terms, covenants and conditions as are herein contained, except such right to extend shall be exercised by written notice to lessor at least 2 months prior to the expiration of said original term or any

extension thereof, as the case may be, upon the giving of such notice and without any further instrument, lease or agreement, this lease shall be so extended.

Section 3: In addition, lessee shall have the option at any time prior to the expiration date of the original 2-year term of this lease to extend said lease for an additional 90-day period beyond the 2-year period by so notifying lessor in writing.

Section 4: Lessee shall also have the option at any time prior to the expiration date of any additional 1-year term which is commenced in accordance with the provisions of article II, section 2, to extend said lease for an additional 90-day period beyond the expiration date of such additional 1-year period; provided that this section 4 shall only be effective if lessee notifies lessor at least 60 days prior to the expiration of such additional 1-year term that lessee desires to have this option. In the event lessee, after giving such notice, does not elect to exercise such option, lessee shall pay to lessor as additional rent hereunder a sum of money equivalent to 2 months rent. In the event lessee, during said 60-day period, and after giving such notice to lessor, shall notify lessor that lessee renounces this option, lessee shall pay to lessor instead as additional rent hereunder a sum of money equal to the difference between 2 months rent and the apportioned rental due for the balance of the additional 1-year period from the date of receipt by lessor of such notice renunciation.

ARTICLE III

Rent

Section 1: Lessee covenants and agrees to accept the aforesaid hotel building and adjacent building, and pay fixed net rent at the rate of \$189,600, payable in equal monthly installments of \$7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the original term of 2 years, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 2: In the event that lessee shall exercise its right to extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of \$94,800 for the first year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of \$7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the first year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 3: In the event the lessee shall exercise its right to further extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of \$94,800 for the second year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of \$7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the second year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

Section 4: In the event the lessee shall exercise its right to further extend this lease under article II, section 2, lessee agrees to pay the fixed net rent at the rate of \$94,800 for the third and last year of said extended term, payable in equal monthly installments of \$7,900 in advance on the first day of each and every calendar month during the third year of the extended term, and pro rata for the fraction of any month.

ARTICLE IV

Taxes

Section 1: Lessee shall punctually pay and discharge, as additional rent, all real estate taxes, property taxes, special assessments, paving assessments, and other taxes and charges of any kind which, after the first day of the term of this lease, are assessed against or become a lien upon the leased premises and against any building or appurtenance now or hereafter located thereon. All such taxes which shall become payable during the first and last years of the term of this lease or any renewal term hereof shall

be apportioned pro rata between lessor and lessee in accordance with the respective number of months during which each party shall be in possession of the demised premises in said respective tax years.

Section 2: Lessor agrees that that portion of the leased premises designated as the Wagner Building as described in item 5, article I hereof, shall be excluded from the lessee's obligation to pay all taxes as provided in section 1 hereof.

Section 3: Lessee shall not be required to pay any tax which may be imposed upon lessor by reason of any transfer of lessor's title to the demised premises or of any interest therein, or any income tax or gross sales tax or other tax which may be imposed upon lessor by reason of the receipt by lessor of the rent herein reserved.

ARTICLE V Utilities

Lessee shall pay for all telephone, water, sewage, fire service, incinerator, and other service and utility charges, including electricity and gas used for lighting, cooling, heating, or for any other purposes during the term or any extended term of this lease.

ARTICLE VI

Compliance with law, etc.

Lessee covenants and agrees that it will promptly comply with all applicable laws, ordinances, rules, and regulations of any duly constituted governmental authority or applicable insurance inspection bureau.

ARTICLE VII

Safe condition

The lessee covenants and agrees, at its own cost and expense, at all times during said term to keep and maintain said premises and appurtenances thereunto belonging, including the adjoining areas, alleys, stairways, and sidewalks, in a clean, safe, and healthy condition, and to keep the same free and clear of snow and ice and other obstructions; and to use all reasonable care to guard and keep safe all fires and other dangerous substances and forces on said premises.

The lessee further covenants and agrees that it will indemnify and save harmless the lessor and also the land and premises herein demised from any and all claims, liabilities, responsibilities, damages, and outlay of expenses that lessor may incur or any cost or expense to which it may be put by reason of any injury and/or claimed injury to person and/or property or by reason of any claim on account thereof, resulting from the condition of the present buildings and/or any addition or alteration which may be constructed or placed upon the premises, or any other building or structure thereon.

ARTICLE VIII

Alteration and waste

Section 1: The lessee covenants and agrees not to commit or suffer any waste on said premises, and not to make any structural changes in said demised buildings, without first submitting plans and specifications to lessor and obtaining the written consent of the lessor to the same, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, together with the lessor's approval of such changes, and that having obtained such consent and approval, the lessee will, at its own cost and expense, make the same within the time, and in such manner as shall be so approved, and indemnify and save harmless the lessor, and said demised premises from and against any and all liens, claims for damages, and other charges and claims of every kind and nature incurred in or arising from the same. However, lessee is authorized to make any and all changes, repairs, additions, improvements and alterations which do not affect the building structure without lessor's consent.

Section 2: In the event lessee shall make structural changes or alterations in said demised buildings, lessee, at its sole cost, here-

by covenants and agrees that within 6 months from the date of the termination of this lease it shall restore the said demised premises to its condition prior to such structural change or alterations, reasonable wear and tear excepted, if required to do so by lessor.

However, lessor shall be required to give written notice on or before 30 days of the date of termination of this lease, listing the structural changes or alterations it will require lessee to so restore, or lessee shall be relieved of its obligation under this section of the lease.

ARTICLE IX Furnishings, fixtures, etc.

Section 1: The lessee covenants and agrees during the term of this lease to maintain and keep the furniture, fixtures, and equipment in said demised buildings in first class condition and repair, and to surrender same to lessor at the end of the lease in its present condition, reasonable wear and tear excepted.

Section 2: It is mutually agreed hereto by lessor and lessee that an inventory shall be made within 1 month from the date of the execution of this lease by representatives of lessor and lessee, of all the furnishings and fixtures on said leased premises, which shall be binding upon both parties upon the termination of this lease in regard to the obligations of lessee contained in section 1 hereof. Said inventory shall indicate the condition of the furnishings and fixtures and any other comments mutually agreed upon by the parties hereto.

Section 3: Lessor agrees to take an inventory of all food, other perishable items and linens within 1 month from the date of the execution of this lease, and lessee shall have the exclusive right to purchase any and all such items at a price to be mutually agreed upon.

It is understood between the parties hereto, however, that said items are not included in this lease, and lessee shall not be responsible for replacement, restoration, or payment of the aforesaid items at the termination of this lease.

ARTICLE X Fire insurance

Section 1: Lessee agrees to procure at its own expense and to maintain in full force and effect through the term of this lease or any extended term or terms hereof, fire and extended coverage insurance on the building or buildings erected on said premises designated herein as the Kanawha Hotel (excluding the leased premises designated herein as the Wagner Building), including all furniture, furnishings, fixtures and equipment of lessor in or appurtenant to the leased premises, and all alterations, changes, additions and improvements in an amount which at any time will represent the fair value of the same. All policies shall be issued by responsible companies authorized to do business in the State of West Virginia selected by lessee and approved by lessor and any mortgagee, which policies shall provide that loss, if any, payable thereunto shall be payable to lessee who shall utilize said proceeds in accordance with section 5, hereof. Lessee agrees to deliver certificates of insurance or authenticated copies of such policies to lessor and mortgagee.

On or before the expiration of any policy or policies of such insurance, lessee shall pay the premiums for renewal insurance and deliver to lessor or to any mortgagee lessor may designate within said period of time, satisfactory evidence of the payment of the premiums thereon and if such premiums or any of them shall not be so paid and the policies or certificates shall not be so delivered lessor may procure and/or pay for the same, and the amount so paid by lessor, with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from the date of payment, shall become due and payable by lessee as addi-

tional rent with the next or any subsequent installment or fixed rent which shall become due after such payment by lessor; it being expressly covenanted that payment by lessor of any such premium shall not be deemed to waive or release the default in the payment thereof by lessee, or the right of lessor to take such action as may be permissible hereunder as in the case of default in the payment of fixed rent.

Section 2: Lessee shall not violate or permit to be violated any of the conditions or provisions of any of said policies, and lessee shall so perform and satisfy the requirements of the companies writing such policies that at all times companies of good standing and acceptable to lessor shall be willing to write and continue such insurance.

Section 3: Lessee shall cooperate with lessor and any mortgagee in connection with the collection of any insurance moneys that may be due in the event of loss and shall execute and deliver to lessor and any mortgagee such proofs of loss and other instruments that may be required for the purpose of facilitating the recovery of any such insurance moneys.

Section 4: Such insurance may be carried under a blanket policy covering the demised premises and other premises owned or leased by lessee.

Section 5: If the demised premises shall be damaged by fire or other cause or peril covered by insurance purchased in accordance with this article X, the proceeds thereof shall be utilized solely to repair, rebuild, replace or restore any and all property damaged, unless mutually agreed upon to do otherwise by both parties in writing.

ARTICLE XI

Public liability insurance

Section 1: Lessee agrees at its sole expense, to procure, carry and maintain in full force and effect throughout the term of this lease or any extended term or terms hereof, public liability insurance in an amount not less than \$100,000 for bodily injury or death to one person, and not less than \$500,000 for bodily injury or death of more than one person in one accident, and not less than \$50,000 for damage to property.

Section 2: Such insurance may be carried under a blanket policy covering the demised premises and other premises owned or leased by lessee.

ARTICLE XII

Damage to person or property

Lessee will indemnify and save lessor free and harmless from any and all claims for damage or otherwise, either to persons or property, arising from lessee's use or misuse of the leased premises and will also indemnify and save lessor free and harmless from any and all claims for damage done to goods or other property in the leased premises. All personal property, merchandise, machinery, goods or other things or articles in the leased premises shall be at the risk of lessee only; and if the whole or any part thereof shall be destroyed or damaged by fire or otherwise, or by leakage or bursting of water pipes, or by roof, gutter or downspout leakage, or in any other manner, no part of said loss or damage is to be charged to or borne by lessor.

ARTICLE XIII

Subordination to mortgage

Lessee shall, upon the request of lessor in writing, subordinate this lease and the lien hereof to the lien of any present or future mortgage or mortgages upon the demised premises or any property of which the demised premises are a part irrespective of the time of execution or the time of recording of any such mortgage or mortgages, provided that the holder of any such mortgage shall enter into a written agreement with lessor to the effect that in the event of foreclosure or other action taken under the

mortgage by the holder thereof, this lease and the rights of lessee hereunder shall not be in any way affected but shall continue in full force and effect so long as lessee shall not be in default hereunder. The word "mortgage" as used herein includes mortgages, deeds of trust or other similar instruments, and modifications, extensions, renewals and replacements thereof, and any and all advances thereunder.

ARTICLE XIV

Surrender upon expiration of lease

Upon the expiration of the term or any renewal term hereof, or sooner termination of this lease, by the exercise of any option herein or otherwise, lessee agrees to surrender possession of the demised premises to lessor, peacefully and without notice, and in good order and condition, excepting fire, acts of God, and subject to ordinary wear and reasonable use thereof.

ARTICLE XV

Compensatory remuneration

In entering into this lease agreement it is recognized that lessor has removed itself from the hotel business to its detriment, and allowed lessee to make structural changes and alterations to the leased premises for its own use, which lessee shall have 6 months from the date of termination of the lease to restore said premises to its original condition. Therefore, in the event that this lease shall be terminated by the lessee, for any reason whatsoever, either at the end of the original term of 2 years thereof or within 90 days thereafter, lessee agrees, in order to compensate the lessor for the loss of its good will, patronage, continued uninterrupted business, and its inability to be ready for business within 6 months after termination of this lease, that it will pay the sum of \$70,000 as compensatory remuneration.

ARTICLE XVI

Quiet enjoyment

If lessee shall perform all and singular the covenants herein agreed to be performed by it, lessor, its successors and assigns, shall warrant and defend lessee in the enjoyment and peaceful possession of said premises during the term of this lease, or any renewal term or terms hereof.

It is understood, however, that the entire demised premises will be vacated within 1 week after the notice to lessor of the commencement date of this lease except for those tenants listed on exhibit A hereto. With respect to such tenants, lessor hereby covenants and agrees that they will vacate the demised premises not later than the termination dates set forth in said exhibit A.

In consideration of lessor's expense in causing said tenants to vacate the demised premises, lessor shall be entitled to retain the rentals paid by such tenants prior to the termination dates listed.

For any month or part thereof during which any such tenant remains in said premises beyond said termination date, lessor shall deduct from his monthly rental payments the amount stipulated as indicated on said exhibit A.

ARTICLE XVII

Notices

Every notice or communication authorized or required hereunder shall be deemed sufficiently served when given in writing and sent by registered mail, and directed, if to lessee, to Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., 12333 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles 64, Calif.; and if to lessor, to Hotel Kanawha Co., Post Office Box 88, Charleston 21, W. Va., or to such other addresses as either party may designate in writing by registered mail to the other. However, any and all notices or communications may be served in accordance with the statutes of the State of West Virginia relating to the service of process.

ARTICLE XVIII

Entire agreement

The entire agreement between the parties hereto is set forth in this instrument. The parties shall not be bound to any agreements, understandings, conditions or modifications except as expressly set forth and stipulated in this agreement or in a subsequent written agreement signed by the parties hereto.

Any amendment or rider attached hereto and duly executed by lessor and lessee shall be deemed incorporated herein and made a part hereof. In the event that any provision contained in said amendment or rider is inconsistent with the provisions of the within instrument, the provisions contained in said amendment or rider shall supersede said provisions of this instrument.

In witness whereof, Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, has caused its name to be signed hereunto by its proper officer, thereunto duly authorized, and Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation has caused its name to be signed hereunto by its proper officer, thereunto duly authorized, all as of the day and year first above written. Executed in triplicate.

HOTEL KANAWHA CO.,
By ANGUS E. PEYTON, President,
PACKARD-BELL ELECTRONICS CORP.,
By WENDELL B. SELL, President.

State of West Virginia, County of Kanawha, to wit:

I, Mary Bowling Frankfort, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, do certify that Angus E. Peyton, who signed the writing hereto annexed bearing date as of the 20th day of March 1965, for Hotel Kanawha Co., a West Virginia corporation, has this day, before me in my said county, acknowledged the said writing to be the act and deed of said corporation.

Given under my hand and seal this 20th day of March, 1965.

My commission expires the 24th day of May, 1972.

MARY BOWLING FRANKFORT,
Notary Public.

State of California, County of Los Angeles, to wit:

I, La Raine Collup, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, do certify that Wendell B. Sell, who signed the writing hereto annexed bearing date as of the 20th day of March, 1965, for Packard-Bell Electronics Corp., a California corporation, has this day, before me in my said county, acknowledged the said writing to be the act and deed of said corporation.

Given under my hand and seal this 29th day of March, 1965.

My commission expires the 25th day of June, 1968.

LA RAINÉ COLLUP,
Notary Public.

EXHIBIT A

Deduction

Tenant and termination date	Con. amount
Kanawha Valley Realty Co. (May 1, 1965)	\$500
Barber shop (May 1, 1965)	150
Capital Investigations (May 1, 1965)	100
Hayden, Stone, Inc. (May 1, 1965)	400
Morris Harvey College (May 31, 1965)	4,000
S. S. Boggess (May 1, 1965)	100
Franklin Finance Co. (May 1, 1965)	600
West Virginia Contractors (May 1, 1965)	250
Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric, Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, Division 1493 (May 1, 1965)	300
West Virginia Society of Professional Engineers (May 1, 1965)	200

EXHIBIT A—Continued

Deduction	
Tenant and termination date—Con. amount	
West Virginia Building & Loan Association (May 1, 1965)	\$350
Charleston Scientists' & Engineers' Society (May 1, 1965)	600
WCAW Radio Station (May 1, 1965)	500
Wagner Building (May 1, 1965)	800

HOUSE BILL NO. 499

An act to amend and reenact section 4, article 9(a) chapter 18 of the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, relating to computation of local share and appraisal and assessment of property.

Be it enacted by the Legislature of West Virginia: That section 4, article 9(a), chapter 18 of the Code of West Virginia, 1931, as amended, be amended and reenacted to read as follows:

ARTICLE (9). ALLOCATION OF STATE AID FOR SCHOOLS

Section 4. Computation of local share; appraisal and assessment of property.—On the basis of the most recent survey of property valuations in the State, completed as to all classes of property in all counties determined by the tax commissioner under present or former provisions of this article, the State board shall for each county compute by application of the levies for general current expense purposes, as defined in section 2 of this article, the amount of revenue which such levies would produce if levied upon 100 percent of the appraised value of each of the several classes of property contained in the report or revised report of such value, made to it by the tax commissioner as follows: (1) The State board shall first take 97½ percent of the amount ascertained by applying these rates to the total assessed public utility valuation in each classification of property in the county. (2) The State board shall then apply these rates to the appraised value of other property in each classification in the county as determined by the tax commissioner and shall deduct therefrom 5 percent as an allowance for the usual losses in collections due to discounts, exonerations, delinquencies and the like. Fifty percent of the amount so determined shall be added to the 97½ percent of public utility taxes computed as provided above and this total shall be the local share of the particular county.

The tax commissioner shall make or cause to be made an appraisal in the several counties of the State of all nonutility real property and of all nonutility personal property which shall be based upon true and actual value as set forth in article 3, chapter 11 of this code. In determining the value of personal property—other than all machinery, equipment, furniture and fixtures of any industrial plant, mine, quarry or installation and of any commercial, industrial, or professional establishment—the tax commissioner shall prescribe accepted methods of determining such values. The tax commissioner shall in accordance with such methods determine the value of such property.

For the purpose of appraising commercial, industrial, and professional properties the tax commissioner after consultation with the county court shall employ a competent property appraisal firm or firms which appraisals shall be under his supervision and direction.

In making or causing to be made such appraisal, the tax commissioner shall employ such assistants as available appropriations will permit and shall prescribe and use such accepted methods and procedures for checking property values and determining the amount of property in the several classes of property provided by law as are customarily employed for appraisal purposes.

Such appraisal of all said property in the several counties shall be completed prior to

the first day of July, 1936. Each year after the completion of the property appraisal in a county the tax commissioner shall maintain the appraisal by making or causing to be made such surveys, examinations, audits, maps and investigations of the value of the several classes of property in each county which should be listed and taxed under the several classifications, and shall determine the appraised value thereof. On the basis of information so ascertained, the tax commissioner shall annually revise his reports to the legislature and to the State board concerning such appraisals, such reports to be made not later than the first day of January of each year.

As information from such appraisal of property in a county under the provisions of this section becomes available for a district, municipality and county, the tax commissioner shall notify the county court and the assessor of said county that such information is available and shall make available to said county court and assessor all data records, and reports or other information relating to said work, along with a list of any properties in said district, municipality, and county which are entered on the assessment rolls but for which no appraisal has been made, a list of any properties which were appraised but which cannot be found on the assessment rolls and a list of all properties carried on the assessment rolls which have not been identified on the maps. Said lists shall set forth the name of the owner and a description of the property and the reason, if known, for its failure to have been entered on the assessment rolls or to have been appraised or to have been identified on the map, as the case may be.

As such appraisal of property in a county, under this section, is completed to the extent that a total valuation for each class of property can be determined, such appraisal shall be delivered to the assessor and the county court, and in each assessment year commencing after such appraisal is so delivered and received, the county assessor and the county court, sitting as a board of equalization and review, shall use such appraised valuations as a basis for determining the true and actual value for assessment purposes of the several classes of property. The total assessed valuation in each of the four classes of property shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property: *Provided*, That, (1) until the completion of the appraisal herein provided for in all 55 counties of the State; and (2) upon completion of the appraisal of any county and delivery of the appraised valuations to the county by the tax commissioner; and (3) when it shall appear that the total assessed valuations of any class of property in such county are less than 50 percent of the total appraised valuations of such class of property; then in such events the tax commissioner may authorize a total assessed valuation in each such class of less than 50 percent of the total appraised valuation of such class of property; except that such authorized total assessed valuation shall be increased each year thereafter, as nearly as practicable in equal steps, so that in the third assessment year after the delivery of the appraised valuations in each class of property, as required above, the total assessed valuation of each class of property shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each class of property as delivered by the tax commissioner: *Provided further*, That, upon the tax commissioner's delivery of the appraised valuation to a county, such appraised valuations shall serve as the basis for the spot check appraisal in said county until all of the 55 counties of the State have been reappraised.

The determination of appraised values in those counties where the full appraisal has

not been completed as defined above and delivered to the assessor and the county court prior to the first day of the assessment year shall be continued by the tax commissioner on the annual spot survey basis. Beginning with the fiscal year 1960 and for each year thereafter until the full survey is so completed and delivered in a county, the assessed value in each of the four classes of property in such county shall be not less than 50 percent nor more than 100 percent of the appraised valuation of each said class of property as determined by the last previous statewide report of the tax commissioner: *Provided, however*, That in those counties where the full appraisal has not been completed and delivered, as aforesaid, to the county assessor and the county court prior to the first day of the assessment year, the requirements of this paragraph shall be satisfied if:

(1) The total tax yield from the four classes of property based upon the allowable school levy rates defined in section two of this article equals or exceeds the amount required to meet the local share as provided in this section; or

(2) For the assessment year 1961, the assessor has increased the total valuations of property in an amount not less than 33½ percent of the difference between the total assessed valuations for the assessment year 1960 and the valuations required by this section; or

(3) For the assessment year 1962, the assessor has increased the total valuations of property in an amount not less than 50 percent of the difference between the total assessed valuations of property for the assessment year 1961 and the total valuations for such class required by this section; or

(4) For the assessment year 1963, the assessor has increased the total valuation of property so that the same meet the requirements of this section.

Whenever in any year a county assessor and/or county court shall fail or refuse to comply with the provisions of this section in setting the valuations of property for assessment purposes in any class or classes of property in the county, the State tax commissioner shall review the valuations for assessment purposes made by the county assessor and the county court and shall direct the county assessor and county court to make such corrections in the valuations as may be necessary so that they shall comply with the requirements of chapter 11 and of this section and the tax commissioner shall enter the county and fix the assessments at the required ratios. Refusal of the assessor and/or county court to make such corrections shall constitute grounds for removal from office.

In any year in which the total assessed valuation of a county shall fail to meet the minimum requirements above set forth, the county court of such county shall allocate for such year to the county board of education from the tax levies allowed to the county court a sufficient portion of its levies as will, when applied to the valuations for assessment purposes of such property in the county, provide a sum of money equal to the differences between the amount of revenue which will be produced by application of the allowable school levy rates defined in section two of this article upon the valuations for assessment purposes of such property and the amount of revenue which would be yielded by the application of such levies to 50 percent of the total of appraised valuations of such property. In the event the county court shall fail or refuse to make the reallocation of levies as provided for herein, the county board of education, the tax commissioner, the State board of school finance, or any other interested party, shall have the right to enforce the same by writ of mandamus in any court of competent jurisdiction.

In conjunction with and as a result of the appraisal herein set forth the tax commissioner shall have the power and it shall be his duty, to establish a permanent records system for each county in the State, consisting of:

1. Tax maps of the entire county drawn to scale or aerial maps, which maps shall indicate all property and lot lines, set forth dimensions or areas, indicate whether the land is improved, and identify the respective parcels or lots by a system of numbers, or symbols and numbers, whereby the ownership of such parcels and lots can be ascertained by reference to the property record cards and property owner's index;

2. Property record cards arranged geographically according to the location of property on the tax maps, which cards shall set forth the location and description thereof, the acreage or dimensions, description of improvements, if any, the owner's name, address and date of acquisition, the purchase price, if any, set forth in the deed of acquisition, the amount of tax stamps, if any, on the deed, the assessed valuation, and the identifying number or symbol and number, shown on the tax map;

3. Property owner's index consisting of an alphabetical listing of all property owners, setting forth brief descriptions of each parcel or lot owned, and cross indexed with the property record cards and the tax map.

The tax commissioner is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into such contracts as may be necessary, and for which funds may be available, to establish the permanent records system herein provided for, or may through his staff and employees, prepare and complete such system.

All microfilm, photography, and original copies of tax maps created under the provisions of this section are the property of the State of West Virginia and the reproduction, copying, distribution or sale of such microfilm, photography, or tax maps or any copies thereof without the written permission of the State tax commissioner is prohibited. Any person who shall violate the provisions of this paragraph shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not less than \$50 nor more than \$300 or imprisoned for not less than 30 days nor more than 1 year, or both in the discretion of the court. Justices of the peace shall have concurrent jurisdiction with other courts having jurisdiction for the trial of all misdemeanors arising under this paragraph.

The tax commissioner shall by uniform regulations establish a procedure for the sale of reproduction of microfilm, photography and maps and may pay for having such reproductions made from the appropriation for "Property appraisal." Any funds received as a result of the sale of such reproductions shall be deposited to the appropriated account from which the payment for reproductions is made.

The cost of conducting the appraisal herein provided for shall be borne jointly by the State and the several counties in the following manner and terms: There shall be appropriated from the general revenue fund not less than \$1,500,000 for each fiscal year until sufficient funds have been appropriated to complete the appraisal in all counties of the State. Each county shall furnish, through its county court, not more than 10 percent of the cost of such appraisal or reappraisal and permanent records system for such county. Such county costs may be paid over a period of 3 years with the approval of the tax commissioner. In those instances where the cost of the appraisal, reappraisals or permanent records system required by this section has been paid by the tax commissioner from funds appropriated for these purposes, the share of such cost allocated to each county shall, upon receipt thereof by the tax commissioner, be deposited to the appropriated account from which such payments have been made. If a county has employed

a professional appraisal firm to conduct an appraisal or reappraisal of all or a part of nonutility property within the past 5 years, and such appraisal, or any other appraisal or reappraisal has been or shall have been accepted by the tax commissioner, credit shall be allowed to such county for its portion of the statewide appraisal costs and any contract with appraisal firm or firms shall not be made for appraisal or reappraisal of such property except and unless requested by such county, or shown to be necessary by the tax commissioner: *Provided*, That until the completion of the appraisal herein provided for in all of the 55 counties of the State, the local share for each county shall be determined on the basis of the annual spot survey of property valuations by the tax commissioner in this State, as heretofore provided, but in no way shall this be interpreted as affecting the assessment provisions set forth above; however, in any county having accepted and used appraised valuations developed by an appraisal made by the tax commissioner or accepted by him as a basis in determining the true and actual valuation for assessment purposes, the county board of education may annually request that the local share shall be that which was in effect under the last applicable spot survey preceding such acceptance and usage and until the full reappraisal has been completed in all counties the board of school finance shall comply with such request: *Provided, further*, That the sample pieces of property employed in making the annual spot survey shall be used by the tax commissioner for this purpose only and shall be open to none other than the legislature by its request through a resolution approved by both the senate and the house of delegates and as otherwise provided in this section; however, if on the basis of the current statewide report of the tax commissioner available the first day of January of each year, it appears that any county shall not have complied with the requirements regarding the ratio of assessed valuations, the tax commissioner shall notify the assessor and the county court of each such county and, if they file a request for review of the appraisals which they believe to be in error, he shall review the appraisal of such properties and shall correct such errors as he may discover in such individual appraisal and/or in the preparation or recording of the report by the tax commissioner. The corrected figures shall be reported to the board of school finance prior to the first day of June and shall be used in determining the allocations of State aid to the county boards of education for the subsequent fiscal year.

The county assessor and the county court shall comply with the provisions of chapter 11 of this code in determining the true and actual value of property for assessment purposes and shall not arbitrarily use a direct percentage application to the appraisal valuations (whether complete appraisal or spot survey) of any class of property or property within a class for such purpose.

The provisions of this section shall not be construed to alter or repeal in any manner the provisions of chapter 11 of this code, but shall be construed in pari materia therewith, and compliance with this section by the assessor and county court shall be considered, pro tanto, as compliance with said chapter 11.

INSURANCE COVERAGE

I

Purpose: Building and contents.
Insurer: Firemen's Fund.
Policy No. AW-1-12-92-84.
Premium: \$15,318 covering period March 31, 1965 to March 31, 1968.

II

Purpose: Covers difference between replacement and depreciation of contents.

Insurer: Lloyd's of London.
Policy No. LC 103789.
Premium: \$1,275 from April 6, 1965 to April 6, 1968.

III

Purpose: Boilers and machinery.
Insurer: Pacific Indemnity.
Policy No. M48751.
Premium: \$209 from April 1, 1965 to June 6, 1966.
Face value: Maximum liability of \$500 per accident.

IV

Purpose: Malpractice for nursing program.
Insurer: Unknown.
Policy No.: Unknown.
Premium: \$2,700 per year.

V

Purpose: Fidelity policy for blanket coverage of all P.B. employees.
Insurer: Unknown.
Policy No.: Unknown.
Premium: Policy is paid through January 1, 1968. No allocation to Charleston operation at this time.

VI

Purpose: Comprehensive general liability.
Insurer: Harbour Insurance.
Policy No. 100445.
Face value: \$2 million.
Premium: \$218.40 for period June 9, 1965, to October 1, 1965—\$700 annual premium for Charleston operation beginning October 1, 1965.

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

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, it would appear clearly from the facts that the Kenawha Hotel Corp., whose president is a prominent Democrat in the State administration, gets a guaranteed annual profit of \$94,800 on an investment of \$250,000. That is poverty profits of 38 percent per year.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he notified the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] that he was going to take the floor today?

Mr. QUIE. I notified the gentleman from Florida to the effect that I was going to bring the Charleston, W. Va., story up again, and that I would be mentioning his name. We talked about it.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate that information.

Mr. QUIE. I mention him because the gentleman from Florida brought it up on the floor in a 1-minute speech after this came up in the committee on March 23.

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

PEACEFUL WORLD ORDER THROUGH UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish community of Greater Cleveland began a 10-day vigil last Sunday—on the eve of Passover—to preserve the human rights of some 3 million Jews living in the Soviet Union. This vigil began with a 1½-mile march from the intersection of Superior and South Taylor Roads to the Jewish Community Center on Mayfield Road where a replica of the Eternal Light in Washington was rekindled. A public rally at the Community Center, attended by Christian clergy and laity, emphasized the themes of "Matzoh of Repression" in Soviet Russia where Jews are being denied matzoh for their Seder tables and the "Empty Chair of Russian Jewry"—as a symbolic reminder of "the millions of fellow Jews in the Soviet Union who are absent tonight from the Seder: absent not of their own volition but because of the tyranny under which they live."

The Passover which began at sundown last night commemorates the delivery of the Jews from ancient Egyptian slavery. Matzoh is the symbolic bread of affliction. It is served at the Seder table with the admonition—Let all who are hungry enter and eat. The youngest of the family is privileged to ask four questions at the Seder table. Those questions serve to remind all those present of the plight of the Jews in ancient times and the manner of their deliverance from the bonds of slavery.

During this Passover the members of the Jewish community in Greater Cleveland might well be asking these questions.

First. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be permitted to freely practice their ancient faith?

Second. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be allowed to have their prayer books in Hebrew?

Third. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be allowed to maintain a rabbinical seminary for the preparation of those holy men who preserve the faith from generation to generation?

Fourth. When will the Jews of the Soviet Union be permitted to enjoy their cultural heritage and to share it freely with their children?

Questions in this same vein might well be raised by Christians as we enter Holy Week and look forward to the Feast of the Resurrection. For the day-to-day lot of the practicing Christian in the Soviet Union is no less severe than that of the practicing Jews. Like the Jews, the Christians are denied the right to freely practice their ancient faith, seminaries are closed and the remaining Christian clergy are victims of systematic persecution, Christian baptisms are performed in secret to avoid harassment by the government, the teaching of religion is officially prohibited and parents pass on the faith to their children at great risk of exposure and punishment by the state.

The same conditions apply to all religious faiths within the Soviet Union. It is the official policy of the Soviet Government to encourage and support financially antireligious programs calculated to promote atheism.

As is well known, the Soviet Union is a multicultural state just as it is a multi-national state. Propaganda emanating from Moscow claims that there is complete cultural freedom in the Soviet Union. But the record of practice tells us otherwise.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have been more than candid in their boasts that they are in the process of developing a Soviet man. An examination of the doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* will reveal clearly the intent of Soviet official policy toward the peoples under its control. Under that doctrine the Soviet man will be "devoid of all attachment to religious beliefs, devoid of all attachment to longstanding cultural heritages, devoid of all attachment to long standing traditions and customs, devoid of a sense of national origin and the historical aspirations associated with that origin." Such a man will, in the meaning of that doctrine, lack all the human feelings held dear within the multicultural, multinational population of the Soviet Union. The developers of this new type man intend that he be denied the civilizing influence of 2,000 years of Judeo-Christian values and be reduced to the unchecked will of the masters in the Kremlin.

When the intent of this doctrine is examined in the context of the writings of Raphael Lemkin, no other opinion can be reached but that the doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* is a blueprint for the crime of genocide. Lemkin spent most of his useful life in the study of techniques used by governments and states to exterminate whole groups of people and nations. He created the term *genocide* and developed the legal theories through which he appealed for international action to control and punish those who perpetrated such crimes against humanity.

The term "genocide" is a combination of the Greek word "genos," meaning race, nation, or tribe, and the Latin suffix "cide," meaning killing. In our lifetime we have seen this crime practiced through mass murder and deportation—crimes against humanity practiced by both Hitler and Stalin. But the same evil ends—the killing off of a race, nation, or tribe—can be accomplished by more sophisticated but equally final methods. For example, the killing of religious beliefs, cultural heritages, and national aspirations by official governmental denial of basic human rights. That is precisely what the doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* is attempting to do.

When any state or nation sets upon a course of genocide as a matter of policy to attain its objectives, a dangerous threat to world peace exists. That threat was created by the Nazi regime prior to World War II and was a major factor plunging the entire world into the most devastating conflict in history.

Mankind must face up to this new threat against the establishment of a peaceful world order. The doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* practiced upon the diversified peoples and nations of the Soviet Union carries with it the seeds of

violence and war. The spread of that doctrine to other lands beyond the Soviet Union has already begun and unless it is checked it will plunge the world into a holocaust.

There is no established law of nations which controls in these crimes. Nor is there an international tribunal before which the human rights of its victims may be defended.

The United Nations was confronted with the issue of genocide as far back as 1946, in its embryo stages and when the hopes for a peaceful world order were at high tide. Over the years the broad issues of human rights within the Soviet Union have come before various organs of the United Nations. Beyond the importance of making a public record of charge and countercharge, little was accomplished in terms of remedy or positive results.

In these circumstances I believe it is both proper and urgent that the House of Representatives take the initiative to establish a means through which the doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* may be put under a global spotlight and examined as a threat to world peace. I have, therefore, introduced today House Resolution 813 calling for the establishment of a House Select Committee on Human Rights and Peaceful World Order.

What can the proposed select committee do to meet this urgent problem?

It can get all the facts from competent witnesses and much documentary evidence can be produced by scholars and students of the problem. Those facts have not been gathered and made available to the American people.

It can seek the advice of experts on the threat thereby presented to world peace and obtain advice from other experts on what steps can be taken to remove the blocks thus presented to a peaceful world order. There is expert opinion available on these issues and it should be sought out and presented to the public.

It can examine the evidence and opinion gathered and formulate positive and practical recommendations for the consideration of our Government.

It can provide the kind of public forum these vital issues deserve.

It can develop public opinion on an international scale which even the most hardened leader in the Kremlin cannot afford to dismiss.

A scholar of Jewish affairs recently asked, "Are the Russian Jews to become a lost tribe of Israel?" It is the opinion of that same scholar that by the year 2000, 34 years from now, it is within reason to assume that there will not be a practicing Jew left in the Soviet Union. If this happens the doctrine of *Homo Sovieticus* will have been proven beyond question as a blueprint for genocide.

We have gone to the rescue of victims of earthquakes and other natural calamities in distant lands. We did so without expectation of reward. We did so because it was right. The salvation of the Jews in the Soviet Union may well rest with the American people. We should now move to marshal world public opinion behind their fight for survival. It is the right thing to do.

Following this course we shall be marshaling world public opinion behind the struggles of the many different peoples in the respective Soviet Republics who also fight for survival as national and cultural entities. By so doing we act to further the cause of a peaceful world order of a determined effort to stamp out the most virulent seeds of world conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks at this point, House Resolution 813, which I introduced today:

H. RES. 813

Resolution creating a select committee on basic human rights and peaceful world order, and for other purposes

Whereas the Government of the United States has consistently advocated the cause of basic human rights and freedom as a key to world peace; and

Whereas the official and organized denial of basic human rights and freedom by any government to large segments of the population under its control creates dangerous international tensions which prevent the development of a peaceful world order; and

Whereas there is mounting evidence that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has officially authorized and is now carrying out an intensified and systematic plan to eradicate all Jewish religious and cultural life within its borders; and

Whereas there is accumulated evidence that the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a matter of official policy is engaged in a systematic effort to eradicate all organized religions based upon belief in a supreme being, to eliminate all non-Soviet cultural and ethnic values and traditions, and to suppress the natural development of the many nations federated by force to the Russian Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the official policies and practices of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics with respect to religious liberty, cultural freedom, ethnic traditions, national aspirations within the respective Soviet Republics and the relationship of such policies and practices to the development of a peaceful world order.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpens may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigations and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, during the course of the House session, it will be my purpose to seek recognition to call up by unanimous consent H.R. 14224, a bill to amend part B of title 18 of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged.

The Committee on Ways and Means in executive session reported the bill this morning unanimously, after having adopted an amendment making two changes in the text of the bill.

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

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the language of the amendment making the changes could be put in the RECORD for this evening so that the membership will have notice of the language involved in the amendment, or really of the bill reported by the committee today?

Mr. MILLS. I would think it will be better to include the bill and the amendment approved by the committee. If there is no objection, Mr. Speaker, I do ask unanimous consent to so include the bill and the amendment at this point.

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

There was no objection.

H.R. 14224

A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 1837(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by (1) striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966"; and (2) striking out "March 31, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 31, 1966".

SEC. 2. Section 1837(d) of such Act is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 1, 1966".

SEC. 3. Section 102(b) of the Social Security Amendments of 1965 is amended by striking out "April 1, 1966" each time it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1966".

SEC. 4. In the case of an individual who first satisfies paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1836 of the Social Security Act in March 1966, and who enrolls pursuant to subsection (d) of section 1837 of such Act in May 1966, his coverage period shall, notwithstanding section 1838(a) (2) (D) of such Act, begin on July 1, 1966.

SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (b) of section 1843 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the semicolon at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period, and by striking out all that follows

and inserting in lieu thereof (after and below paragraph (2)) the following new sentence:

"Except as provided in subsection (g), there shall be excluded from any coverage group any individual who is entitled to monthly insurance benefits under title II or who is entitled to receive an annuity or pension under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937."

(b) Section 1843 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) The Secretary shall, at the request of a State made before January 1, 1968, enter into a modification of an agreement entered into with such State pursuant to subsection (a) under which the second sentence of subsection (b) shall not apply with respect to such agreement.

"(2) In the case of any individual who would (but for this subsection) be excluded from the applicable coverage group described in subsection (b) by the second sentence of such subsection—

"(A) subsections (c) and (d) (2) shall be applied as if such subsections referred to the modification under this subsection (in lieu of the agreement under subsection (a)).

"(B) subsection (d) (3) (B) shall not apply so long as there is in effect a modification entered into by the State under this subsection, and

"(C) notwithstanding subsection (e), in the case of any termination described in such subsection, such individual may terminate his enrollment under this part by the filing of a notice, before the close of the third month which begins after the date of such termination, that he no longer wishes to participate in the insurance program established by this part (and in such a case, the termination of his coverage period under this part shall take effect as of the close of such third month)."

(c) Section 1840 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) In the case of an individual who is enrolled under the program established by this part as member of coverage group to which an agreement with a State entered into pursuant to section 1843 is applicable, subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of this section shall not apply to his monthly premium for any month in his coverage period which is determined under section 1843(d)."

CRIME—A NO-WIN POLICY SEEN BY DON MACLEAN

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, having twice been the victim of personal assaults since coming to Washington, I was very much struck by a story told by Don Maclean in his column in last Friday's Washington News. It reports an attack by juveniles on the mother of an aid to one of our colleagues. No names are mentioned in the article but the story Mr. Maclean relays, if accurate, indeed spells out a no-win policy towards crime. I urge my colleagues to give their most thoughtful attention to this account of how a vicious assault could take place with the guilty parties going scot free and unpunished.

The story follows:

The other day I took testimony from a Congressman's aid, whose story, I think, has a message. (His name is available to any legitimate agency wishing to do further research on this subject.) His mother-in-law, who survived the bombings of Warsaw, Poland, without a scratch, was viciously beaten and robbed by three youngsters in daylight on a Washington corner. Fortunately, a passing motorist, who turned out to be a karate instructor at the YMCA, jumped from his car and sat forcefully upon one hooligan while the victim limped off to call police. Her son-in-law, the congressional aid, arrived at the precinct station as police brought in the other two purse snatchers. (The first one finked out.)

"A juvenile 'case worker,' or some such title, gave the little rats a stern lecture," the Congressman's assistant said. "He was a wonder. He understood child psychology, environmental problems, toilet training, etc. When the kids' parents showed up, he lectured them, too. After that, he said the kids were to be released.

"Well, I screamed. He said they were only juveniles, after all. And that the training schools are jammed. 'Be reasonable,' he said, 'we've scared them, they've apologized to the old lady, what more do you want?' In desperation, I said, 'Forgetting her doctor bills, how about the kids or their parents giving her back the \$27 they stole?' The kids said they lost it, the parents said they didn't steal it, why should they pay it back? Everyone looked at me like I was some sort of monster. I gave up and left. I'm afraid we're pursuing a no-win policy in the so-called war on crime."

POLISH REPUBLIC-IN-EXILE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Government-in-exile in London persistently carried out its moral responsibility to speak on behalf of the oppressed people of Poland. At this time the task is as important as in any period since the close of World War II because the Communist government of Poland is retrogressing into a completely Stalinistic state.

On April 2, in London, the President of the Polish Republic-in-exile, His Excellency August Zaleski, addressed the latest session of the Council of the Republic of Poland which functions as a parliamentary body in exile. His remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT AUGUST ZALESKI OF THE POLISH REPUBLIC-IN-EXILE

News received from Poland indicates that the situation there has worsened in many respects since I last had the honor of addressing this Council.

In the economic field, the imbalance between supply and demand still persists as is usual with countries under a Communist system and with a bureaucratic economy. In Poland, this state of affairs is now aggravated by a natural increase of population for which the feebly developing industry cannot provide employment. But the economic state of the country suffers far more because Poland,

as a member of Comecon, is bound with Russia—actually the autocrat of this allegedly voluntary union of so-called fraternal nations and who ruthlessly exploits her position as the principal supplier of raw materials and the chief recipient of the commodities produced by the countries she has subjected. The very low standard of life in Poland caused by this situation has dual repercussions: on the one hand, it evoked the serious dissatisfaction of the population and, on the other hand, forces a great many people to seek means of existence for themselves and their families by various illegal methods of acquiring essential sources of income.

Unable to cope with this situation, the Communist regime feels bound to restrict freedom of speech in ever greater measure by tightening the censorship and punishing not only those who strive to earn some money illegally but even those who protest against the system current in Poland.

This system was imposed upon Poland by Russia, and all that the Communist regime in Poland does is either on the orders of Russia or at least tolerated by her. Thus, an examination of Russian relations can clarify much for us.

It seems undoubted that the attitude of the Warsaw regime toward the church, so incomprehensible for many, is modeled on Soviet relations. In Russia, the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church has been mastered by the Soviet Government. The present-day Russian patriarch is just as much a faithful servant of the godless Soviet Government as the procurator general of the holy synod was in czarist times, creating the impression abroad of the existence of religious freedom in Russia. This would seem to be the ideal the Communist regime in Poland is striving to reach. It is my firm conviction that these efforts will be in vain if only because they are incompatible with the character of the Catholic Church and of the Polish nation. Nonetheless, the struggle against them will be a desperate one, and bringing it to the notice of the Western World is one of our principal tasks. The struggle must be undertaken, particularly during this year of Poland's Christian millennium as it is probable that, with the morale of the whole nation raised by this great anniversary, the Communist regime has decided to step up its antireligious activity wishing to do all in its power to obstruct the huge celebration of Poland's Christian millennium planned for May this year, when even His Holiness the Pope was expected to honor Poland by his presence at the Polish shrine of Jasna Góra in Czestochowa. At present the Communist regime in Warsaw has informed the Vatican that a visit by Pope Paul VI to Poland would be inopportune, and the official announcement a few days ago of new difficulties in obtaining visas for foreign visitors to Poland leaves no doubt that they are meant to prevent the participation in the May millennium celebrations of foreign bishops invited by the Polish Episcopate.

Finally, the vast complications which now mark international relations likewise merit our close attention. Chief amongst the root-causes of these complications is the fact that up till now no peace treaty has been signed. This is due mostly to the attitude of Russia, who wanted to exploit the state of "neither peace nor war" for her imperialistic ends. In this she has been largely successful. It afforded her the possibility of establishing Communist regimes in a large part of Europe. Now she has managed to instill within many circles on both hemispheres the hope that her intentions are pacific.

The Federal German Republic could improve this situation by recognizing the Oder-Neisse frontier line. But the Bonn government refrains from doing it in the hope that with time perhaps it will succeed in obtaining a change of this frontier, although such

a policy tends to prolong the division of Germany.

All this inhibits efforts for European unity not only in Europe but also in some American circles where the conviction is arising that the danger of an armed Communist China is a factor common to the interests of the United States and of Russia, although the last American investigations prove that the rearmament of China is a matter requiring a long time to accomplish.

All these circumstances call for great vigilance and intensive effort on our part. It is still my hope that the Poles in exile will realize this and successfully unite in order to cope with the very arduous task which faces them.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that one of the tragic developments in postwar Europe following the infamous Yalta agreement has been the persistence of the State Department in subsidizing the Communist governments of Eastern Europe. We recognize that the dangers to our freedom remain great as long as the Communists maintain control of previously free people in any part of the world. Therefore, we should note the words of wisdom and strength of the President of the Polish Government-in-exile and hope that U.S. foreign policy might be properly redirected to effectively achieving a world of complete freedom and peace.

RHODESIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I venture to bring up again the subject of Rhodesia now that the British elections are over. Already it is possible to note the accelerated hue and cry calling for the downfall of Ian Smith's government as a result of Prime Minister Wilson's so-called mandate.

The word, "mandate," is becoming a much-abused word and has, apparently, taken on a new meaning. It once meant, in politics, that an overwhelming majority of the people supported, through their vote, a particular man and his philosophy. It is impossible for me to read a "mandate" into Wilson's skin-of-the-teeth vote. His vote was a scant 48 percent, which, by anybody's figuring, is less than a majority and certainly less than a mandate.

In the 5 months since Ian Smith signed Rhodesia's Declaration of Independence from Great Britain, this small nation has managed to keep its governmental head above water despite the vindictive treatment heaped upon it, principally by Great Britain and the United States.

Three generations ago, a group of resourceful white men went into the jungle of what is now Rhodesia and carved a civilized land by the sheer force of their brains and management ability. The lesson of history was crystal clear then as it is now: The natives were not capable of producing any semblance of what we call civilization. Now that the white man has lead them out of savagery, the Socialist, leftwing camp is up in arms to turn the country back to them. This is, of course, a not too subtle way of

building a Socialist bridge from democracy to communism.

These advocates, who play so lightly with the truth, try to create the impression that, in Rhodesia, a handful of white men are holding the natives in bondage and worse, after having forcefully taken their land from them. Nothing could be further from the truth. Let us look at a few of the facts, as opposed to the big lie.

The impression is created that only the white man can vote; that a small white dynasty controls the nation. The fact is that all Rhodesians, black and white, are subject to exactly the same voting requirements. What could possibly be more democratic? There is even a provision made for those, black and white, who fail to meet the minimum standards. They are allowed to vote on the so-called B list which elects almost 25 percent of the governing legislature. These are the facts; not the fiction of the Socialists.

This same group would have us believe that the natives are segregated, down-trodden and living in fear of a white-supremacy police. Again, let us look at the facts, rather than the big lie.

The facts are that segregation is unknown in Rhodesia. It is forbidden by law. Public facilities, hotels, bars, buses and the like are open to one race as well as another. And as for the white-supremacy police force, this fiction is dispelled by the truth itself: Both the police force and the army are almost entirely black.

If the situation in Rhodesia were what the Socialist left would have us believe, it would be true that the natives were suppressed in their educational opportunities. The truth of the matter is that Rhodesia has a much higher proportion of African children in school than any other nation except South Africa.

In spite of all this, the leftwing wolf-pack of the world continues to bay for blood; even to armed intervention to overthrow Ian Smith and hand the nation over to the Africans. If they are successful, the day will not be far off when, as they were before, the natives will revert to living in the jungles. It is the height of folly and treachery to snatch success from the Smith government on the vague theory that any head, no matter how empty, must have an equal count in the management of the nation.

The U.S. policy is apparently being shaped by U.N. Ambassador Goldberg; working, sometimes openly, sometimes under cover, to undermine Smith and bring about a black revolution. This policy is urged on us by the same extremists who brought about the rout of anti-Communist, pro-American Moise Tshombe. They are the same, violently vocal group, that instigates protests and demonstrations about our so-called meddling in Vietnam. Our anti-Communist effort in Vietnam is called meddling, but they have no difficulty facing the opposite direction and calling for our intervention in a successful pro-American government in Rhodesia to overthrow it in favor of some Socialist regime that will, at least cooperate, if

not submit to the left. This about-face is completely inconsistent, but, then, consistency is never a hobgoblin to their minds.

In recent months, government after government among the emerging nations has fallen, risen, and fallen again. Military dictatorships flourish. Free speech and all forms of personal liberty have been suspended in any number of countries. Yet in no other instance has there been a word of protest from this Government. Only in the case of Rhodesia has the United States seen fit to meddle in the internal affairs of a government. Naturally, the question must be asked, why?

One principal difference separates Rhodesia from these other nations and that is that the Ian Smith government is predominantly white. There can be no denying that the U.S. policy is based, in the main, on racism in reverse and a determination that, no matter what he wants, the Negro shall have it. The fact is that Rhodesia has become the cornerstone of this nation's tenuous foothold in the entire Afro-Asian world. If we are successful in our treacherous subversion of Rhodesia, there is no possibility that Portuguese Africa and South Africa can stand. When they, too, collapse, we will have no friend on the continent.

The question must also be asked as to why we are so willing to support Great Britain in imposing every sort of economic and political sanction against Rhodesia. The answer lies again imbedded in the Socialist philosophy and in racism in reverse.

During the months we have sided with Great Britain in imposing these sanctions against Ian Smith, the British Government has refused to apply sanctions against Communist Cuba. Ship after ship flying the British flag has put into North Vietnamese ports unloading supplies for the Communist Vietcong, supplies which fortify the soldiers who are, daily, slaughtering American servicemen in South Vietnam.

Beleaguered though his government is, Ian Smith has offered the United States troops he can ill afford to spare us, to aid us in Vietnam. Who, then, is our true friend? Great Britain who supplies the Communist enemy or Rhodesia who offers us troops to fight the Vietcong?

The answer is obvious. But the Rhodesian Government has committed the mortal sin of being white and this Government cannot forgive them. We clamor for one man, one vote and threaten to topple their Government if they do not adopt this foolish ideology immediately no matter what the cost.

Again, one can only wonder where our dedication to this principle was when Cuba was taken over by the Communists and elections forbidden. Or when Hungary was overrun by Russia. Or in any other nation where voting is an abstraction, whether one man, one vote or no vote for anyone.

The United States began just as Rhodesia is beginning, by declaring its independence from Great Britain. It would be impossible to draw a parallel any closer to the founding of this land. Yet,

instead of helping Rhodesia or, at the very least, leaving her alone, we have adopted the reprehensible policy of seeking its overthrow.

Our actions in Rhodesia make a mockery of freedom and democracy.

Rhodesia is at its Valley Forge. It ill behoves this Nation to play the part of the Hessian by attacking the most promising nation to emerge from the Dark Continent.

THE AMERICAN FLAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS], is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have been shocked in the past several days to learn of two incidents in which the American flag has been deliberately and publicly insulted and desecrated right here in our own country.

Many have also been surprised to learn that at the present time there is no law to deal with this crime. Perhaps this is because until recently it was not seriously considered that Americans would enter into this kind of activity.

Perhaps the average citizen, who still gets a lump in his throat when the flag goes by, never believed that it would be necessary for laws to protect the very symbol of our liberty. Yet this time has come.

We have become accustomed, unfortunately, to seeing Communist-led agitators carry on with demonstrations and riots in other countries, especially in the less developed areas of the world where it can be expected that the irresponsible, self-seeking Communists can hope to make headway in stirring up hatreds against this country. It is only barely newsworthy these days when another American Embassy overseas is stormed and the American flag is desecrated as a symbol of injustice.

But now that the unlikely has happened, and the American flag is being defiled within our borders as well as abroad, it is time that we take action to penalize this gross disrespect for decency and sense.

I am introducing a bill today that would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the American flag. The proposed law would carry a prison term and a fine for such an act.

The most recent incident of this kind which has been reported in the newspapers took place on March 31 at Cordele, Ga. What the Associated Press called a wild demonstration by a so-called civil rights group was staged on the courthouse lawn in that community. Apparently, the law-enforcement people were not able to halt the demonstration or to maintain order. They allowed the demonstrators complete freedom to register their feelings.

But then some of the demonstrators threw all sense of responsibility to the winds and tore down an American flag and a Georgia flag from the flagpole. They pulled at the American flag until holes were torn in it. If this is the civil

rights movement, then a lot of do-gooders had better take a second look.

The other recent incident took place during the third week in March at a meeting of the Students for a Democratic Society at Purdue University in Indiana.

The meeting was held to protest the U.S. effort against communism in Vietnam. The people attending evidently have a very poor regard for this country in its efforts to protect innocent people against the military aggression and terrorism of despots.

To illustrate his point a participant at the meeting stood on the stage and methodically spat upon the American flag, first twice from one side, then twice from the other. He then tore the flag apart, threw it to the floor, and stepped on it.

At the conclusion of his performance many persons from the audience came to the stage and milled about, stepping on the remnants of the flag.

Mr. Speaker, we are making an extremely serious mistake if we go much further in the belief that the unrest in our land today is entirely spontaneous and idealistic. We are being foolish and naive if we underestimate the element of Communist involvement in these incidents of agitation and strife.

Last year at about this time an official of Howard University wisely said that some demonstrations are being led by people who are not interested in the civil rights of anybody.

It might be said of the Purdue University incident that the American flag was desecrated by a person who was motivated not by any kind of justice for anyone, but rather by a wish to arouse emotional hatred against the very idea of an orderly society.

This seems true because at that Purdue University meeting the object was to recruit students to march in a "peace" demonstration in Chicago. And the slogans the students were advised to use included some favoring U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, refusal to pay taxes, protests against any kind of nationalism, some against monogamy, in favor of free love, and in favor of something called antistatism.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing in this country today a serious problem in the form of a tiny minority of subversives who are using great skill in techniques of agitation to influence events to an extent far beyond what most of us might think would be likely or possible.

We are either unwilling or unable to come to grips with this problem. We are turning our eyes from it, and are not prepared, evidently, to grasp the potential seriousness of it, just as in other countries the people turned their eyes until it was too late.

A law to assess penalties to individuals who desecrate the American flag will not solve the basic problem by itself. However, such a law at least will show where we stand on this question of respect for our flag.

It might also help to identify some of the hard core agitators who are devoting themselves wholeheartedly to the effort of breaking up U.S. communities and the Nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, the frustrating point is that the very freedom which makes it possible for these perpetrators of treasonable acts to indulge in their irresponsible behavior is the same freedom symbolized by the flag they would desecrate.

Were it not for the flag and the glorious freedom it represents these hoodlums would not be able to speak out in dissent; they would not have the right to petition their Government; they would not be allowed to hold meetings opposing the Government or the war in Vietnam, or local authority.

No, Mr. Speaker, when the flag is destroyed or defiled and is no more the effective symbol of our American heritage, then the desecrators themselves would become the slaves of the very statism which they seek to destroy.

The flag symbolizes the very law that gives them the benefit of doubt when they go into court for such illegal acts; it protects them and gives them constitutional rights; it is the guardian of each and every individual in this Nation.

In passing this proposal into law we will confirm the principles and ideas on which this Nation was founded and on which the morality of our system is based. We will express the love and the honor we feel for the American flag.

Mr. Speaker, Henry Ward Beecher said:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty and men rejoiced in it.

And President Woodrow Wilson said:

This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

Today in Vietnam more than 200,000 of our young men are fighting for the ideas symbolized by the U.S. flag. It is not tolerable that we can allow defilement of the flag to go unpunished any longer.

I urge early consideration of the bill.

RED CHINA LOBBY AT WORK AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, once more we see the Red China lobby at work with its usual approach of soft-pedaling the vicious Communist regime's tyranny and holding out the olive branch to our enemy. It is no secret that our State Department has been waiting for a chance to push Red China into the community of respectable nations and now seems to be the time. For the past 5 years I have continually pointed out the feelers that were sent out by these professional miscalculators who champion the cause of aid to our Communist enemy, negotiation, and treaties, increased trade, and lowering of all barriers with them. The terrible

record of Communist performance does not deter them a bit, they continue to advocate the same shopworn "be kind to Communists and they will treat us nice, too" theory which is out of touch with reality.

In the late forties, these same people were referring to the Red Chinese as agrarian reformers. They attacked Chiang Kai-shek and had many Americans believing that he was worse than Mao. The Institute of Pacific Relations and other pro-Communist groups were grinding out a relentless barrage of misinformation calculated to bring the American guard down. It did just this. All of a sudden, we hear the same line reminiscent of the Owen Lattimore days when, in the words of the late President Kennedy, then a Massachusetts Congressman, our diplomats and President frittered away what our soldiers had won. He was speaking of course of the loss of China to communism.

Now we see a concerted effort to put the aura of respectability over this bandit nation whose leaders murdered more than 20 million of their fellow Chinese when they came to power. This is bad enough but the method of accomplishing this change in policy is even more interesting. They sell the idea that our policy is to get Red China to shift from its position and relax the barriers it has erected against us. Note that well. The situation is exactly the opposite. We have erected the barriers, we have prevented them from becoming a member of the United Nations. We have had the barriers against them. Now we read that the State Department is working hard to get China to give in. The next step will be to talk them into accepting our foreign aid. They will hail as a diplomatic victory the Red Chinese acceptance of a seat in the United Nations and the resumption of trade with the United States.

An Associated Press news story on March 15, 1966, gives a hint of this line. It said in the lead paragraph:

The United States is pressing Communist China through public and diplomatic channels to lower barriers between the two countries, officials said yesterday, and the next effort probably will be made tomorrow in a meeting of ambassadors at Warsaw.

Read that over again. We are pressuring Red China to lower its barriers. This is fraudulent. One of the number one foreign policy goals of the Communists for the past two decades has been to get U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China, to open trade and to get the Reds a seat in the United Nations. This has been their goal, not ours—"ours," of course, meaning most of us excepting the State Department—and now we see our so-called foreign policy experts hunting for the "key to unlock China." Red China is an aggressor nation; it lives in disregard of the United Nations Charter and gives no evidence of being the type of nation which would live at peace in the community of nations. It is in the Communist world's interest to accomplish a reversal of present U.S. policy, not ours.

Fortunately, there are a few people around who see the China picture clearly and speak out with ringing authority.

One of these is Prof. David Nelson Rowe of Yale University who testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 28, 1966. Professor Rowe is a stalwart American and spent last summer in Seoul, Korea, at the Freedom Center. I was privileged to serve with him as one of the American observers at the 11th annual Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League conference which was held last September in Manila. The following transcript of his testimony shows the China picture in its true perspective. We can only hope that the sound judgment of men like Professor Rowe will be heeded and the willful band of diplomats who have failed, miserably failed, in dealing with world communism will not succeed in this effort to whitewash Red China. I share the concern of those who would like to see a change in Communist China-United States relations. This change should be based on their change, however, and not on merely determining this is the time and place to let moral standards go out the window and acquiesce once more to communism. The United Nations has enough problems trying to be effective now. If it is turned into a reform school there will be no hope for it.

Professor Rowe's testimony follows:

THE CHINA PROBLEM TODAY IN U.S. POLICYMAKING

(Statement before the Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, by Yale University Prof. David Nelson Rowe, March 28, 1966)

Why does this problem exist (in the United States)?

1. The Korean war proved that Communist China was willing to fight the free world in order to achieve Communist expansionist aims in Asia vis-a-vis Korea (Japan was the real objective and the most important one).

2. The formula has been repeated in:

(a) Tibet—anti-India and Nehru.

(b) Laos—250,000 Chinese Communist troops massed on the Laos frontier in 1961-62 to bring a settlement favorable to Communist China.

(c) Indian frontier—this involved an actual Sino-Indian war, with Communist Chinese troops fighting Indian troops.

(d) Communist Chinese support for North Vietnam aggression against South Vietnam. The Sino-Russian ploy: North Vietnam (the North Korea of this episode) is immune from destruction at the hands of the United States and its allies, because of its joint Sino-Soviet backing. Communist China stands behind North Vietnam's aggression militarily, to prevent such military action against North Vietnam as is necessary to the attainment of our military objectives in and for South Vietnam. Thus, Communist China achieves for North Vietnam immunity from the consequences of its aggression in South Vietnam which the previous Sino-Soviet techniques and strategies of support for North Korea failed to achieve, and this without any cost thus far in Communist Chinese manpower.

3. Thus, Sino-Soviet "indirect" aggression in South Vietnam depends upon their joint success in preventing the United States from taking military action against North Vietnam adequate to achieve the defense of South Vietnamese independence.

4. The chief Sino-Soviet weapon in this psychological warfare struggle is the threat of massive Chinese manpower intervening as "Peoples Volunteers" in the Vietnamese war.

5. How did we deal with this threat and fact in the Korean war?

(a) By making no direct attacks on the Chinese Communist home base.

(b) By application of massive firepower to Communist Chinese mass attacks in Korea, resulting in such heavy Communist Chinese casualties as to make them insupportable indefinitely. This led to truce talks of great length, so long that most U.S. casualties were incurred during the truce talk period.

6. The difference this time is that we have publicly announced that never again would there be a privileged sanctuary in Communist China in case we got into another war directly with Communist Chinese military forces under whatever guise and in whatever conditions.

Thus, the risk to the Communist Chinese regime is incalculably greater this time than in the case of Korea, albeit the current actual costs to them are negligible.

7. This pattern fits the current picture of China perfectly:

(a) Internal economic crises prevent Communist China's incurring real costs, particularly in manpower (for political reasons).

(b) Lack of logistical support to Communist China from the U.S.S.R. means poverty of Chinese Communist military means. All material from the U.S.S.R. in the Korean war was purchased by Communist China, in exchange for food and agricultural raw materials sent to the U.S.S.R.

(c) The internal crisis in Communist China demands external action, for internal mobilization, diversion of attention, and internal political and military and economic payoff with the victory that is confidently counted upon for the Communist forces in Vietnam.

8. To mitigate the risks of Communist China's southeast Asia policy today is the aim of all true friends of Communist China in the United States today. Many others aid and abet this aim for a variety of reasons.

9. Thus, almost immediately after the Johnson policy of heavy, direct U.S. military involvement in the Vietnamese war was initiated, the friends of Communist China began to emerge from the relative obscurity into which they have been forced by the Communist Chinese attack on us in Korea and to start openly supporting Communist China again and attacking the U.S. Far Eastern policy at the same time.

10. These movements, so patently anti-anti-Communist, seem to have forced the administration to speak as though communism by and large was not involved in the Vietnamese war, thus robbing us of one of the chief psychological supports and chief political bases of the war in Vietnam and the whole war against Communist aggression everywhere. This is clearly seen in President Johnson's Baltimore speech (see my analysis in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) [Not shown in this issue of the RECORD] and even more so in his recent speech at Freedom House, New York, where he uses "Red" and "Communists" just once each in the whole speech, thus playing down communism as an issue in the Vietnam war.

By contrast on January 12, 1966, the Ambassador from Vietnam to the United States, in a speech of only about one thousand words (about one-fifth as long as that of President Johnson, cited above) used the term "Communist" 9 times, for a frequency thus 22 times greater than that of President Johnson. This is a useful index of the importance of the Communist issue in the Vietnam war, to the government and people of South Vietnam.

The purpose of the anti-anti-Communists here is clear, namely to try to show that the war in Vietnam has no valid ideological basis and thus to depict it as naked U.S. aggression without any justifications. Who sold President Johnson the line of de-emphasizing communism as an issue in the Vietnamese war?

11. Paralleling these movements are the hearings in the Senate which seem to aim at two main effects:

(a) To align selected civilian propagandists uniformly against the mainlines of U.S. foreign policy in Asia and then to bring to rebut them the main administration figures such as the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense (much of whose testimony has to be classified). This show then goes on radio and TV (highly edited toward the left). The whole effect is to depict public "experts" as at odds with the administration. This not only persuades the Communists in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow of divisions of opinion in the United States that do not exist in fact. It also seems to drive the administration toward public positions on Communist China that contradict its public position that the war in Vietnam could soon be ended if only Communist Chinese attitudes and measures would change. It also seems to lead members of the administration to start softening its policy of resistance to Communist China by talking "containment without isolation" and to that extent undercutting its own experts such as Secretary of State Rusk and Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs William Bundy.

(b) To have a main effect of softening our resistance to Communist China. Senator FULBRIGHT himself states that the main aim of his hearing on China is a political aim, namely to prevent a war with Communist China.

12. In fact, the prevention of a military showdown now between the United States and Communist China is the main aim of Communists everywhere. Why?

(a) If such a showdown came soon it would destroy Communist China as such and constitute the single most catastrophic setback in history to the course of the Communist world revolution. In the course of such an event, however, the U.S.S.R. would assuredly grab both Manchuria and Sinkiang, in order to have those Chinese areas available as bases to start over again the job of communizing east Asia. But the rest of China could be saved, without doubt.

(b) If such a showdown can be prevented for 5 to 10 more years, the pro-Communist-China and anti-anti-Communist elements in this country count on the development of Communist Chinese thermonuclear power to produce a standoff and make Communist China then invulnerable to U.S. destruction, by means of the retaliatory threat. They count on this stage lasting 10 to 20 years during which either one and probably both of two things would happen:

(1) The United States would prove unable to develop any effective deterrent to so-called indirect aggression and peoples war with the result that all of Asia would come under Chinese Communist domination and control and the impact on Africa and Latin America would be disastrous.

(2) Under the deterrent of terror the political and psychological pressures toward a "detente" with Communist China similar to present illusions along that line with the U.S.S.R. would engender a thorough and complete "coexistence" policy vis-a-vis the Communist Chinese.

The Communist Chinese need coexistence much worse than do the Russians. Why? The lack of massive external support and their huge and insoluble internal problems, doom them forever to weakness and mediocrity and complete totalitarianism and military adventurism. They are trying their hardest now to soften our approach to them under the blackmail of aggression and war, to gain, at no cost to them politically, what they need in outside economic and technical support from the West and particularly from the United States. This is why their friends in the United States are trying so hard to

soften the U.S. approach to Communist China.

13. What are the main themes now being pushed by the pro-Communist China and anti-Communist elements along this line?

(a) (Theme). The historical causation line: The Communist Chinese foreign policies are merely a logical result of China's frustrations and suffering at the hands of the outside world for the last century or more:

Question. Why are these frustrations and hostile reactions focused on the United States, the one nation with the longest and best record of pro-Chinese aims and actions for 125 years?

Answer. Because our past pro-Chinese policy and our present anti-Chinese-Communist policies are identical. Both involve (as with our war against Japan, 1941-45) the defense of the territorial integrity and sovereignty of small and/or weak countries in Asia. The Chinese Communists today are the chief declared opponents of this policy of ours, as Japan was previously.

Question. In this framework, why should anyone react emotionally to the word "Munich" when it is used similarly to evoke a hostile reaction to any sell-out of our friends in southeast Asia. (I.e., was a surrender to fascism appeasement and surrender; a surrender to communism neither?)

Answer. Is this reaction hypocritical, merely naive, or knowingly wrongheaded?

(b). (Theme.) The "inevitable softening of the Communist Chinese": This line is pushed hard by all the pro-Communist-China and anti-anti-Communist elements. Even Fidel Castro gives them aid and comfort by blasting the current Chinese Communist leaders as "senile" and anticipating a less dangerous Communist Chinese leadership to come with the demise of Mao.

Question. Was Khrushchev better than Stalin, and is the present leadership of the U.S.S.R. better than Khrushchev?

Answer. No.

(c) (Theme.) The "two-Chinas" line. This is tantamount to saying we can play with enemies without alienating friends. Whatever the distant future holds we cannot know. But for the responsible policymaking future there can be no two-Chinas policy for the United States or anyone else. For example, the United Kingdom has tried to adopt a two-Chinas policy: recognition of Peiping and trying to do business with Taipei. Result: it has neither China. The Communist Chinese have never entered full diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom, and the United Kingdom cannot really cooperate with the Republic of China, on Taiwan, the single most rapidly advancing and developing area in Asia. By contrast, the United States without recognition of Peiping, has much higher-level diplomatic contacts with the Chinese Communists than Britain, and is the main ally and collaborator with the Republic of China on Taiwan.

Question. Should anyone believe there can be any formal United States-Communist China diplomatic relationship without U.S. abandonment of the Republic of China?

Answer. No.

Question. Can any U.S. administration advocate abandonment of the Republic of China without committing political suicide?

Answer. This is what two-Chinas policy advocates really are urging the administration toward, some knowingly and other unwittingly. I.e., the two-Chinas policy means to start full diplomatic and other relations with Communist China, and with a trend toward this once set in motion we can more easily abandon the Republic of China on Taiwan, particularly since it would break relations with us if we recognized Communist China.

(d) (Theme.) The "they don't mean what they say" line. Anyone who believes in drawing the lessons of history, should not

object if we say the world would have been better off if more people had taken seriously such historical documents as the Marxist Manifesto, Hitler's "Mein Kampf" or the pre-World War II utterances of the Japanese imperialists. The current utterances of the Communist Chinese leadership seem just as dangerously unrealistic today as the previously cited ones did then. They are therefore hard to give credence to. They are, in fact, filled with nonsense, but then of course so too was "Mein Kampf." But this is merely to say that all madmen are dangerous, to a great extent precisely because they are mad.

For example, in the same March 19, 1966, issue of the New York Times in which witnesses before the Fulbright committee were quoted as describing Communist China as being "fundamentally weak" and "inward-looking" and "desirous of avoiding a military confrontation with the United States," the Times carried (on the last page in the upper right-hand corner) a statement by Juo Mo-jo, Vice Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Peoples Congress, as follows:

"Listen, U.S. imperialists. The 650 million people of China are prepared. If you insist on another trial of strength, suit yourselves. Come whenever you like, alone or with others. We will not shut you out; we will wipe you out, as many as you come."

Question. When men talk madness (as the Communist Chinese do) would it not be wise to assume they mean it until and unless they prove otherwise by their acts? Yes. Are the Communist Chinese proving otherwise by their acts? No—they do just the opposite. Witness: Korea, the Taiwan Straits, the Indian frontier, Laos, and Thailand, as well as Vietnam.

(e) (Theme) The "simultaneous hard and soft" line: "containment, but not isolation." The friends of Communist China and the anti-anti-Communists are constantly describing our post-World War II policy toward the U.S.S.R. as combining these two features and advocating that we adopt such a policy toward Communist China.

What is the truth?

(1) Our immediate postwar policy toward the U.S.S.R. was not one of containment, but of surrender. Eastern Europe and Outer Mongolia were surrendered to the U.S.S.R. with the connivance of the United States and even with highest pressures being brought to bear by the United States on our allies to surrender to the U.S.S.R. land grabs, as in the case of Nationalist China and of Mongolia. This was an effort to appease Stalin and get him to accept this as his price for cooperating with us. He took the price, but did not cooperate.

(2) The containment policy was then resorted to and it has prevented further territorial takeover. However, this whole policy is now threatened by French action in re NATO, and the chief deterrent to armed action by the U.S.S.R. in Europe is now the mutual thermonuclear threat.

(3) Accordingly, we have generally not applied the policy of surrender of territory to Communist China, and in every case but one, have resisted Communist Chinese efforts to push outward. This case was Laos in 1961-62, and much of our trouble in Vietnam stems from the application to Laos of the formula of appeasement and surrender through the device we tried to use in China (1946-47) to prevent a Communist Chinese takeover pure and simple, i.e., the coalition government with Communists in it. Sino-Soviet cooperation helped bring about the surrender in Laos and thus to mark out South Vietnam and Thailand as the next Communist targets.

(4) As far as Communist China is concerned containment means isolation: The two are one and inseparable and the crux of this problem is Taiwan. The Communist Chinese price for nonisolation (which is a

two-sided matter, not solely under our control) is the handing over of Taiwan to them, i.e., destruction of containment. Any U.S. administration which would even suggest any such thing would commit political suicide by producing a major catastrophe in Asian affairs.

Question. Do those who suggest the ending of Communist China's isolation in re the United States, the United Nations, etc., know what they are saying? Are they merely stupid? Or hypocritical? Or are they trying to be "smart"?

(f) (Theme) The line "we have no support among our allies" for our southeast Asian policy. This line was, for example, advanced in re the Japanese by that great authority (?) on Japanese affairs, Mr. George Kennan. Mr. Kennan today seems to know even less about Far Eastern affairs than he did 17 years ago, when I asked him what Asia would mean in our future struggle with communism. He replied then that the struggle with communism would be settled somewhere along a line drawn between Stettin in the north and Trieste in the south. Of course, since then we have had Greece and Turkey in Europe; Korea, the Taiwan Straits, and the 17th parallel in Vietnam, not to mention Laos, and the Indian frontier, in Asia.

But today Mr. Kennan is our latest "Johnny-come-lately" on Japan. He resembles his colleague as a Soviet specialist, Ambassador "Chip" Bohlen, who in 1958 while U.S. Ambassador in the Philippines assured me personally that the United States would not support the Republic of China in its defense of the offshore islands against the then current Chinese Communist attack. I told him we would, and we did.

Mr. Kennan now says we are seriously alienating our Japanese friends by our military actions in Vietnam. He thus shows his profound ignorance of the Japanese people, who suffer as we do ourselves in this country, from the presence of a lunatic fringe of cowards, pacifists, appeasers, and just plain, simple Communists and pro-Communists. In spite of this they basically understand and respect what we are doing in Vietnam. They know their own security depends upon us, and our resolution and will to suffer and die for what we believe in. Despite their "lunatic fringe" problem, the Japanese people are sound and sensible. They understand the need of armed defense. Their own small "self-defense" forces are slowly, but steadily, growing in strength and improving. Even business firms today are sending their new employees for short periods of living and working with the armed forces before starting work, in order to bolster their morale and acquaint them again with the spirit of disciplined organization so lacking in upper-level educational institutions today both there and elsewhere. They increasingly support their defense arrangements with us, and this is because of, not in spite of, the war in Vietnam. In the past 2 years, the number of Japanese who support their alignment with the West has increased materially, and the number advocating so-called neutralism has decreased. This "new mood" is the result, I believe, of our firmness in southeast Asia, an area vital to Japan from an economic point of view.

The Japanese people will respect and honor success on our part in Vietnam. Like others, they view with apprehension any irresolution, lack of determination or willingness to pull out and surrender, on our part. This is generally true of all Asians, from Japan clear around through Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, southeast Asia and south Asia. This is one of many reasons why we cannot and must not fail in Vietnam.

Other friends and allies, including Korea, the Republic of China, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand are all helping in various ways in Vietnam, and will doubt-

less help still more in the future. If and when the need arises, the arrangements have no doubt already been worked out for the Republic of China, on Taiwan, to become directly involved. But, whether this will be required only time can tell.

As to allies and friends in Europe and elsewhere the vast preponderance of them approve what we are doing whether they say so or not. Secretary Rusk is right on this.

(g) (Theme) The line "if we can get to know enough about China and the Chinese people we can promote better relationships with the Chinese Communists." This is the opposite of the truth. Actually, the more we study Chinese history and culture the more we can see that the Chinese Communists are revisionists who have chosen to reemphasize the worst that can be found in the Chinese tradition instead of the best. What are some of these things? Totalitarianism, authoritarianism and autocracy, conspiratorial politics, dogmatic subjectivity, the perversion of education into sheer indoctrination, the exaltation of political dogma and the corresponding debasement of technology, true science, and scientific expertise. They have chosen these emphases, and allied them with the religious subjectivism of Marxism, which appeals to them because it demands so little in the way of abandonment of those reprehensible features of the Chinese tradition that they have seized upon in their fanatical desperation and urgency to change China and the Chinese overnight. This latter characteristic they assert over and over again in such terms as "The Great Leap Forward," "Socialism Within 5 Years," "Do 20 Years' Work in 2," etc., etc.

Such hopeless and futile experiments at doing something with nothing as the backyard steel furnace debacle, are also illustrative of this trend, as well as of the subjectivist dogmatism of the upper level Chinese Communist leadership. No wonder the Chinese intellectuals reacted in such a hostile way to this leadership in the brief interval of the so-called hundred flowers episode when they were encouraged to express their opinions, only to be ruthlessly suppressed by Mao Tse-tung when he realized the truth; namely, that they were not for him but against him. With true subjective self-deception he had convinced himself that the intellectuals were on his side. But they were not, and are not today. In the last 2 years 160,000 intellectuals have been seized by the regime and forced into so-called reform through labor camps. This means for most of them merely slow death by overwork and starvation. This has gone virtually unnoticed in the West, at a time when even some European Communists are openly rebelling at the recent arrest, "trial," and condemnation to forced labor of only two Soviet intellectuals.

Indeed the notion that to know the Chinese Communists better will make it easier for us to tolerate them is no more true than if we were to say that to know Italy better would make it easier for us to tolerate the Mafia. The fact is we already know enough about both the Mafia and the Chinese Communists to know one thing, and that is that we do not need to know any more in order to justify our policies of opposition and hostility. Of course, we can always use more knowledge on what can be described as a tactical level, such, for example, as is being supplied by U-2 overflights from Taiwan. But we are not likely to learn much from proposals to allow our scholars and students of China to visit Communist China, and for two reasons:

(1) The Chinese Communists are not going to allow anyone to come there unless they are convinced that he is a dependable friend of communism and of Chinese com-

munism, in particular. They have been following this policy for years.

(2) Under these circumstances what knowledge is brought back is likely to be either superficial or biased along pro-Chinese-Communist lines.

Even in the U.S.S.R., as my colleague Professor Barghoorn could no doubt testify, efforts at objective fact-gathering by foreign scholars are not without their risks. The hazards to life involved in even minor contacts with the utterly incompatible, are clear from the recent death of an innocent American traveler while in the hands of the Russians. The subsequent warnings to such potential travelers by the State Department were well deserved.

14. The campaign along the lines analyzed above, is being carried out in this country at a pitch of intensity unmatched in recent propaganda history. The so-called teaching more extensively used in the earlier phases of the anti-Vietnam-war campaign, has not been emphasized in this one. Instead, full-blown new organizations have been established on a nationwide basis, including ARFEP, or "Americans for a Review of Far Eastern Policy." This organization was started on the Yale campus by a group of students and faculty members. It has been spread across the country from there by a well-manned organization of promoters and organizers. Recently a large advertisement advancing its views appeared, for example, in a San Francisco newspaper, as emanating from the "Northern California Chapter" of ARFEP.

Certain features of this organization appear very clearly. For example, what they mean by a "review" of our Far Eastern policy usually turns out to be nothing but propaganda in favor of Communist China in the shape of support for its admission to the United Nations, United States recognition of the Red regime, full U.S. relations in trade, cultural relations, etc., well calculated to advance the aims, purposes, and interests of Communist China. This propaganda also, at times, is heavily in derogation of our ally, the Republic of China, President and Madame Chiang Kai-shek, etc.

Second, the main centers of organization and the main personnel involved are the colleges and universities. I do not know how many ARFEP centers and branches there are, or how many persons have "signed up" or are otherwise formally or informally affiliated with them. Nor can we fully know at present just what activities they engage in. The following is a no doubt incomplete list of activities: signing petitions and placing advertisements in newspapers; holding small and unadvertised "seminars" conducted by faculty members on China and China policy; sponsoring open debates on China policy questions, with both sides represented (a minor feature); conducting what amounts to a speaker's bureau to supply speakers from one campus to another.

What we do not know is the extent to which ARFEP is behind the second main feature of the current campaign, that is the current rash of conferences on various aspects of China and United States policy toward Communist China being held on college and university campuses from coast to coast.

For example, in Portland, Oreg., two such conferences, involving a number of educational institutions on a cooperating basis, are being held within a month of each other this spring. At these and other such meetings, speakers are brought in from long distances for substantial honoraria plus travel costs, necessitating very substantial budgets in the amount of thousands of dollars. Where does this money come from?

At a "National Conference on the United Nations and China" to be held next month at the University of Pennsylvania, the fee and travel cost paid to one speaker alone, will approximate \$1,000. At this conference,

where they hope for a maximum of 800 registrants, a \$10 registration fee is being assessed toward expenses. But it is doubtful that the cost of the conference can be met in this way. Where will the balance come from?

It should be noted that at the University of Pennsylvania conference, not one single academic expert on China will be present to speak on the program in favor of the official U.S. policy toward Communist China. This defense is relegated to official representatives of the U.S. Government and of the Republic of China. This repeats the pattern so clearly seen elsewhere, of putting up as academic experts on China only those in opposition to the official policy, and balancing them with official spokesmen who can be discounted in advance as such. Thus, the false impression is created that the public, represented by the academic experts, is uniformly opposed to the policy of our Government at this time. This is false, and utterly false.

At a conference at Harvard under the auspices of the Collegiate Council for the United Nations on March 25-27, Prof. Owen Lattimore, of Institute of Pacific Relations fame, was scheduled to speak on "The Chinese Revolution: Causes and Consequences."

Also, from an organizational point of view, new and political uses are now being made of an organization that predictably would be used for pro-Chinese-Communist purposes if and when the time came to do so. This is the Association of Asian Studies. When I say its current political uses were predictable, I mean just that. I refer you to my statement on this organization made in testimony under oath before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, on March 27, 1952 (pp. 4010-4013). [Not shown in Record.] I referred then to the Far Eastern Association, which is now the Association of Asian Studies, and I characterized it as designed at least in part, to take over the political propaganda functions of the Institute of Pacific Relations in case the latter institution came to grief, as I believe it subsequently did, over questions of the pro-Communist bias of its activities.

Well, my prophecy on this matter in 1952 has taken almost exactly 14 years to prove out, but prove out it has. We now see (on March 21, 1966) that all the signers of a pro-Chinese-Communist position paper published on that date in the *New York Times*, are among the about 2,700 members of the Association of Asian Studies. Of these 2,700 persons, 198, labeled (in many cases incorrectly) by the Times as "China experts," signed the statement which now places the Association of Asian Studies squarely in the policymaking arena. Of the total membership of 2,700, some 300; i.e., about one-ninth, "responded to the paper" signed eventually by 198 of them, i.e., about 7.3 percent of the total membership. To the views of this small minority of the total membership the *New York Times* of March 21, 1966, devoted a full column on its front page and nearly an entire inner page (p. 12). In an editorial on March 23, 1966, the Times stated that "this shows where the weight of informed American opinion lies." This is at the very least a gross distortion of the meaning of the statistics. Such are the distortions of propagandistic journalism.

The least the Times could do would be to give equal weight and coverage to the some 330 signers, as of January 1966, of the "Declaration in Opposition to Any Concessions to Communist China" sponsored by the Committee of One Million (not 2,700) Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. I say this in view of the fact that all of these some 330 signers are Senators or Representatives in Congress, representing I do not know how many millions of American voters. But the Times would not even print a letter submitted to it in February 1966, by two U.S. Senators in op-

position to a Times editorial on the subject of China and the United Nations. The two Senators wrote as members of the Steering Committee of the Committee of One Million, which no doubt accounts for the failure of the Times to print it.

What the Times will print is well exemplified by the letter in its columns for March 18, 1966, by Prof. Vera M. Dean of New York University. In this letter the lady professor while expressing her views on various policy matters, also expresses her hopes. Among these, as she puts it is that the "ghosts" as she describes them, of "Senator McCarthy and the Committee of One Million on China" should be exercised, and that former China experts who she says were driven from the State Department by McCarthyism should be sought out to advise the President and Secretary Rusk. Leaving this latter point aside, the lady professor should be informed that before she can exercise the ghost of the Committee of One Million it will have to die and produce such a ghost. Far from dying, the committee is very much alive today, and shows no signs of dying. All reports to the contrary are highly premature, to say the least. As time goes on I am sure the committee itself will do everything in its power to continue its efforts by all means at its disposal. It should see to it that Professor Dean is aware of these efforts. Or is she merely whistling to keep up her courage?

In this situation and from this background in what policy area should our best and strongest efforts be made, to counter the current attempts to support Communist China, and its program for Asia and the world? We are talking here, of course, of U.S. policy alternatives.

I do not believe the matter of possible U.S. recognition, trade and cultural relations, etc., is central. It is quite doubtful that, under current circumstances, any administration in Washington would move toward such policies. More real is the danger that we will succumb to the folly of supinely accepting the supposed inevitability theory, and submit to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations. In fact, so central do I believe this whole question to be to the problem of "standing up to Communist China's grandiose demands" in world affairs, as Prof. John Fairbank puts it, that I believe here is where major emphasis should lie in respect to China policy today. Therefore, I propose to devote a considerable part of my presentation to analyzing the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations.

Let us see why the Chinese Communists should not be admitted to the United Nations.

First, let us sketch in the background of the problem.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

1. What was the origin of the United Nations?

The United Nations originated as an association of victors in World War II. It excluded the soon-to-be-defeated powers, Germany, Italy, and Japan. In its very origins it was thus exclusive, not universal. The essential feature was the wartime association of the wartime Allies, the United Nations, and the community of interests that alliance embodied.

2. The United Nations: What for?

The United Nations was founded in the hope for peace and the search for it. The functional approach was adopted, i.e., cooperation wherever possible, in whatever measures possible. Measures were to be taken for common and mutual security. The problem of expanding the United Nations membership arose at the United Nations Conference of 1945. Exhaustive debate at San Francisco in 1945 produced the decision that the

organization should not be based on universality of membership, but there should be qualifications for membership. In the Charter these are:

(a) Only peace-loving nations are eligible. It may be difficult to define and determine what is meant by a peace-loving nation, but it is not hard at any given time to determine what nations are breakers and disturbers of the peace.

(b) Only those nations are eligible for membership that are willing to assume and live up to the obligations of the Charter.

(c) Members who violate the Charter may be expelled.

This opened the way for the defeated nations in World War II to enter, if and when they qualified, and also for new states to enter. But the United Nations, unlike the League of Nations, has never expelled a member, although a member has voluntarily withdrawn.

3. The United Nations: How has it done?

(a) It has been almost swamped by the worldwide results of the breakup of the wartime alliance and the worldwide contests between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., the free world countries (divided as they may be) and the Communist countries (divided as they may be).

(b) Its whole future has been put into the balance by a gross increase of its membership drawn largely from nations newly emerged as independent and many of which are themselves caught up in internal and international problems threatening constantly their very existence. Having (many of them) recently emerged from colonialism, they are now, willy-nilly, dragged into the worldwide contest between communism and freedom.

(c) Korea after 1945 is a perfect case in point. Emerging after the defeat of Japan from 35 years of Japanese colonialism, it was divided between the United States and the U.S.S.R. for postsurrender administration. The United Nations tried to unify it by peaceful means, but the U.S.S.R. thwarted this at every point. The U.S.S.R. tried to unify it by indirect war in 1950, but U.N. forces thwarted this. Then the U.N. tried to unify it by war, but Communist China thwarted this and was branded by the United Nations as an aggressor for its armed invasion of Korea.

This act by Communist China firmly and irrevocably established that regime as a full-time, highly activated part of the Communist side of the worldwide struggle between the free world and the Communist countries.

4. How did the United Nations representation issue on China arise, and why does it exist?

The Republic of China was a founding member of the United Nations in 1945. On the 18th of November 1949, shortly after Communist China set up a new regime on the mainland, Communist China notified the United Nations that the Republic of China's delegation to the U.N. was illegal. The United States upheld the right of the Republic of China to continue to represent China. The U.S.S.R. supported Communist China. The basis of the U.S. position was not Communist China's communism per se, but its lack of qualification. But can these be separated? On the 13th of January 1950, the Security Council voted 3 to 6 against Communist China's claim to represent China at the United Nations. Norway and the United Kingdom abstained, the United Kingdom on the basis that action should be deferred until the majority of the United Nations recognized Communist China.

On March 9, 1950, Secretary General Trygve Lie issued a memorandum on this, saying that representation and recognition should not be linked in the United Nations. He stated that representation should be based on a United Nations determination of which government is in the position to carry

out the obligations of the United Nations Charter, to exercise effective authority and to employ the resources of the state.

On the 6th of November 1950, Communist China's forces invaded Korea, thus forcing the United Nations to brand Communist China "guilty of aggression in Korea" and disqualifying Communist China by Secretary Lie's criteria, for United Nations membership. Since then the China representation question has arisen frequently, but Communist China never secured approval for U.N. membership.

5. What are the main elements of the United Nations situation in regard to this issue?

(a) Growth of the functions of the General Assembly, due to multiple impasses in the Security Council. The Assembly tends to argue the case, but the Security Council authority in this matter is still present and available on the basis of the 1950 precedent.

(b) A large increase in Assembly memberships has taken place. This has produced a struggle to secure the votes of African nations, for example.

(c) The "important question" issue. Is the question of China's representation an "important question" at the United Nations? It has several times been decided to be.

6. Now, what are the issues today?

(a) Communist China's record as to aggression. This is overwhelmingly relevant to the question of its accepting the "obligations of the charter." This is not just a matter of Korea. In February 1950, 5 months after the Chinese Communists established their regime, it began its aggressive course. This was predictable: Mao says every good thing comes out of the barrel of a gun. In February 1950 the Chinese Communists issued a call to all people of southeast Asia to overthrow their governments. Was this merely a move against colonialism? No. It called for revolution against independent governments also. Then there came the Chinese Communist 1950 Korean aggression and the United Nations resolution (still outstanding) which branded Communist China an aggressor. The Chinese Communist philosophy is: "Ours is a policy of fight-fight, stop-stop, half-fight, half-stop. This is no trick, but a normal thing." This is a philosophy of alternating war and subversion. This was followed by direct Chinese Communist aggression in southeast Asia (Laos and Thailand), India, and indirect aggression in Vietnam.

(b) In view of this, in order to admit Communist China to the United Nations, the United Nations Charter would have to be changed and the relevant qualifications for membership removed. The Communist Chinese know this and themselves say the Charter must be revised as a prerequisite for their accepting a seat there.

(c) Communist China's position on this in the United Nations is as follows:

(1) "All countries should review the United Nations Charter together." All independent countries should then be admitted and all "imperialist puppet states should be driven out." It wants to expel some members even before its own admission. Clearly the Chinese Communists neither want nor plan either universality or coexistence.

(2) They openly state what kinds of changes would have to take place in the United Nations:

(a) As a prerequisite to Communist China's accepting a seat, the United Nations would have to openly declare that the United Nations resolution condemning Communist China for aggression in the Korean war was wrong, and brand the United States as the aggressor in Korea.

As Chinese Communist "Foreign Minister" Chen Yi said on September 29, 1965: "Calling China an aggressor and then asking the aggressor to join, would not the United Nations be slapping its own face?"

(b) The United Nations is nothing but a United States-Soviet medium of cooperation.

(c) Another United Nations should be set up as a rival to the United Nations now extant.

(d) Thus, there is no more argument possible about what the necessary effect of the United Nations admission for Communist China would be: it would destroy the United Nations as we know it. The United States could not any more be a member under those conditions and would have to withdraw.

(e) The current issue today is that of the war in southeast Asia.

(1) The Communist Chinese show complete obduracy here and hold to a hard line of demanding total United States-South Vietnam surrender.

(2) Can we change this by admitting Communist China to the United Nations? On September 1, 1965, the New China News Agency authorized broadcast stated: "The Vietnam questions has nothing to do with the United Nations."

(3) But we'd better believe that once Communist China was in the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council it would veto all acts by the Security Council which sought to promote peace by curbing Red Chinese aggression. Even the thus far futile efforts of U Thant to mediate the war would be impossible.

(f) The current issue today is the Taiwan issue. Communist China demands that we abandon a loyal ally, an excellent partner in economic, social, and political development, and a strategic strength closeup, by insisting that the United Nations throw the Republic of China out of that body as a prerequisite for its own entry. This would mean we would tell everyone else: "go make your settlement with Communist China; become its vassal." Is there a way out of this in the so-called two-Chinas policy? No; this policy is utterly infeasible, because both the two main parties to it, Communist China and the Republic of China, reject it totally and absolutely.

(g) The general issue today in regard to the western Pacific is: Can we have any security if the whole area falls under control of such a hostile power as Communist China? No. We tried withdrawal between 1922 and 1941, but it just led to a greater war.

(h) Can we hope for change in Communist China? It is often said that we can make the United Nations a reform school for Communist China. I would like to quote on this, Edgar Snow, in the Nation, September 12, 1953, when he said: "A Chou En-lai showing us his posterior from Peiping and uttering slanderous statements or carrying out irresponsible or warlike actions against us is not necessarily less a threat than the same infidel seated in full view of the United Nations and answerable to a body of world judgment." But, of course, the answer is that if the United Nations is made over on the Communist Chinese model, Communist China won't have to change, will it? Since we can't change that much, we will have to get out if they come in on their terms.

(i) The overriding policy question is the growing United States-Communist China confrontation in southeast Asia and what it may mean to Communist China: destruction at our hands. In view of this, it is natural that more interest in United States-China policy should develop. The possibility is clear that this time another major United States-Communist China confrontation may destroy Communist China.

(j) Finally, Pope Paul VI has been widely quoted (October 4, 1965) as urging Communist Chinese United Nations admission by saying to the United Nations that it should "study the right method of uniting to your pact of brotherhood in honor and loyalty,

those who do not yet share in it." But here is what *L'Osservatore Romano*, the official organ of the Vatican, said on this on October 18-19, 1965. In an editorial under the title "The Church and the Universal Community of States," it takes note of the fact that there are people who have "given a precise political meaning" to these words of His Holiness. Then the editorial declared: "But true universality does not mean the arithmetic sum of nations; it presupposes the convergence of everybody on the effective recognition of and respect for natural law, which is the foundation of the United Nations." That is to say, the rule of law is primary; expanding United Nations membership is secondary.

The Pope is thus saying what we all know to be true; namely, that any form of political association must be founded on some measure of agreed-upon community of values, and that for such associations to tolerate as components thereof, those elements which deny and forcefully flaunt the agreed-upon community of values, will seriously endanger and probably eventually destroy the association. Thus, limitations upon membership and upon participation in political action are common to all political communities. The United Nations, weak as it already is, is no exception. It cannot be an exception.

To sum up, I quote in full the leading editorial in the *New York Herald Tribune* for November 8, 1965, as follows. It is a welcome antidote to the columns of the *New York Times*. It reads:

"RED CHINA OVER THE U.N."

"If the United Nations were administered by completely rational men, there would be no reason to doubt the outcome of this week's General Assembly debate on the issue of admitting Communist China as a member of the world organization. But reason does not always rule. Not infrequently it is clouded and weakened by set positions which, as in the case of Soviet Russia and India, have become so hardened as to imprison those who have assumed them; or by misleading arguments, such as the contention that Peking's effective control of the Chinese mainland automatically entitles it to China's seat; or by wishful thinking, such as the suggestion that admission to the U.N. will convert Peking overnight from a warmaking into a peace-loving country.

"Therefore it cannot be taken for granted that the United States and its allies will again succeed in turning back the attempt to seat Peking. The two sides appear to be more closely balanced than ever before. This throws a still greater burden on the handful of countries which have acquired the power to decide the issue one way or the other. How could they better discharge it than by exercising the rational process?

"On moral, legal and constitutional grounds, Peking is ineligible for admission. It is an aggressor; its leading spokesmen beginning with Mao Tse-tung, insist on their right to commit aggression so long as it advances their Communist, international, revolutionary aims. The U.N. Charter, on the other hand, clearly disqualifies an aggressor by stipulating that a candidate for membership must be a peace-loving state.

"The question must then be considered on what are called 'realistic' grounds. The main argument is that Peking, once inside the U.N. and exposed to its civilizing, restraining influence, will be less aggressive than if it remained outside the U.N.—an unhappy and rebellious outcast.

"Those who advance this argument forget one very crucial point. If Peking were admitted to the U.N., it would become a permanent member of the Security Council. As such, it would acquire the power to veto any act by the Security Council (and, according to the Soviet view, by the General Assembly, too) which ought to promote peace by curbing Red Chinese aggression. In other words, admission of Peking, in its pres-

ent frame of mind, could very well tie the hands of the United Nations and thereby advance, rather than inhibit, Red Chinese acts of aggression.

"In view of this possibility—one which has yet to be disclaimed, or even aired in the General Assembly—admission of Red China this year would be carrying irrationality dangerously close to the edge."

In the time and space available to me I cannot well deal with all the other aspects of positive policy which should be dealt with. However, I wish to call the attention of the committee, the Congress as a whole and the country at large to what I consider a very excellent presentation of these matters from an official source. I do not believe this cogent and learned statement has been given anywhere near the attention it deserves, either in the public media of communication or by the body of our citizens who are so actively concerning themselves with questions of China policy today. In order to help, I hope, in securing general circulation for it and what it says, I enter it here, as the final section of what I want to present to this honorable committee and through it, I hope, to the Senate, the Congress, and the public at large.

THE UNITED STATES AND COMMUNIST CHINA

(By William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs, delivered at Pomona College, Calif., on Feb. 12, 1966)

Communist China is without doubt the most serious and perplexing problem that confronts our foreign policy today. Peking's foreign policy objectives, and the tactics it employs to achieve those objectives, sharply focus for us the issues of war and peace in Asia and the freedom and lives of millions of people, not only in Asia but throughout the world.

U.S. OBJECTIVES

The key questions we must ask at the outset are: What are our objectives in Asia and in the world as a whole? What are Communist China's objectives? and What kind of policy is best for the United States in the light of those basic assessments?

And, viewed in this light, the unfortunate fact is that the kind of world that we seek and the kind of world our Asian friends seek is totally antithetic to the kind of Asia and the kind of world that Communist China seeks. What we seek is a situation where small, as well as large nations are able to develop as free and independent countries, secure from outside aggression or subversion. We look toward their economic, political, and social development and growth; we hope their development will be in the direction of increasingly democratic institutions, but we recognize that these nations must develop as they themselves see fit, in accordance with their own traditions and customs. Their rate of progress, we believe, will vary according to individual situations, but progress will inevitably take place and toward goals which are deeply rooted in individual aspirations.

In harsh conflict with these objectives is any situation in which a single nation or combination of nations sets out to control others in the region or to exercise political domination over other nations in the area or any major part of it.

Our objectives are consistent with the spirit of the charter of the United Nations and, I believe, with the aspirations of the peoples and the governments of the area and of the nations in contiguous and other areas that share with us a concern for what happens in Asia in this and in the next generation. We believe, too, that our objectives accord with the whole tide of history at the present time. They are not abstract principles. They are the bedrock of our policy throughout the world. Governed by

what the nations themselves wish to do and by practical factors, what we seek is to assist the nations that are trying to preserve their independence, trying to develop themselves, and, therefore, necessarily trying to resist forces working in the contrary direction.

CHINESE COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

There is today in Communist China a government whose leadership is dedicated to the promotion of communism by violent revolution.

The present leaders in Peking also seek to restore China to its past position of grandeur and influence. Many of Peking's leaders today, now grown old, are proud and arrogant, convinced that they have been responsible for a resurgence of Chinese power. The China of old exercised a degree of control over Asia that waxed and waned according to the power of the ruling emperor. Under strong rulers this meant a type of overlordship, sometimes benign but frequently otherwise, over the countries around its borders. And the restoration of that image and controlling influence is certainly a part of Communist China's foreign policy today.

In the 1930's Mao Tse-tung called attention to areas controlled by China under the Manchu Empire but since removed from Chinese control: Korea, Taiwan, the Ryukyu, the Pescadores, Burma, Bhutan, Nepal, Annam, and Outer Mongolia. In more recent years, Chinese Communist leaders have added to that list parts of Soviet Central Asia and eastern Siberia. I think we can take this as valid evidence of Peking's Asian ambitions. As Prof. Oliver Edmund Clubb, in his "Twentieth Century China," says: "The urge to revolutionary empire is fortified by the feeling drilled into all Chinese since the beginning of the Republic that all territory ever included in the vast Manchu Empire rightfully belongs to China."

In addition to these historically rooted aspirations, the present leadership is inspired by a Communist ideology still in a highly militant and aggressive phase. This phase is ideologically akin to that in the Soviet Union in the 1920's or early 1930's. It coincides, however, with a situation in which the opportunities for expansion are, or appear to Peking, more akin to those available to the Soviet Union at a much later phase in its ideological development—in 1945 and the immediate postwar years. This Communist element includes the advocacy of change through revolution and violence throughout the world and particularly in China's neighboring areas—not revolution seeking the fruition of the national goals of the people of these areas, but revolution supplied or stimulated from outside and based on a preconceived pattern of historical development.

Their vision of this Communist mission extends to countries far from China—including, as we all clearly have seen, Africa and even Latin America. Peking's plans for carrying out its objectives have been delineated in a series of pronouncements issued by its leaders, one of the latest and most widely publicized having been that issued last September by Marshal Lin Piao, top military leader in Communist China, in which Lin Piao offered Chinese Communist experience in the war against Japan as a lesson to be emulated by the less developed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America in their pursuit of "revolution."

As you know, the Lin Piao article draws an elaborate analogy based upon the domestic experience of Mao and his cohorts in taking over China: the organization of the rural areas against the urban ones. It extends that analogy to the thesis that the less developed areas of the world are all in the rural category which will be mobilized in order to destroy "the cities"; that is to say, all the Western, more advanced centers ourselves, of course, at the head.

I mention this article because it is a clear and comprehensive indication that there has not taken place any moderating, but if anything a solidifying at least at this stage, of this virulent revolutionary policy that is central to our discussion of Communist China. And, of course, we have seen it in action over and over again.

THE CHINESE THREAT IN ASIA

I shall not speak at length of the problems created by Communist Chinese policy in Africa and Latin America. The recent reaction even of Castro suggests that Latin America is reacting adversely to the heavy-handedness of these policies. In Africa, too, there is every sign that the new nations of the area, themselves carrying out nationalist revolutions of their own design, know full well what is meant when Chou En-lai, for example, referred last June to Africa being ripe for a second stage of revolution. The new leaders of Africa have shown no desire to be Kerenskys.

But it is in Asia itself that the major thrust of Communist Chinese policy is felt and must be countered by their neighbors. It is sometimes argued that the ambitions of Communist China in the areas contiguous to it do not mean outright control; and it can certainly be argued that they are tactically cautious in pursuing those ambitions. They have not wished to seek a confrontation of military power with us, and in any situation that would be likely to lead to wider conflict they are tactically cautious. But in looking at the extent of their ambitions one cannot, I think, simply take the historical picture of tributary governments that would be tolerated as long as they did roughly what China wished. That indeed was the historic pattern in many periods when powerful governments ruled in the mainland of China. It is also, perhaps, the pattern one might draw abstractly from the desire any major power might feel not to have hostile military power based in areas adjacent to it. Those two logics, historic Chinese logic and "great power" logic, might appear to point to something less than total political domination as the Chinese Communist objective around their borders.

And yet we must recognize, I think, because of the Communist element in the thinking and practice of the leaders of Peking today, that there is another factor that raises strong doubts whether their ambitions are in fact this modest. We have seen, for example, in the contrast between what the Soviets have done in Eastern Europe and the behavior of predecessor Russian regimes, that there is a Communist logic that does insist on total control, that will not tolerate anything other than the imposition of the full Communist totalitarian system. The experience of Soviet control in Eastern Europe suggests that this same kind of Communist logic does and would apply to the behavior of Communist China.

That it would be further strongly suggested by the way that the Communist Chinese regime has treated Tibet. The fact that Tibet was within the historic limits of Chinese suzerainty does not explain why Communist China has virtually obliterated the culture of Tibet in seizing control of it. One cannot rationalize this on grounds of history or of the need of a great power not to have hostile forces adjacent to it. So I suggest that we must give great weight to the probability that the ambitions of Communist China do extend, not necessarily to the degree of obliteration of the local culture that we have seen in Tibet, but at least to a fairly total form of domination and control in areas contiguous to it.

What, then, would be the consequences if Communist China were to achieve the kind of domination it seeks? Here again one is tempted to look for analogy to Eastern Europe, where there is a growing will to pursue

national and independent policies and to adopt domestic policies that differ sharply from the original Communist model. Yet it has taken 20 years of virtual subjugation for the nations of Eastern Europe to move this far, and their nationalism, traditions of independence, and capabilities for independent development were in general far more highly developed than those of the smaller nations on China's borders. To accept Mainland Chinese domination in Asia would be to look forward to conditions of external domination and probably totalitarian control, not merely for 20 years but quite possibly for generations.

Moreover, the spread of Chinese domination would inevitably create its own dynamic and in the end threaten even the most securely based and largest nations within the area of that threat, such as India and Japan. One does not need to subscribe to any pat "domino" formula to know from the history of the last generation, and indeed from all history, that the spread of domination feeds on itself, kindling its own fires within the dominant country and progressively weakening the will and capability of others to resist.

PAST MISTAKES AND THEIR RELEVANCE TO PRESENT

This is what we are dealing with. We can all think, as we look back at the history of China, of errors that we as a nation have made and that other nations of the West have made—errors in justice and conduct in our relationships with China. We should search our souls on these and set our objectives and our principles to avoid repeating them over again. In Asia, at least, the colonial era is for all significant purposes at an end.

But to say that the West itself bears a measure of historical responsibility for the strength of the feelings of Communist China does not deal with the present problem any more than discussion of the inequities of Versailles dealt with the ambitions of Hitlerite Germany. Whatever the historic blame may be, we have to deal with the present fact of a Chinese Communist Government whose attitudes are very deeply rooted in China's national history and ambitions to revive its past greatness, and in an extremely virulent Communist ideology.

In the words of a recent article by Professor (John K.) Fairbanks:

"We are up against a dynamic opponent whose strident anti-Americanism will not soon die away. It comes from China's long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world, which we seem to thwart."

TACTICS AND STRATEGY

I would like to emphasize that up to this point I have been speaking of the basic objectives of Peking's policy. To describe these objectives as deeply expansionist is by no means to paint the picture of another Hitler, building a vast military machine with the aim of conquest by conventional warfare on a timetable backed at some point, in the Chinese case, by a nuclear capability.

This has not been the historical Chinese way, and there is every reason to believe that it is not their present preference. Chinese are patient and think in long historical terms. Military force is important and they would like to think that their nuclear capability may at some point be useful in backing the picture of an overwhelmingly strong China whose will must be accepted. But the doctrinal statements of Lin Piao and others speak rather in terms of what they call "people's war," which plainly means the instigation and support of movements that can be represented as local movements, designed to subvert and overthrow existing governments and replace them by regimes responsive to Peking's will.

This is what we are seeing today in Thailand in the form of a so-called Thai patriotic

front established and supported from mainland China. This is the direct form of Communist Chinese tactics that must be met. A variant tactic was reflected in the Communist Chinese role in support of the PKI (Communist Party of Indonesia) in Indonesia.

But equally important to Peking is its encouragement and support of the parallel efforts of the other Communist Asian regimes in North Korea and North Vietnam. What is now happening in Vietnam is basically the result of Hanoi's own ambitions and efforts. Peking might wish eventually to dominate North Vietnam or a unified Vietnam under Hanoi's initial control. But if this were resisted by the Vietnamese in the classic historical pattern of relations between the two areas Peking would still gain enormously from the success of Hanoi's effort, which would clear the way for Peking to expand and extend the kind of action it is undertaking on its own in Thailand. It takes no vivid imagination to visualize what Peking would do in Malaysia, Singapore, and Burma if Hanoi were to succeed in Vietnam and Peking itself succeeded in Thailand.

This, then, is the preferred Communist Chinese tactic and strategy. Ideas are a part of it, although Communist China's image as a successful model of social and political organization is hardly as attractive today as it may have been before the disastrous mistakes of the "great leap forward" and the uneven progress of the years since. Few Asians today think of the Communist Chinese structure as a model, although individual ideas such as land reform and attacks on "feudal" social structures are a part of Peking's tactical efforts.

But essentially we are dealing here not with the power of ideas but with the power of subversive organization—perhaps the one field in which Communist China has shown real innovation and skill. In mainland southeast Asia, as today in South Vietnam, what we could expect to see as the spearhead of the subversive effort would be terrorism, selective assassination, guerrilla action, and finally, if it were required, conventional military forces largely recruited by the tactics of the earlier phases.

These tactics might be varied if Communist China were to decide again to threaten India directly. There the element of conventional forces would play a greater part but would still be backed and reinforced by major political efforts to disrupt the cohesion and strength of India.

OUR BASIC POLICIES

I repeat, we must look at things and deal with them as they are, if we are to hope for change. Our basic policy must include, as major elements, two interrelated efforts: to assist the free nations of the area, as they may desire, to preserve their security; and to help them, again in accordance with their own wishes, to improve their political, economic, and social conditions. The latter is an effort that I am sure we would be making even if there were no security threat.

These two fundamental elements of our policy have much in common with the policies that we and our NATO allies pursued so successfully in the areas threatened by the Soviet Union after the war. And surely there is, to a very high degree, a valid parallel between the situation we continue to face vis-a-vis Communist China and that we faced with the Soviet Union after the war. We have dealt with the Soviet Union fundamentally by assisting in the restoration of the power and strength of Europe so that Soviet ambitions were successfully checked. Since 1955, although Soviet ambitions remain, we have seen a trend toward moderation in Soviet policy and a turning inward by the Soviets to their domestic problems.

There are, of course, myriad differences between the situation in Asia and that in Europe in terms of sophistication of eco-

conomic and political bases, the stability of the societies, and the unity of national cultures. But basic to our policy in respect to Communist China, as in the case of our policy toward the Soviet Union, must be our determination to meet with firmness the external pressure of the Communist Chinese. Again, in Professor Fairbank's words:

"We have little alternative but to stand up to Peking's grandiose demands."

So the effort to assist in preserving security is fundamental to our policy. It is reflected in our treaty commitments—bilateral with Japan, Korea, the Republic of China, and the Philippines, multilateral (but individually binding) through the SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization), and ANZUS (Australia-New Zealand-United States Security Treaty) treaties, and extending to South Vietnam through a protocol to the SEATO Treaty.

Necessarily, our security effort and commitments have a major military element, for the threat of military action is direct in relation to Korea and the Republic of China and lurks in the background of the Communist Chinese threat to southeast Asia, as it does for India. The day may come when other nations in the area can join in assuming more of this burden, but the simple facts that today there cannot be an effective deterrent military force, and thus a balance of power, around China's frontiers without major and direct military contributions by the United States.

But even in the security area the effort is far from merely a military one. Local military forces should, wherever possible, be adequate, so that an external attack would have to take on large proportions immediately identifiable as aggression. But at least as basic to the preservation of the independence of the nations of Asia is their capacity to insure law and order and to deal with subversion, and this in turn relates to the whole nature of their political structures and to their social and economic progress. So in the end what is done under the heading of "Security" merges almost indistinguishably into what is done under the heading of "Development."

And so, at one time or another, we have had assistance relationships with all of the non-Communist countries of Asia. Today three of these—Burma, Cambodia, and Indonesia—have chosen to follow paths that involve little or no assistance from us. And there are nations such as Japan, and more recently the Republic of China, which have made such economic progress that they no longer need our direct help. Malaysia and Singapore are other special cases, which look for historical and practical reasons to Britain and the Commonwealth.

So the pattern is varied. In a very few instances we supply major assistance to conventional military forces. In others, such as Thailand, the emphasis is as great or greater on nonmilitary measures to better the lot of the people and thus to strengthen the fabric of the nation. And throughout the area, even where we are no longer giving direct economic assistance, we have joined in supporting the increasing efforts of the World Bank and private lenders to pitch in on the economic side, and more recently the profoundly important regional economic developments represented by the formation of the Asian Development Bank and the growing, though still embryonic, effort to provide an effective framework, through the United Nations, for assistance in the Mekong Basin and on a regional basis to southeast Asia.

All of these efforts are linked together. They represent the kind of activity which, as I have said, we would be supporting in large part in any case irrespective of the threat of Communist China and the other Communist nations. What they should do, over time, is to help build in Asia nations

which are standing on their own feet, responding to the needs of their peoples, and capable of standing up to the kind of tactics and strategy employed by Communist China, backed where necessary and in accordance with our treaty commitments by the assurance that, if external attack in any form should take place, the United States and others would come to their help.

This is the essence of what we are trying to do. Containment, yes, but containment carried out by actions that run clear across the board. And containment in the last analysis that depends upon the performance of the Asian nations themselves. As one looks back over the short historical span of the last 15 years, one can surely see throughout the area tremendous progress where security has been maintained. Even though present difficulties are formidable, the nations of Asia have great capacity, and there is much reason for encouragement at the long-term prospect.

UNITED STATES-CHINESE COMMUNISTS RELATIONS

This brings me to the whole question of how we deal specifically with Communist China. Let me briefly review and analyze some of the things we have done or might do.

As far as contacts through diplomatic channels are concerned, we have had 128 meetings at the ambassadorial level with Peking's representatives, first in Geneva and now Warsaw. I think it is fair to say that we have had the longest and most direct dialog of any major Western nation with Communist China.

I am bound to say at the same time, however, that the dialog so far has not been very productive and founders on the fundamental issue of Peking's demand for Taiwan and by its stated conviction that the United States is by historical necessity Peking's prime antagonist on the world scene. But it is fair to say that it is more of a dialog than we could expect to have if we were ever to recognize Communist China, if the experience of Western diplomats in Peking is representative. And it is an opportunity to try directly to make them understand that we have no hostile designs on mainland China or its leaders but that we fully intend to maintain our commitments to defend our friends and allies against Communist aggression and that the United States seeks peace, freedom, and stability for the countries of Asia.

In addition to these direct contacts, we have of course been prepared to deal with Communist China in multilateral forums where its interests are directly involved. This was true of the Geneva conferences of 1954 and 1961-62, and we have made clear our willingness to participate in a Geneva-conference type of format to resolve the present Vietnam problem or to have Communist China appear at the United Nations if Hanoi or Peking were ever ready to let the United Nations deal with the Vietnam issue.

And there is the possibility that Peking may at some point be prepared to participate usefully in multilateral discussions on disarmament. We have always said that we would envisage such participation if workable arrangements appeared to be in prospect, although I am bound to add that Peking's attitude, particularly since its nuclear tests, has given no ground for supposing that she is prepared to enter disarmament discussions with any constructive position.

CHINESE REPRESENTATION AT THE U.N.

Some nations at the U.N. hope that Communist China's seating would have a moderating effect on its policies. They advance the thesis that, not being included in the U.N., Peking feels rejected and acts with considerably less restraint than if it were a member with a member's obligations.

We respect those who hold this view, but we cannot agree with it. It seems to us a rationalistic view that ignores the deep-seated historic and ideologic reasons for Peking's current attitudes. Nor does this theory—the neurosis theory if you will—explain Peking's behavior toward other Communist nations or its behavior in Afro-Asian groupings to which Communist China has been fully welcomed. I return again to Professor Fairbank's description of China's "long background of feeling superior to all outsiders and expecting a supreme position in the world." Surely this, alongside ideologic differences, lies at the root of the Sino-Soviet split, of Communist China's disruptive behavior in Afro-Asian groupings, and of the heavyhandedness of Communist China's policy from Indonesia to Burundi.

Moreover, we must consider Peking's price for entering the U.N. On September 29, 1965, Chen Yi, the Chinese Communist Premier, made the following demands:

1. The expulsion of the Republic of China from the U.N.
2. The complete reorganization of the U.N.
3. The withdrawal of the General Assembly resolution condemning Peking as an aggressor in the Korean conflict.
4. The branding of the United States as an aggressor in that conflict.

These are obviously unacceptable conditions.

The Republic of China, for example, is one of the original signatories of the United Nations Charter and has lived up to its obligations as a U.N. member in good faith. More than 13 million people live on the Island of Taiwan. This is a larger population than that of 83 members of the United Nations. The United States for many years has had close and friendly relations with the Republic of China, and since 1954 we have been bound by treaty to join with it in the defense of Taiwan. It would be unthinkable and morally wrong to expel the Government of the Republic of China from the U.N. to meet this demand of Peking's.

One must also consider the attitude of Communist China toward conflict, not only where its own interests are directly concerned but even in cases where they are not. Had Communist China been in the United Nations, could there have been a cease-fire resolution on the India-Pakistan conflict in September and could Secretary-General U Thant have received any mandate to bring that conflict to a halt? Peking's critical comment on the Tashkent proceedings is a clear answer. We are dealing with a nation that, at least as far as we can now see, will attempt as a matter of principle to put a monkey wrench into every peacemaking effort which may be made in the world.

Finally, there is the psychological factor: whether the admission to the U.N. of a nation that is dedicated to violent revolution and currently supporting North Vietnam's aggression against South Vietnam and threatening India in seeking to exacerbate and extend the Indo-Pakistan conflict would, in fact, not encourage Peking to think it is on the right track while deeply discouraging other nations which are resisting Peking's pressures and seeking to maintain their own independence.

It continues, therefore, to be U.S. policy to support the position of the Republic of China in the U.N. For our part, we will also continue to oppose the admission of Communist China.

BILATERAL CONTRACTS

Now I should like to talk briefly on the subject of unofficial contacts with Peking, stressing above all one point which has not been sufficiently emphasized.

Many people do not realize that it is Communist China which has prevented any movement toward bilateral contacts. The United States over the past several years has tried to promote a variety of contacts,

but the Chinese have kept the door tightly barred.

Since 1958, for example, we have validated passports of over 80 representatives of newspapers and other media for travel to Communist China. Only two have been admitted. We have tried unsuccessfully to arrange with the Chinese either a formal or an informal exchange of newsmen and more recently we have indicated to them our willingness unilaterally and without reciprocity to see Communist Chinese newsmen enter the United States.

In addition, we have a short time ago amended our travel regulations to permit doctors and scientists in the fields of public health and medicine to travel to Communist China.¹ We shall see, but so far the response has been negative.

We have discussed with various scientific and other organizations their interests in arranging people-to-people exchanges with the Chinese. We have encouraged the exchange of publications between various universities and institutions in the United States with Peking. There is a free flow of mail to and from Communist China. All of these efforts have been consistent with our worldwide concern for a freedom of information and for the exchange of knowledge and views in humanitarian fields. Yet they have been consistently rejected by Communist China. If there were a possibility that such contacts might over time develop a broader understanding of the rest of the world in Communist China, it is they, not we, who reject this possibility.

TRADE WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Let me now say a few words about trade. We have not opposed the trade of other nations with Communist China except insofar as there is a strongly built-up pattern of control in the area of strategic commodities. We have expressed our concerns to other nations from time to time, recognizing that their trade policies were their own decision but raising questions of their vulnerability to possible pressures from Peking in their overinvolvement in trading patterns.

As for the possibilities of our trade, every time the subject is seriously mentioned in this country, it is shot down immediately in Peking. In 1961, for example, when food supplies in mainland China were very short, President Kennedy made it quite clear that we would take under consideration a Chinese Communist request to purchase grain. The Chinese Communist response was to denounce the President and to reject any possibility of trade, not only in grain but in other commodities with the United States.

CONCLUSION

These are samples of what we are up against. We are Peking's great enemy because our power is a crucial element in the total balance of power and in the resistance by Asian states to Chinese Communist expansionist designs in Asia. That is the really controlling fact, not sentiment, not whatever wrongs may have been done in the past, but that very simple fact and the very fundamental conflict between their aims and objectives and the kinds of aims that we have—above all, our support for the right of the nations of Asia to be free and independent and govern themselves according to their own wishes.

All of us must hope that this picture will change. Mainland China is, of course, a great power in the world historically. How it will develop economically and in other respects remains to be seen. I myself think that they will have considerable problems that will tend over time to absorb them if their external ambitions and desires are checked. There are those who argue that

mainland China's great size and population, its historical and cultural links with the areas around its borders, and its economic potential make inevitable the growth of a Chinese "sphere of influence" in Asia. Those who advance this fatalistic theory discount the aspirations of the peoples in the area, their ability, and the effectiveness of U.S. aid, and they ignore the historical trends of our time.

In sum, I repeat that the problem must be considered basically in the same way we did that of the Soviet Union. We must, on the one hand, seek to curtail Peking's ambitions and build up the free nations of Asia and of contiguous areas; on the other hand, while maintaining firm resistance to their expansionist ambitions, we can, over time, open the possibility of increased contacts with Communist China, weighing very carefully any steps we take in these general areas lest we impair the essential first aim of our policy, including our clear commitments.

It is unlikely that the present leaders, who have become doctrinaire and dogmatic, can be expected to change, but they in due course will be replaced with a new generation of leaders. It is our hope that these men will see with clearer eyes and better vision that China's best interest lies in pursuing a peaceful course.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today, on April 5, 1964, our Nation lost one of the most distinguished soldiers in its history when General of the Army Douglas MacArthur died at the age of 84 in Walter Reed Medical Center after a month's illness. The indebtedness that the United States and the free world in general owes to the leadership of General MacArthur in helping to eradicate the greatest actively militant coalition of despotism at that time, the Axis powers, needs no elaboration here. Suffice it to say, that he was one of freemen's bulwarks in a time of freedom's peril.

Today the free world faces another enemy with worldwide designs, older in time and experience and infinitely more treacherous and cunning. In 1926, years before Hitler became a matter of international concern, the Lenin University in Moscow was established for the purpose of training Communists of leadership quality from all races and nations. As long ago as 40 years ago, Lenin University could boast of a student body comprising Communists from almost every country in the world. In its first year of existence, the university began training, among many others, a small contingent of 10 students sent by the Communist Party of the United States. The following year 20 students arrived from this country with the number increasing in later years. Over a period of years many of the outstanding Communist political figures in the Balkan countries, in Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, France, Bulgaria, Austria, China, India, and in the South American countries, were trained in Russia's Communist academies. Since that time the number of these schools of revolution have greatly increased, with recent additions as close as Cuba, 90 miles from our southern shores.

At present the fruits of Communist patience, farsightedness, and industry are materializing. Coupled with military might, a ruthlessly atheistic ideology and control of 35 percent of the world's population and over 26 percent of its land mass, this international movement can influence, in varying degrees, the peoples, governments, and policies of every nation on the globe.

Of course Douglas MacArthur, who could spot a tyrant hemispheres away, was not fooled. In his address to the joint session of Congress in 1951 he cautioned:

The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe.

Would that the present opponents of our firm policy in Vietnam heed this admonition.

Again today, a leaderless, directionless free world faces an international menace to man's God-given rights. Voices of appeasement, reminiscent of sincere but misguided Neville Chamberlain, call for coalition governments, admission of Red China to the U.N., increased trade with Communist countries and other political follies, forgetting—or ignoring—the fact that appeasement of despots fosters new and bloodier wars. Those who called for a coalition government between the Nationalist forces and the Chinese Reds in 1949 see no connection between the subsequent downfall of free China and the killing of over 33,000 American soldiers in combat by North Korean and Chinese Communist troops in Korea a short time later. Also forgotten by some in the present Red China debate is the unbelievably inhuman treatment of both the Chinese and Tibetan people by the Chinese Reds in violation of the United Nations Charter.

On this second anniversary of the death of General MacArthur, the poignant and inspiring words of his "Duty, Honor, Country" speech are especially fitting. Given without preparation or notes on May 12, 1962, at the U.S. Military Academy, these remarks were addressed to the American soldier, but the theme and moral message vitally concerns every citizen, potential soldiers all, within their own spheres of influence.

Although his leadership in adversity and his reassuring presence are gone forever, may these words serve as his legacy and contribution to his Nation in its struggle for survival.

The inspiring speech which General MacArthur delivered on May 12, 1962, at West Point is contained at the conclusion of these remarks. The speech represents the type of message that should be repeated over and over and over.

DUTY—HONOR—COUNTRY

As I was leaving the hotel this morning, a doorman asked me, "Where are you headed for, General?" And when I replied, "West Point," he remarked, "Beautiful place. Have you ever been there before?"

No human being could fail to be deeply moved by such a tribute as this. Coming from a profession I have served so long, and a people I have loved so well, it fills me with

¹ For background, see Bulletin of Jan. 17, 1966, p. 90.

an emotion I cannot express. But this award is not intended primarily to honor a personality, but to symbolize a great moral code—the code of conduct and chivalry of those who guard this beloved land of culture and ancient descent. That is the meaning of this medallion. For all eyes and for all time, it is an expression of the ethics of the American soldier. That I should be integrated in this way with so noble an ideal arouses a sense of pride and yet of humility which will be with me always.

Duty—Honor—Country. Those three hallowed words reverently dictate what you ought to be, what you can be, what you will be. They are your rallying points; to build courage when courage seems to fail; to regain faith when there seems to be little cause for faith; to create hope when hope becomes forlorn. Unhappily, I possess neither that eloquence of diction, that poetry of imagination, nor that brilliance of metaphor to tell you all that they mean. The unbelievers will say they are but words, but a slogan, but a flamboyant phrase. Every pedant, every demagog, every cynic, every hypocrite, every troublemaker, and, I am sorry to say, some others of an entirely different character, will try to downgrade them even to the extent of mockery and ridicule.

But these are some of the things they do. They build your basic character; they mold you for your future roles as custodians of the Nation's defense; they make you strong enough to know when you are weak, and brave enough to face yourself when you are afraid. They teach you to be proud and unbending in honest failure, but humble and gentle in success, not to substitute words for actions, not to seek the path of comfort, but to face the stress and spur of difficulty and challenge; to learn to stand up in the storm but to have compassion on those who fail; to master yourself before you seek to master others; to have a heart that is clean, a goal that is high; to learn to laugh yet never forget how to weep; to reach into the future yet never neglect the past; to be serious yet never to take yourself too seriously; to be modest so that you will remember the simplicity of true greatness, the open mind of true wisdom, the meekness of true strength. They give you a temper of the will, a quality of the imagination, a vigor of the emotions, a freshness of the deep springs of life, a temperamental predominance of courage over timidity, an appetite for adventure over love of ease. They create in your heart the sense of wonder, the unfailing hope of what next, and the joy and inspiration of life. They teach you in this way to be an officer and a gentleman.

And what sort of soldiers are those you are to lead? Are they reliable, are they brave, are they capable of victory. Their story is known to all of you; it is the story of the American man-at-arms. My estimate of him was formed on the battlefield many years ago, and has never changed. I regarded him then as I regard him now—as one of the world's noblest figures, not only as one of the finest military characters, but also as one of the most stainless. His name and fame are the birthright of every American citizen. In his youth and strength, his love and loyalty, he gave all that mortality can give. He needs no eulogy from me or from any other man. He has written his own history and written it in red on his enemy's breast. But when I think of his patience under adversity, of his courage under fire, and of his modesty in victory, I am filled with an emotion of admiration I cannot put into words. He belongs to history as furnishing one of the greatest examples of successful patriotism; he belongs to posterity as the instructor of future generations in the principles of liberty and freedom; he belongs to the present, to us, by his virtues and by his achievements. In 20 campaigns, on a hundred battlefields, around a thou-

sand campfires, I have witnessed that enduring fortitude, that patriotic self-abnegation, and that invincible determination which have carved his status in the hearts of his people. From one end of the world to the other he has drained deep the chalice of courage.

As I listened to those songs of the glee club, in memory's eye I could see those staggering columns of the First World War, bending under soggy packs, on many a weary march from dripping dusk to drizzling dawn, slogging ankle deep through the mire of shell-shocked roads, to form grimly for the attack, blue-lipped, covered with sludge and mud, chilled by the wind and rain, driving home to their objective, and, for many, to the judgment seat of God. I do not know the dignity of their birth but I do know the glory of their death. They died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in their hearts, and on their lips the hope that we would go on to victory. Always for them—**Duty—Honor—Country;** always their blood and sweat and tears as we sought the way and the light and the truth.

And 20 years after, on the other side of the globe, again the filth of murky foxholes, the stench of ghostly trenches, the slime of dripping dugouts; those broiling suns of relentless heat, those torrential rains of devastating storm, the loneliness and utter desolation of jungle trails, the bitterness of long separation from those they loved and cherished, the deadly pestilence of tropical disease, the horror of stricken areas of war; their resolute and determined defense, their swift and sure attack, their indomitable purpose, their complete and decisive victory—always victory—always through the bloody haze of their last reverberating shot, the vision of gaunt, ghastly men reverently following your password of **Duty—Honor—Country.**

The code which those words perpetrate embraces the highest moral laws and will stand the test of any ethics or philosophies ever promulgated for the uplift of mankind. Its requirements are for the things that are right, and its restraints are from the things that are wrong. The soldier, above all other men, is required to practice the greatest act of religious training—sacrifice. In battle and in the face of danger and death, he discloses those divine attributes which his Maker gave when He created man in His own image. No physical courage and no brute instinct can take the place of the Divine help which alone can sustain him. However horrible the incidents of war may be, the soldier who is called upon to offer and to give his life for his country is the noblest development of mankind.

You now face a new world—a world of change. The thrust into outer space of the satellites, spheres and missiles marked the beginning of another epoch in the long story of mankind—the chapter of the space age. In the five or more billions of years the scientists tell us it has taken to form the earth, in the three or more billion years of development of the human race, there has never been a greater, a more abrupt or staggering evolution. We deal now not with things of this world alone, but with the illimitable distances and as yet unfathomed mysteries of the universe. We are reaching out for a new and boundless frontier. We speak in strange terms: of harnessing the cosmic energy; of making winds and tides work for us; of creating unheard-of synthetic materials to supplement or even replace our old standard basics; of purifying sea water for our drink; of mining ocean floors for new fields of wealth and food; of disease preventives to expand life into the hundreds of years; of controlling the weather for a more equitable distribution of heat and cold, of rain and shine; of space ships to the moon; of the primary target in war, no longer limited to the armed forces of an enemy, but instead to include his civil populations; of ultimate conflict between a united human

race and the sinister forces of some other planetary galaxy; of such dreams and fantasies as to make life the most exciting of all time.

And through all this welter of change and development, your mission remains fixed, determined, inviolable—it is to win our wars. Everything else in your professional career is but a corollary to this vital dedication. All other public purposes, all other public projects, all other public needs, great or small, will find others for their accomplishment; but you are the ones who are trained to fight; yours is the profession of arms—the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory; that if you lose, the nation will be destroyed; that the very obsession of your public service must be **Duty—Honor—Country.** Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide man's mind; but serene, calm, aloof, you stand as the nation's war guardian, as its lifeguard from the raging tides of international conflict; as its gladiator in the arena of battle. For a century and a half, you have defended, guarded, and protected its hallowed traditions of liberty and freedom, of right and justice. Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government; whether our strength is being sapped by deficit financing, indulged in too long; by Federal paternalism grown too mighty; by power groups grown too arrogant; by politics grown too corrupt; by crime grown too rampant; by morals grown too low; by taxes grown too high; by extremists grown too violent; whether our personal liberties are as thorough and complete as they should be. These great national problems are not for your professional participation or military solution. Your guidepost stands out like a tenfold beacon in the night—**Duty—Honor—Country.**

You are the leaven which binds together the entire fabric of our national system of defense. From your ranks come the great captains who hold the Nation's destiny in their hands the moment the war tocsin sounds. The long gray line has never failed us. Were you to do so, a million ghosts in olive drab, in brown khaki, in blue and gray, would rise from their white crosses thundering those magic words—duty, honor, country.

This does not mean that you are war mongers. On the contrary, the soldier, above all other people, prays for peace, for he must suffer and bear the deepest wounds and scars of war. But always in our ears ring the ominous words of Plato, that wisest of all philosophers, "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

The shadows are lengthening for me. The twilight is here. My days of old have vanished tone and tint; they have gone glimmering through the dreams of things that were. Their memory is one of wondrous beauty, watered by tears, and coaxed and caressed by the smiles of yesterday. I listen vainly, but with thirsty ear, for the witching melody of faint bugles blowing reveille, of far drums beating the long roll. In my dreams I hear again the crash of guns, the rattle of musketry, the strange mournful mutter of the battlefield. But in the evening of my memory, always I come back to West Point. Always there echoes and echoes in my ears—duty, honor, country.

Today marks my final rollcall with you. But I want you to know that when I cross the river my last conscious thoughts will be of the corps—and the corps—and the corps.

I bid you farewell.

FIRST LADY DISCOVERS SAN ANTONIO FOR THE NATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, it is truly said that America is the most magnificent of countries, but the sad fact is that many of us overlook our own Nation's charms for more fabled places overseas. But Mrs. Johnson, the gracious First Lady, is rediscovering America for us, and is even now touring in her own Texas and showing its charm and history to a country that often thinks of Texas as only a cow pony and an oil well. Yesterday she was at Fort Davis, in far western Texas; the day before that she was in the Big Bend country—a land so magnificent that words cannot describe it, a land where anyone can go and see for himself country that very few living men have seen. The Big Bend is vast and unspoiled; it is a land conservationists dream of, and tourists seldom find.

Mrs. Johnson rediscovered San Antonio last week. I think that few Americans know the charms of San Antonio, but they do now, thanks to the First Lady. They now know about the San Antonio River—that tiny and meandering stream running through the very heart of a great city. The river is a place of walks, soft lights, music, dancing, and restaurants. It is a place where artists hang their paintings, and where little boats will take people from place to place.

San Antonio is more than the Alamo; it is more than the river walk; it is a place filled with history and charm. I think that my colleagues will be interested in the April 2 Washington Post account of Mrs. Johnson's visit to San Antonio. After reading this story, I know that they will want to come to San Antonio and see a city that is among the favorites of the President and his lady.

The article follows:

MRS. L.B.J.'S SAN ANTONIO ROSE ON ALAMO SAFARI

(By Winzola McLendon)

SAN ANTONIO, TEX. April 1.—Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson put the spotlight on one of America's most fascinating beautification/conservation projects tonight when she turned on the lights for this city's *Fiesta de Las Luminarias* (Festival of Lights).

"All over the country there is an awakening to the preservation of nature's endowment's," said the First Lady as she dedicated a newly installed esthetic lighting project along San Antonio's *Paseo Del Rio*. "As the lights go on tonight, I look out over the river with its grassy banks and cottonwoods, and cypress, and pecan and willow, and retama, and all I can say is 'This is America the Beautiful'."

The *Paseo*, an exciting blend of lush tropical foliage, pleasant walks, quaint shops and sidewalk cafes, follows a unique horseshoe bend of the San Antonio River right in the heart of the city—the Indians called the crooked stream "drunken old man going home at night." Saved by a militant group of women in the 1920's when city planners decided to cover the river with pavement, the river and its banks have been

turned into a setting which has become known as the *Venice of America*.

"I have traveled through a great many cities in recent months and found them coping with what you have overcome," she told San Antonio City leaders and a vast audience of men, women, and children sitting and standing along the river banks.

"Urban sprawl has withered away their centers and they are struggling to find a way to breathe life into centercity. Here is a great example of what can be done. It says to every city—look around and find the individual charm, the bounty of nature, the heritage of the past with which to rebuild."

The newly installed esthetic lighting dedicated by the First Lady is the workmanship of a wizard of watts, John R. Watson, 43, noted landscape illuminator, tall and lanky, and a native Texan. Watson designed the lighting in Queen Victoria Park at Niagara Falls as well as the illumination of the Texas pavilion at the New York World's Fair.

The First Lady flew to San Antonio this afternoon accompanied by Secretary of Interior and Mrs. Stewart Udall, White House staff members, Secret Service Agents, and more than 50 members of the press.

After checking into the hotel, Mrs. Johnson went out immediately on the balcony of her ninth floor suite and looked across at the steeple of St. Mark's Church where she and President Johnson had been married.

With her were Dan Quill, who had made the local arrangements for their wedding in 1934, and Mrs. John Connally, wife of the Texas Governor.

She started her evening along the *Paseo* at the Hemisfair headquarters where she saw a colorful model of the fair which will take place in San Antonio, just 200 yards from the Alamo in 1968.

The fair will show the diversified cultures of Pan America—the history, art, religion, and socioeconomic development of each of the nations of this hemisphere, and the significant contributions to their development from Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The next stop was La Villita, the little restored village in the shadow of San Antonio's skyscrapers. The spot was a crude Indian village until, about 1732, it became the abode dwelling place of the soldiers attached to Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Alamo. The present restoration was begun in 1939 and many skills and crafts of the early settlement are still pursued in the old adobes.

La Villita was the setting for tonight's reception, attended by more than 500 of the city's leading citizens, and it honored the First Lady.

At the reception Mrs. Johnson literally received the red carpet treatment. On hand to see that she got it was the Red Carpet Committee, a group composed of citizens who think that only a real red carpet is good enough for VIP visitors. The men, wearing red jackets and the women in red dresses spread it for Mrs. Johnson on her arrival.

The reception took place outdoors in a courtyard and, even at 8 o'clock in the evening, the summer-like weather hovered at a warm and friendly 78 to 80 degrees.

From La Villita Mayor Walter W. McAllister escorted Mrs. Johnson down to the river edge where she planted an American elm seedling. Eighteen inches high and 2 years old, the seedling was taken from the John Quincy Adams elm, the old-commemorative tree on the White House grounds.

After the lighting ceremony, the Lady Bird Johnson entourage boarded gaily decorated barges for a 90-minute cruise up the winding San Antonio River.

At the Arneson River Theater where the stream separates, the audience was seated on grassy tiers from the stage, there were songs of Spain and Mexico. A German band, au-

thentic to the last "oompah" serenaded the First Lady as her barge moved under the Alamo Street footbridge.

IOWA'S NATURAL BEAUTY INCLUDED IN NATIONAL TRAILS BILL

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as our society becomes increasingly more complex and as our population continues to expand, it is imperative that we plan for the long-range recreation needs of the Nation. I believe vigorous action by we of the 89th Congress, is important to the future development of our national recreation effort and to the health and well being of our citizens and the maintenance of our position of world leadership.

To help meet this expanding need for recreational facilities I am today introducing a bill to establish a National System of Trails. My bill is similar to H.R. 14222 which was introduced last week by our distinguished colleague from Alaska, the Honorable RALPH RIVERS, whose long leadership and efforts in this vital area is deserving of the highest praise. My bill calls for the inclusion of a hiking and riding trail along the scenic banks of our Nation's river, the mighty Mississippi, which borders my district for more than 100 miles. This trail which would stretch from New Orleans to the headwaters of the river in Minnesota, would pass through some of our Nation's most scenic areas. In my own district in southeast Iowa, the trail would be through wooded areas, along high bluffs overlooking the river, and in close proximity of numerous historic and geological points of interest. My proposed trail would stretch the full length of the Mississippi which has played such a vital role in the development of our great Nation and which is such an important part of our national heritage, folklore, and culture.

Secondly, I propose that the historic Mormon Trail and the Mormon Handcart Trails be included in our national trail system. These two famous trails pass through my district. Certainly, a recognition of this historic trail through incorporation in our national trail system, would contribute much to the preservation of our heritage and to the full development of our recreation resources.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this proposal which would make available trails for all citizens and would permit Americans to more readily enjoy the outdoor wonders of our great Nation. As my able colleague from Alaska pointed out, the trail system will not only provide an experience which touches the senses, but will contribute to relieving the strains and tension of modern living.

LET'S LOWER THE OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues a fine editorial which appeared in the April 7 issue of *The Machinist*. I believe the message presented by the editorial should receive very serious consideration by all of us in the Congress who have the sober responsibility of congressional oversight of executive actions in this vital area. Apparently there are some areas which have for the past several decades been regarded as "sacred cows" with regard to suggested guidelines for tax reform policy.

In fairness to our working people in the farms and factories of America, we should extend considerations of restraint to areas which have been hitherto untouched. As an initial step in this direction, I introduced H.R. 12993 a bill which would progressively reduce the oil depletion allowance. I call this legislation to not only the attention of Members of the House, but also to the members of the Council of Economic Advisers. Adoption of this measure would be a first step in meeting the valid and constructive criticism voiced in this perceptive editorial entitled "Green Stamps."

GREEN STAMPS

Read the financial pages of almost any newspaper on almost any day. They raise serious questions about the fairness of the administration's efforts to limit this year's wage increases.

The President's economic advisers are worried that wages will go up so fast that prices will rise faster than usual. So they have set an arbitrary guide for negotiated wage increases. They would restrict all wage increases to 3.2 percent this year, except for inequity, labor shortage, or other special cases.

To the economic advisers at the White House, wages are part of the cost of production rather than family income. They would restrict that cost like they try to restrict the cost of aluminum or steel.

So far, there is no talk at all about regulating corporation profits, stockholders' dividends or management salaries, bonuses and stock options. The economic advisers consider those as personal incentives, rather than a cost of production.

PROFITS OF 20 PERCENT

The result is a kind of lopsided unfairness that sticks out all over the financial pages. Just look for one example, look at a recent *Wall Street Journal* report of a financial statement by Sperry & Hutchinson Co., the firm that produces the S. & H. green stamps. Most of us think we get those stamps for free.

That company has assets of more than a quarter of a billion dollars. Last year the profits of Sperry & Hutchinson jumped almost 20 percent. The wage guideline, remember, is 3.2 percent. The year before that, S. & H. profits had increased 42 percent.

These profit increases occurred despite the fact that the trading stamp business is not expanding as fast as it used to.

SALARIES OF \$200,000

The S. & H. green stamp business is owned by a family named Beinecke. Six of its eight top officers are Beineckes. Edwin Beinecke, who is 80 years old, is chairman of the board. He was paid \$200,000 last year. Frederick Beinecke, who is 79, serves as chairman of the executive committee. He also received \$200,000 last year. That is a wage rate of almost \$100 an hour. Four other corporate officers each get \$100,000 or more.

If there has been any effort by the President's economic advisers to limit corporate salaries like these, we haven't heard about it. The President's economic advisers are after the men and women who make \$3, \$4, or \$5 an hour. Some would even apply the 3.2-percent guideline to those earning \$1.25 an hour.

Economic pressure applied like this to one group of Americans is patently unfair. Especially when it increases the profits of others.

CREATIVE FEDERALISM—A NEW CONCEPT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, a new phrase signaling a new concept in government has been introduced by President Johnson. It is "creative federalism." While the phrase is known to many of us in Congress, the public is only now beginning to hear and read of it.

Much of the domestic legislation passed by the 89th Congress is tied to the creative federalism concept through its emphasis on programs designed to create greater power and initiative at the local government levels.

This recent legislation is not designed to increase Federal controls but to inspire community initiatives to solve problems of education, employment, and health.

The Federal Government is to act only as a junior partner in the programs.

The concept of creative federalism has been analyzed in depth by Max Ways in the January 1966 issue of *Fortune* magazine. His article, entitled "Creative Federalism and the Great Society," follows:

CREATIVE FEDERALISM AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

(By Max Ways)

(Note.—There's much more to L.B.J.'s domestic policies than meets the eye. Government is learning from modern business that, when it comes to problem solving, power belongs out where the know-how is.)

As the huge program enacted by Congress in 1965 moves into action, U.S. history is making a major turn from the politics of issues to the politics of problems, from an emphasis on need to an emphasis on opportunity, from struggle over the redistribution of what we have to the less crude and more intricate decisions about what we might become.

Salient features of the new package include aid to education, medicare, and expanded Federal activities in the health field, urban renewal, and scores of other efforts to improve the physical environment. Since many of these topics have a long and embattled past

in public discussion, some observers try to force the present programs into the mold of yesterday's debates. They see the new programs simply as another surge in the drive begun thirty years ago to expand the Federal Government's share of total power in order to right social wrongs. When the Johnson program is put into that context, liberals automatically applaud it and conservatives automatically denounce it. Both are missing the point.

They fail to recognize that a fundamental break with the welfare-state trend occurred when this society made a different assessment of its own vigor. A new confidence in opportunity began to be reflected in politics 15 years ago and was a factor in both of the Eisenhower elections. Although John F. Kennedy's 1960 campaign included appeals to the older kind of politics, his statements and policies as President seldom moved back toward the assumptions about U.S. society that characterized his party's dominance between 1933 and 1952. Lyndon Johnson even more explicitly has founded his administration on the premise that U.S. society in general is exceedingly lively, increasing its rate of innovation and expanding its range of opportunity.

Two events early in Johnson's administration indicated his commitment to this premise. One was the way he argued the case for the income tax cut that Kennedy had proposed. Both Presidents, and especially Johnson, made it clear in the tax debate that they regarded the private economy, and not the pump of Federal spending, as the main engine of economic growth. The second event was Johnson's Great Society speech at Ann Arbor in May 1964. In some quarters this address has been misread as a threat to impose upon the U.S. future a Federal Government blueprint of what the Great Society ought to be.

But this interpretation is contradicted by the speech itself and Johnson's subsequent policies and words, including his 1964 campaign speeches. At Ann Arbor he was expressing, in his capacity of national leader, a bolder view of the prospect before the Nation, the widening range of choice presented to all its people and all its institutions, public and private. Toward the end of the speech, he suggested that the Federal Government would have an important part to play in the quest for a better future. Neither then nor later, however, did he intimate that the Federal role in the decisions ahead would be dominant or that Washington could supply the superior wisdom.

Along with the new assumptions of vigor in U.S. society came a new way of organizing Federal programs. At Ann Arbor and on five public occasions since then, Johnson has used a phrase, "creative federalism," that has not received the attention it deserves. Federalism means a relation, cooperative and competitive, between a limited central power and other powers that are essentially independent of it. In the long American dialog over States rights, it has been tacitly assumed that the total amount of power was constant and, therefore, any increase in Federal power diminished the power of the States and/or "the people." Creative federalism starts from the contrary belief that total power—private and public, individual and organizational—is expanding very rapidly. As the range of conscious choice widens, it is possible to think of vast increases of Federal Government power that do not encroach upon or diminish any other power. Simultaneously, the power of States and local governments will increase; the power of private organizations, including businesses, will increase; and the power of individuals will increase.

Creative federalism as it is now developing emphasizes relationships between Washington and many other independent centers

of decision in State and local government, in new public bodies, in universities, in professional organizations, and in business. This characteristic of the new programs is part of a rather belated application to government of the organizational habits developed by modern business. While everyone has been watching the influence of Government policies on the economy, the impact of the economy's strength and its mode of organization have been quietly altering the way the Government works. Tens of thousands of professional and managerial types, in and out of Government service, are shaping and executing Great Society programs. This is as it should be, for professional and managerial men are preeminently oriented toward direction choosing and problem solving within a complex framework of many centers of decision.

This new outlook in Washington is the deepest reason for the rapprochement, during the Johnson administration, between Government and business. The two still have and will always have different responsibilities and aims. But they are beginning to use the same working language, depend on the same kinds of people, and get at tasks and decisions in the same way. More than administrative style is involved in this Washington shift. The whole framework of U.S. politics is changing.

THE OLD POLITICS AND THE NEW

Many observers have noted disparagingly that the Johnson program—with the significant exception of civil rights—does not generate much public "excitement." Those observers are conditioned to expect a certain kind of political excitement that arises when classes or other broad groups in a society—each armed with principles of ethics, justice, constitutional law, or ideology—clash over whether Government power should be used to achieve or retain a group advantage. The 20th century, at home and abroad, has produced so many exciting political conflicts of this sort that they have come to be considered as the whole of politics and even, perversely, as desirable.

The Johnson program's relative lack of this sort of exciting conflict should be read as a clue to its fundamental novelty. Civil rights, the single domestic issue that today creates the familiar kind of popular excitement, points up the contrast between the old politics and the new. The drive for Negro equality invokes principles of justice and ethics in demanding that the weight of Government be employed to do for one large group what society itself has conspicuously failed to do. Government can do little for Negroes as a group without hurting (psychologically, if not materially) many whites most directly affected by such measures as school desegregation. When Government must decide how far it will go in taking cherished advantages from one group in the course of helping another group, an exciting political issue arises.

Most issues of the 1930's had this same characteristic of taking from group A to give to group B. Indeed, a class redistribution of income and power was one of the stated aims of the New Deal. Thirty years ago belief was widespread that the U.S. economy was mature, that a large and increasing proportion of all social initiative would have to be exercised through the Federal Government, that the hope of progress lay in the enlarged Federal power to take from the economic royalists and give to the underprivileged. In the struggle arising from such beliefs the political positions called radical, liberal, and conservative jelled into their present meanings.

The Johnson program does not fit any of these molds. Except for the special case of the Negro, every group is now believed capable of advancing under its own steam. Consequently, the old welfarist arguments for Government intervention lose some of their

force and urgency while the newer problem-solving approach comes to the fore.

Medicare, when it was first seriously debated in the 1940's, was presented with an emphasis on what the young owed to the old and, especially, on what the fortunate owed to the unfortunate. Today the viewpoint has shifted. It is now recognized that this society as a whole has a problem of paying for the greatly enlarged medical services now available to the aged; medicare is put forward as a device to deal with the problem. Similarly, the programs to improve education, clean up rivers, beautify highways, and reduce air pollution are not struggles between broad social groups. And they are not ideological issues. They are efforts to deal with problems by a society that is becoming increasingly confident of its problem-solving ability.

Specific Federal programs derived from this new approach may be good or bad, valuable or wasteful, disruptive or constructive. Each will certainly require close public scrutiny of its conception and execution. There will be plenty of chance for criticism and opposition when we learn to look at these programs in the context of the new politics. But effective criticism and opposition will not develop from the old yammer for or against any extension of the Federal Government's scope.

WILL THE PARTNER STAY JUNIOR?

Those Washington officials now busily setting up the programs like to describe the new roles for the Federal Government with the phrase "junior partner." An easy cynicism, bred of past conditions, is quick to suspect that this junior partner means to enlarge his scope until he takes over the shop. But an examination of the new programs in detail shows this cynicism is misplaced. These programs are so designed that they will work only if the "senior partners"—i.e., elements of the society other than the Federal Government—continue to grow and innovate vigorously. If that hope is disappointed, the Federal "junior partner," instead of increasing his power, will be in trouble with the electorate.

Because the Washington junior partners are aware of this danger, "creative federalism" includes a deliberate policy of encouraging the growth of institutions that will be independent of and, in part, antagonistic to the Federal Government power. Almost every part of every new program transfers Federal funds to some outside agency. Nothing will be achieved if the recipients—universities, State and local educational authorities, hospitals, medical schools, and poverty program councils—merely become subservient arms directed by the central Federal power. Tension between Washington and other independent centers is required by the whole body of experience out of which the notion of "creative federalism" comes.

This way of doing things entered the Government by osmosis from corporate management. Big corporations have been getting bigger, but executives are increasingly and justifiably impatient of outside criticism that, using the language of 50 years ago, attacks corporations as "monolithic" concentrations of power in a few hands. From the inside of any great corporation it is obvious that top management spends a great deal of its time trying to enlarge the responsibilities and strengthen the initiative of other power centers within the corporation. Such policies are pursued in the face of certain knowledge that the multiplied and strengthened power centers will develop troublesome tensions with top management and with one another. Top management does not pursue this "polycentric" policy out of altruism or masochism. It does so because the complexity of modern knowledge, reflected in the complexity of organized action, demands

that much of the decisionmaking be decentralized.

Not only is a high degree of local autonomy required but, even more significantly, a high degree of professional autonomy. Engineering decisions have to be made by engineers. Accountants, architects, artists, and xerographers acquire similar "states' rights."

Yet it is not correct to assume that the overall trend in modern organization is toward decentralization. Complexity has two sides: while specialization decentralizes interdependence centralizes. The art of modern management consists largely in discovering what to centralize and what to decentralize, and in constructing the channels through which information and decision, generated at many levels, flow. An old-fashioned "captain of industry," an industrial absolutist of the Henry Ford type, would be driven screaming into the night by the restraints and complexities of modern corporate "federalism." But it works.

Those business executives who still see in recent Washington trends only further expansion toward "absolute government" are as blind as those critics of big business who go on mouthing warnings against "monolithic" corporations. These business executives are doubly blind, because in the new Federal patterns they do not recognize their own children.

The new patterns first entered Washington at the point where the connection between government, advanced business, and science is most intense—the Defense Department. During World War II, teams of analysts began to apply techniques of "operations research" to military decisions. In the postwar period this approach spread to analytical comparisons of "weapon systems" by methods that worked back from battlefield value to factory costs. Secretary of Defense McNamara made the Pentagon a link in an informational and decision-making process stretching from White House policy decisions through prime contractors to thousands of subcontractors.

No one can calculate whether the vast activity we call defense is more or less centralized than it was in 1960; and the answer, if we had it, would not be very important. What matters is that the total system has a more rational and a more effective way of relating the parts to the whole. There is a conscious, unceasing effort to ensure that any given decision will be made at the most appropriate place—high or low, in Washington or out—and on the basis of the best information.

ROADS FOR THE HILLBILLIES

Many Great Society programs are marked by an emphasis, similar to that of the Defense Department, on "cost effectiveness."

Take, for example, Appalachia. The casual reader of the news may assume that the program for stimulating this backward region is just another dribble of welfarist pap from the Washington udder. The casual reader will be wrong. And he will be missing one of the most interesting of recent political innovations.

The act of Congress creating the program contains a remarkable clause: within Appalachia Federal funds are to be "concentrated in areas where there is a significant potential for future growth, and where the expected return on public dollars invested will be the greatest." This method of allocation runs counter both to the old congressional pork-barrel system and to the welfarist system that allocated funds on the basis of "need." Appalachia's "need" is such that the \$1.1 billion authorized by Congress would be frittered away if it were concentrated on the neediest hollows, the deepest hamlets, and the most eroded hillsides.

By making the greatest investment potential its basic criterion, the Appalachian Act directs the program to concentrate in an-

other way. Within Appalachia there are, right now, a number of economically vigorous towns that may be stimulated to greater growth. There are other areas where local initiative and private enterprise can make a case for a high potential return on investment. The new criterion of public spending leads the men in the Appalachian program to talk in businesslike terms about market analysis and plant-location strategy rather than in terms of social work. John L. Sweeney, Federal cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, does not try to wring the reporter's heart with statistics of beriberi and illiteracy in Appalachia. Instead, he makes his pitch like a chamber-of-commerce secretary, about how Appalachia, lying between the two great markets of the United States—the eastern seaboard and the Great Lakes complex—may have a glittering economic future.

But how will concentration on the growth counties of Appalachia help the people of the back hollows? How can it relieve them of the grim choice between continued poverty and psychologically disruptive migration to Chicago, Detroit, and other great industrial centers? In answer, Sweeney turns to a map. A large proportion of Federal funds for Appalachia will be spent to aid the construction of a road network that would allow the hill dwellers to live in the land they love and commute by bus or car to jobs in the growing centers of the region. Motorized transit offers the possibility of large labor pools without a megalopolis.

One danger of all this is that the Federal Government, in moving away from welfarist standards, will find it has let in the seven worse devils of rigid central planning. But the Appalachian program is set up in a way that minimizes this danger. The key power center is not Sweeney's office but a commission made up of the Governors of the 12 Appalachian States. States, counties, towns, colleges, and private businesses have already been stimulated to compete in presenting to the commission proposals based upon the test of "greater potential." If this local initiative continues to wax, Federal coordinating functions will be a small part of the total activity. If the local initiative subsides there won't be anything worth coordinating and the Appalachian program will be a clear-cut failure. In neither case will Washington have increased its "control" of Appalachia.

TENSION AT A HIGH LEVEL

The same organizational principles can be seen at work in the Government's relations with one of the most advanced sectors of U.S. life, higher education. John W. Gardner, the recently appointed Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare did much shrewd and unconventional thinking about this subject when he was head of the Carnegie Corp. of New York. Over a year ago in a speech to university people he took aim at the familiar charge that the flow of Federal money to universities represents a dangerous increase in Federal power and a threat to academic independence. He pointed out that there was another side to the story. "To the old-time Federal official used to a world in which Government funds were spent for purposes defined by Government and administered by hierarchically organized departments under complete Government control, the new trend looks like a grievous loss of Government power," he said. "Wherever he looks, he sees lay advisory bodies recommending how Government money shall be spent, and he sees nongovernmental organizations spending it."

A Government agency, because it is accountable to Congress and the taxpayer, wants to define quite precisely what is to be done with public money that it hands over to a university research project. The university, accustomed to the notion that science works best when it is free of externally imposed conditions, resists the definitions, re-

strictions, and reviews insisted upon by the agency.

Gardner has urged university people to give more sympathetic understanding to the Government view, and he has urged Government officials to see the university view. But he does not believe—and this is the important point—that the tension between them will or should disappear. "Actually, there is some advantage to the public interest in keeping a certain adversary quality in the relationship."

This thought gets close to the heart of "creative federalism." In the context of modern knowledge and work, whether we are talking about business or Government, the overall degree of centralization or decentralization is seldom an interesting or useful question. What matters is the quality of an ever evolving process of deciding which functions to centralize and which to decentralize.

TOWARD A LIVELIER SCHOOL SYSTEM

"Creative federalism" is also conspicuous in the hugely expanded federal program of aid to primary and secondary education. Some redistribution from the prosperous to the poor is involved in this program since Federal tax money, collected mainly from a graduated income tax, will be spent at a higher rate per pupil in poorer school districts. But this was not the central motive for enacting the new education program and is not the dominant idea of the administrators in Washington.

Two main motives have converged to increase Federal aid to schools. The first is the widespread belief that the next 30 years will see a rapidly increasing national need for better educated men and women. Economists believe this. Business executives, now running into skill shortages, believe it. PTA groups believe it. And it is almost certainly true. The second idea, held by many educators, is that techniques of teaching now stand on the verge of a major breakthrough into greater efficiency and improved quality. Clinical psychologists have demonstrated the lifelong importance of stimulating the learning processes of children under 6. For all age groups, radically new teaching materials—movies, closed-circuit television, programmed learning, recording devices—suggest that important advances may lie around the corner. How long it will take to turn the corner will depend partly on how much research and development is done in educational methods.

The Federal Government has no solutions to educational problems—and no particular competence in finding solutions. It has no set educational philosophy or policy to sell, and does not expect to develop such a policy. Those who hope and those who fear that the Federal Government is about to "take over" the schools are both off the track. The official expectation is that a heavy infusion of Federal funds entering the educational scene will further stimulate innovation and improvement at those points—nearly all outside the Federal Government—where educational innovation can actually be made.

A very large measure of control over the spending of Federal funds will be in the hands of State departments of education and local school boards. Congress even appropriated a small but significant sum for the purpose of strengthening State departments of education, some of which are now too professionally feeble to carry out the independent functions that the spirit of the program requires of them. Many local school boards, superintendents, principals, and teachers will find, if the Federal aid program works as it is supposed to, that they will have new budgetary elbowroom to develop their own initiative. Following the 1965 act, the Office of Education has invited local school boards to submit experimental projects, the most promising of which can be supported by Federal funds.

Until a few years ago there was scandalously little professional interest among university scientists and scholars in the quality of elementary and high school teaching. Lately there has been a great ferment, of which "the new math" and the new high school physics course designed by Prof. Jerrod R. Zacharias of MIT and his associates are the best known products. The Federal research program is designed to spread and stimulate this ferment.

The U.S. Office of Education won't do any of this research and it won't be able, even if it so wished, to exercise a tight control over research. Scholars and scientists will insist that they be given a rather free hand. Moreover, when any piece of research is finished, its conclusions are not going to be put into practice unless local administrators and school boards are impressed. Some proposals will be tried out in one State, some in another. Federal aid can help create a livelier network of professional information and evaluation—a "market," that is—in which the relative merits of educational innovations can compete more actively. Markets, of course, are far from infallible; but they are fundamentally different from decision-making by centralized control. The marvel is that this marketlike competition for forming educational policy is the one that now appeals to the people we are accustomed to call "educational bureaucrats."

WHO WILL CART THE GARBAGE?

Research and its more costly brother, development, turn up at point after point in the wide spectrum of enlarged Federal activities enacted by the 1965 Congress. A small but interesting example is the Solid Waste Disposal Act. Hah, cry the alarmists, now the Federal Government is going into garbage collection; the last rampart of local autonomy has been stormed. But maybe not.

The technology of a nation that can put men in space may discover a more efficient manner of garbage and trash disposal than burning it, or dumping it, or hauling it by scow to the open sea—which will wash it up on the beach of some other municipality. Cities struggle along with one method or another, and few of them can afford a thoroughgoing R. & D. project to find better ways of coping with the garbage and trash explosion. New ideas for solid-waste disposal will have to be tried out in practice, and in the trying it may be desirable for Washington to make a grant to some city willing to be, if one may put it so, the guinea pig.

Similarly, we have Federal programs for research into the causes of crime and delinquency and into better methods of transmitting information on suspected criminals. These do not necessarily imply that Washington is about to take over all the police work of the Nation. We will not necessarily be forced to choose between the Keystone cops and the police state.

Health, including medicare, is the largest single category of increased Federal spending projected by the 1965 legislative program. The fact that there is now a huge and increasing population over 65 years old represents medical triumphs in saving lives at all age levels. The public has shown its appreciation of the improved quality of medical care by increasing its payments for such services from a level of 4 percent of disposable income to 6 percent. Part of this increase represents the fact that "unit costs" of medical care have been rising somewhat faster than other costs. But in the main, the increase to the present level of nearly \$30 billion a year indicates that the public has decided that medical care is worth more than it used to be.

For the aged, especially, there are now many opportunities for treatment (e.g., the removal of eye pupils in cataract cases) that did not exist a generation ago. Once such

treatment becomes medically feasible, this society raises its standards of what it considers essential. Lack of money, it says, must not be allowed to stand between an aged person and a chance to preserve his eyesight. Even though private health insurance, pension plans, and individual savings have expanded rapidly, they lagged behind the new standards of minimum medical service to the aged. In a problem-solving society medicare was seen as a way of closing a gap that medical progress had opened up.

Unquestionably, medicare will throw a new burden of demand on medical services that are already overloaded. Recent Federal legislation provides funds to encourage the expansion of medical and nursing schools.

THE AMA SHIFTS ITS GROUND

Meanwhile, there may be opportunities to increase further the productivity and quality of medical services. To explore some of these opportunities a Presidential commission headed by Dr. Michael E. DeBakey of Baylor University proposed Federal aid for an elaborate system of regional centers for the treatment of heart, stroke, and cancer cases. The American Medical Association did not like DeBakey's plan, but in this case the AMA avoided the all-out ideological attack that had characterized its unsuccessful opposition to medicare. Congressmen, sitting down with AMA leaders and Federal officials, greatly modified the DeBakey plan into a setup that many doctors believe will work. Federal funds will be used to strengthen the professional networks that now run between practicing doctors and the great centers of medical research. In order to take advantage of the best medical knowledge, a patient in a small town will not have to be transported to a great teaching hospital; relevant information can be brought to his bedside by closer, quicker connections between existing research centers and local hospitals.

This is not a bricks-and-mortar program; Congress authorized no funds for new buildings. The goal, improved channels of communication among the doctors of a region, obviously can be sought only with local doctors in control of the program. The Federal fund dispensers can suggest procedures and can relay information from one region to another. They can deny funds to regional projects that do not meet the very flexible requirements set up by Congress. But the weight of authority will have to lie in professional organizations. Fifteen years from now medical practice will undoubtedly be organized quite differently, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that 99 percent of the decisions shaping the changes will continue to be made at points outside the Federal Government—even if, as is also probable, Federal activity in the health field expands.

THE CITY IS A PROCESS

In 1965 the Federal Government acquired a new Cabinet-level Department—Housing and Urban Development. Over the last 20 years, as the problems of the cities have become more formidable, there has been a change in how we think about these problems. This new way of seeing the urban challenge works against the danger that the Federal Government will "take over" the cities.

A generation ago, "slum" had a simple, physical meaning. It signified a group of buildings that were overage, overpopulated, and underequipped. That simple meaning implied a remedy, which is now understood to be inadequate; "slum clearance" and "public housing" would replace bad buildings with better buildings. All that was required was money and the Federal Government had it. In a program so conceived there would be some—but not much—inelastic need for local decisionmaking and local initiative. Federal housing on this model made some—but not much—improvement.

"Slum" today signifies a complex in which such elements as the quality of education and the morale of inhabitants are more important than the buildings themselves. Moreover, a slum is not thought of as an isolated "blighted area" that can be quarantined and dealt with independently of the rest of the city. We are now aware of "gray areas," which may be degenerating into slums faster than bulldozers can level old slums. From this and similar observations we have come to look upon the city as a process to be improved rather than as a product to be altered.

As any manager knows, improvement of a process requires analysis of how its parts affect one another and how they can be better coordinated to obtain the chosen objectives. It is simply unimaginable that in any given city the Federal Government can play a major role in such coordination. The problems are, city by city, so unique that local coordination and local initiative must be the determining elements. Experience bears this out. Philadelphia, New Haven, Boston, are cities where urban renewal is making huge strides because bubbling local initiative and increasing professional competence make effective the spending of Federal and other urban renewal money. By contrast, New York lags, not because it has been out of favor with Washington fund dispensers, but because it has lacked the local political and business leadership, which is more important than money from Washington. Members of Congress—relics of the old politics—who promise to "do more" in the way of increasing the flow of Federal money to such laggard cities as New York will continue to be helpless until local initiative develops.

Urban renewal, far from being an extension of the "monolithic" Federal power, has created or revived a host of local organizations, which have become centers of influence on reconstructing the process of living in cities. A Philadelphian involved in the revival of that city said: "Citizen organization is the principal phenomenon of this town." In other words, Federal housing money in Philadelphia helped to create and strengthen decision-making centers that lie outside of Federal control.

THE NEW LIMITS ARE PRACTICAL ONES

It is as true today as it ever was that a free society must be vigilant against concentration of power in a few hands. It is also true that in the 20th century many national governments, using humanitarian slogans, have tended to squash the sphere of local government and constrict the scope of private organizations and individuals. The United States has not been immune to this trend. Twenty-five years ago, State and local government in the United States was anemic, and predictions—some approving, some despairing—were widely made that the Federal political system must be transformed into a unitary national system on the British or French model. Twenty-five years ago the dispersed and competing power centers of private enterprise were being cramped by the encroaching power of Washington.

As resistance to this trend developed, the United States seemed to be in a struggle between what was politically practical and what was, by traditional interpretation, constitutional. The traditionalists lost ground steadily until it became much harder to see the tidy pigeonholes into which Americans used to separate what was private, what was governmental, what was State, what was Federal. Today the scope of Federal action cannot be specifically defined by categories (that is, defense and foreign affairs). The Federal Government may have a proper function in almost any field of action. This change raises a question: can a central government that has massive roles in business, agriculture, schools, health, and even per-

haps, garbage collection truly be described as a "limited" federal government?

The answer, oddly, is "Yes." The new limits on Federal power have been imposed by political practicality. Ironically, the popular hunger for progress that seemed to generate a threat to limited government has come to the rescue of limited government. An electorate that began to expect real results—and would not be fobbed off by such psychological titillations as "soaking the rich"—pressed political leaders toward more effective modes of action. These modes turned out to put a heavy practical emphasis on State and local government, on business freedom, on the market as a way of making economic decisions.

If in January 1956, anybody had forecast a Federal Government budget of \$175 billion by 1976, his prediction would have been taken to mean that more and more power would be concentrating in Washington. Today we can view the same prediction against a projected background of a 1976 gross national product of over a trillion dollars and understand that Federal spending at \$175 billion would take a smaller share of total national activity than the present budget does. Today we are less interested in the size of the total Federal budget than in the relative "cost effectiveness" of the programs that make up the budget. The old public sector versus private sector argument is giving ground before a rising interest in good management, both Government and private.

CONSTRUCTIVE WORK AND OUTDATED ORATORY

Lyndon Johnson as Senate majority leader in the Eisenhower years showed that he sensed the new political framework. He muted the strident ideological slogans that had dominated his party in the years 1933-52 because these class struggle slogans in a rapidly progressing country were losing their appeal. As President, his much-derided insistence on "consensus politics" is in part a shrewd recognition that "issues" are no longer central. Knowing that his new programs will be judged more by what they accomplish than by the good intentions of their authors, he has warned administrators to build these programs soundly rather than quickly. Even so, several of the new programs—notably the war on poverty—have run into serious organizational difficulties. Johnson's fundamental difficulty is that many leaders of his party are still stuck in the old framework where ideology counted more than good management.

Many Republican leaders are also stuck there, still firing irrelevant ideological guns at a target area from which the enemy is decamping. The great Republican political asset for the future is its hold on a high proportion of the managers and professional men whose skills are especially needed in the conception, execution, and criticism of the new type of governmental program. Use of this asset required close engagement with the new programs at local, State, and National levels. Beneath the surface of the last congressional session some exceedingly important work was done in improving Great Society measures proposed by the executive branch—and Republicans made a contribution to this improvement that has been somewhat masked by the party's own outdated oratory.

All through the postwar period, partisan political debate has lagged behind the radical change, generated outside politics, that has been sweeping through U.S. society. This accelerating rate of change, which appears to be a permanent condition, posed a challenge to the fundamental American political institutions. We are now emerging—successfully—from this period of challenge. In a way that was hardly conceivable 25 years ago, U.S. democratic institutions have proved flexible and adaptable and are becoming, once again, the objects of envy

and admiration by discerning men in other countries. The American political genius is moving through creative federalism toward new ways of expanding individual choice while maintaining social cohesion.

INVASION OF PRIVACY

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, during the past year, Congress has become particularly aware of problems involving the invasion of privacy. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER], a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations has been analyzing some of these problems, particularly in the area of psychological testing.

As a member of that subcommittee, and a Representative from New York City, therefore, I was deeply troubled to discover that the New York City Board of Education had recently allowed 350 ninth-grade pupils to be subjects for a highly intrusive personality test under a Federal research grant from the National Institute of Mental Health. The test in question was the controversial Minnesota multiphasic personality inventory which is supposed to aid researchers in discovering personality aberrations. I say "controversial" because skepticism about the scientific validity of the test has been expressed by several experts, some before our subcommittee.

The test given to the ninth-grade boys and girls included the following questions:

TRUE OR FALSE?

Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.

My sex life is satisfactory.

Evil spirits possess me at times.

I have never been in trouble because of my sex behavior.

I am very strongly attracted by members of my own sex.

I believe women should have as much sexual freedom as man.

I believe in a life hereafter.

I have never indulged in any unusual sex practices.

I am worried about sex matters.

Children should be taught all the main facts of sex.

I believe my sins are unpardonable.

I like to talk about sex.

I have been disappointed in love.

I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.

I believe there is a devil and hell in afterlife.

I wish I were not bothered by thoughts about sex.

I have never been in trouble because of my sex habits.

Many of my dreams are about sex matters.

Religion gives me no worry.

I feel sure there is only one true religion.

I am attracted by members of the opposite sex.

I deserve severe punishment for my sins.

Sexual things disgust me.

I am a special agent of God.

Christ performed miracles.

When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.

I pray several times a week.

I read the Bible several times a week.

There is something wrong with my sex organs.

I never attend a sexy show if I can avoid it.

A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.

I like movie love scenes.

I believe this examination represents a clear invasion of privacy and threat to civil liberties. I consider such tests improper and offensive and, with young students as subjects, capable of causing serious confusion.

Rather than measure psychological anxiety, such tests are more likely to cause it.

I was all the more disturbed to discover that the test had been administered without prior parental consent. The entire incident thus represented a deviation from existing policy as well as from good sense.

During the course of hearings held by the Special Subcommittee on the Invasion of Privacy, we expressed our concern for prior parental consent to members of the executive branch.

We are extremely anxious to protect the right of privacy for all schoolchildren and their parents where Federal research projects were involved. To this purpose, we communicated with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and received, from the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable Philip R. Lee, the following statement:

The principle that participation in research projects involving personality tests, inventories, and questionnaires is voluntary and, in those cases involving students below the college age, that the rights and responsibilities of the parents must be respected.

We understood this statement as constituting a commitment to prior parent consent. We understood it as a policy declaration to govern all administrative programs and executive discretion. We understood it as a rule which was not to tolerate exception or deviation. Apparently this has not been the case.

I believe, therefore, that the Congress has an obligation to close any loopholes which might allow future incidents of the sort encountered in New York City. I am, therefore, introducing today legislation which prohibits the expenditure of funds for the acquisition or use of personality inventory tests unless certain prior conditions be met.

First, steps must be taken to insure that the person to whom any such test is administered is notified that the test is voluntary and that he may refuse to take the test or any part of it without being subjected to penalty.

Second, in the case of a test administered to a person who had not attained the age of 18 years, the test will be given only with the prior informed consent of a parent or guardian. These conditions represent the principal assurance that transgressions such as that which took place in New York will not be repeated. These conditions will be made clear to all Federal departments and agencies which, in turn, shall emphasize them in all regulations.

In no way am I anxious to restrict the conduct of legitimate behavioral research. It is clear that such research can make an important contribution to higher learning and to the development of more enlightened social policy. I see no reason, however, to support such research if it means we must tolerate invasions of privacy. The right to privacy is more basic than the privilege of research. That right must be protected by the Federal Government in clear and unequivocal terms. I believe the legislation I am today submitting is a necessary step in an essential direction.

FOOD AID TO INDIA

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House approved a joint resolution supporting U.S. participation in a large program of food aid to India. I was happy to support the resolution because of India's critical food shortage caused by the unusual and extensive drought conditions last year that seriously reduced the harvest.

I am concerned, however, as I imagine many of my colleagues are, about the implementation of the program. The proposed commitment is a sizable one. India's wheat requirements for this year alone will be more than half of the U.S. total annual consumption of wheat.

With current boxcar shortages in many areas of the country and the economy almost on a wartime basis, I hope that those responsible for carrying out the program will emphasize to Indian officials the need for flexibility in making U.S. supplies available.

The situation in many ways is similar to those early post World War II years when world needs were great and the United States and a few allies were called upon to supply the bread rations that were so vital in maintaining the free world. Shipping wheat in the form of flour, as well as grain, greatly increased U.S. availability of food supplies—particularly for port loading.

This flexibility of handling food shipments provided a much broader base of supply by adding more sources from more locations and reducing pressures and difficulties caused by the concentration of bulk movement through a few selected port areas. With part of the shipments in bag form, more flexibility, both in loading in the United States and the unloading for distribution and use in India is provided.

In implementing special programs of this kind, I believe every possible consideration should also be given to the best utilization of U.S. labor. Many flour mills in our Southwest area have been operating only part time and some have been forced to close down. I understand the situation to be similar in other parts of the country. In fact, my attention

has just been drawn to efforts being made by union officials and some of my colleagues in New York State to do something about the great milling center at Buffalo which has been experiencing serious difficulties recently.

If more U.S. labor can be employed in this special program—especially labor that is now only working part time—not only people, but communities all over our country become directly involved in working to send food to India.

I think it is in the best interest of both the United States and India to keep our food assistance programs as flexible as possible by utilizing flour for shipments as well as unprocessed wheat.

IT'S NO PLACE TO GET RICH

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there is a persistent and cleverly designed political effort to discredit the anti-poverty program by playing up the compensation received by those administratively involved in the program. This is like any other program in that competent people must administer it; otherwise the intended beneficiaries will not enjoy what Congress intended them to receive. So far as I am aware the salaries of those administering the Federal funds which go into this program are consistent with the salaries received by those who are handling comparable responsibilities under similar programs involving the expenditure of Federal money.

Jack Kassewitz, able chief editorial writer of the Miami News, recently did an excellent piece on salary scales in Dade County's outstanding Economic Opportunity Program, Inc. Mr. Kassewitz points out that while EOPI is responsible for an antipoverty budget of \$4,470,000, with several million more dollars indirectly involved, EOPI administrative costs—including salaries—account for only 2 percent of the total budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Mr. Kassewitz' article inserted at this point in the RECORD:

IT'S NO PLACE TO GET RICH

(By Jack Kassewitz)

One thing seems certain in the war on poverty. The small band of administrators who are working to comfort perhaps one-fifth of this county's entire population will never get rich themselves at the public's expense.

Dade's Economic Opportunity Program, Inc., is fiscally responsible for projects in the community totaling \$4,470,000. Indirectly, several million more dollars is involved. And yet the administration of EOPI is accomplished with the expenditure of a meager 2 (that's right, 2) percent of the sum total.

Quite a bit has been made of the fact that Mrs. Jack Gordon, wife of the controversial school board member, has been, is, and will be, earning \$50 a day as a consultant for Project Headstart, designed to improve the educational lot of poor children. Now \$50

a day is a large sum to one who is impoverished. But it also happens to be a fair going wage for qualified consultants in the field of education.

OTHERS BUSY

Others are earning this same salary. For example, Dr. Elizabeth Metcalf, psychologist, is currently working to train teachers for Headstart. And architect Richard Rose is designing a million-dollar day-care center program. Like Mrs. Gordon, their contracts expire February 25, but may be extended, if need be.

Richard Weatherley, director of EOPI, isn't bashful about discussing his administrative setup. The Federal allotment for his entire staff totals only \$94,000, a minute portion of the overall project in Dade County.

Weatherley is paid \$15,000. The director of day care, Mrs. Leslie Danforth, is paid \$12,500, the same as Dr. Harold Strauss, director of the employment program. Fletcher Paschal who recently took over the community action program is paid \$13,300, which equals his salary when he was assistant principal at Brownsville Junior High.

Among the other administrators, Bob Wyrick, the community relations director, is paid \$8,500 and controller Harvey Kell \$9,000. Mrs. Betty Lou Barbieri, director of the volunteer program, is paid \$5,500, which is much closer to the average salary earned by most of EOPI's 165 staff members. (The U.S. Government says a person earning less than \$3,000 is "poor.")

BOARD INFORMED

EOPI is controlled by a 28-member board of civic leaders. Weatherley said he informed them last November that Mrs. Gordon, whose husband is a board member, was being hired for Headstart. "No one objected, and no one complained about a conflict of interest," said Weatherley. "In fact, I don't think there is, either."

"If you want to draw a parallel, look at Holmes Braddock, another member of the school board. His wife is a school teacher but I didn't hear anyone complaining about a conflict of interest."

"Mrs. Gordon was recommended to us by Dean John Beery, of the University of Miami. It's much more economical to hire a person of her ability on a short-term basis. She has the professional training we needed. That's why she was hired."

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to represent Miami Beach, along with my able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, DANTE FASCCELLI. The whole world knows of this great center of tourism and recreation. Nowhere on earth are there to be found so many beautiful and spacious hotels and motels, such delightful accommodations located so proximate to the Gulf Stream in such a tropical climate and tropical setting as in Miami Beach. Millions of people every year come to enjoy this glamorous city so perfectly designed for the delight of the visitor. The man responsible for the vision and the beginning of Miami Beach was Carl Graham Fisher, of Indianapolis, Ind., who bought land and

initiated the building of this magnificent resort with the comment that it would be the greatest resort area in the world.

Carl Fisher was as fabulous a character as he was a builder. The lovely and keenly intelligent lady who was by Carl Fisher's side in all these great days, his wife, Jane Fisher, has in the April number of Reader's Digest written of this extraordinary man under the heading, "My Most Unforgettable Character."

I believe this is a story everyone would delight to read—an exciting story about one of the exciting figures of our times, Carl Fisher. I therefore include this article by Mrs. Fisher in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

MY MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER (By Jane Fisher)

My favorite spot in Miami Beach is a tiny, flower-filled park where children play before a bronze bust of a smiling man wearing a floppy, broad-brimmed hat. Sometimes as I gaze at this likeness of my husband, Carl Graham Fisher, the city's gleaming skyscraper hotels dissolve into cloud castles, and I relive that day shortly before World War I when he took me to a sand dune in a steaming, alligator-infested swamp across Biscayne Bay from Miami.

"Honey," he said with his Hoosier twang, "I'm going to build a city here."

"Fisher's Folly," people called his idea. But Carl believed that "If you can dream it, you can do it." He built his dream city as he did everything else, by saying "I dare you" to himself, and moving heaven and earth to meet that dare.

LITTLE HONEY

I was going on 15 that memorable Fourth of July 1909, in Indianapolis when the starting bomb went off in a puff of white smoke, horses reared, John Philip Sousa struck up "Stars and Stripes Forever" and I got my first glimpse of my future husband. He was soaring into the sky in a white Stoddard Dayton roadster attached to an enormous yellow balloon—one of his publicity stunts.

To my elders, Carl Fisher was the flamboyant automobile racer and salesman who had built the big Prest-O-Lite plant on the edge of town. To us teenagers, he was the daredevil hero who had ridden a bicycle on a tightrope above Main Street. One night at the Canoe Club with my parents, I passed within a few feet of Carl's table and when he glanced up it seemed to me he looked into my heart. A few weeks later, when a fire broke out in our kitchen at home, the first thing I did was telephone his office: "Mr. Fisher, this is Jane Watts, the girl you saw at the Canoe Club, and my house is on fire."

"I'll be right over, Little Honey," said the deep male voice.

A neighbor had put out the fire by the time my hero drove up in his racy white roadster. His white felt hat was pushed back, buccaneer fashion; a yellow polo coat covered his broad shoulders. The handsome face was wreathed in a smile. When I explained about the fire being out, he said, "Hop in, Little Honey," and took me for my first automobile ride. We went to a field outside the city where he was building the Indianapolis Speedway.

"It's going to be the greatest automobile racetrack in the world," he told me. That, I was to discover was the Carl Fisher style—first the matter-of-fact announcement that he was going to do something nobody else thought possible, then the action. That dusty drive was the first of many with Carl that summer. One day he said, "You know, Jane, I'm going to marry you," and I said, "Yes, I know."

My stepfather took a dim view of a son-in-law almost his own age (Carl was 35).

but he and mother finally consented. At 6 o'clock on our wedding morning, a German street band began playing "Ach Du Lieber Augustine" under my bedroom window in a rainstorm, and nobody could stop them. "Orders from Mr. Fisher," the band-leader said. Then came a procession of wagons bearing flowers and presents. There was hardly room for the small wedding group by the time Carl arrived with his mother and Galloway, his Negro valet.

It was Galloway who decorated our apartment in Indianapolis while we were on our honeymoon. The apartment was arranged just like Carl's bachelor quarters. The doorbell was wired to an electrical player piano that played "After the Ball," to which Carl's St. Bernard, Collie and Airedale howled in chorus. The bedroom was dominated by a huge, revolving department-store rack filled with Carl's suits. Over the head of the bed hung large prints of Carl's lifelong heroes, Lincoln and Napoleon, and a piece of sandpaper for striking matches.

SKINNING THE CAT

Carl's drive and his impatience with convention were easier to understand when I learned more about his boyhood. In Greensburg, Ind., where he grew up, he was considered a show off. He couldn't pass a fence or gate without stopping to stand on his head or "skin the cat." He practiced tightrope walking on his mother's clothesline, and he built a pair of stilts so tall he had to mount them from an upstairs window. No one guessed that Carl was showing off to conceal the fact that his vision was badly impaired. Because he stumbled and upset things, his playmates called him "crip," and his teachers considered him stupid.

He left school when he was 12. His mother ran a boardinghouse, and Carl was the mainstay of the family. He got a job as grocery-delivery boy; he peddled peanuts and magazines on the trains. Having little but his own peanuts to eat, he developed a fondness for them and always kept a huge jar of salted peanuts beside his bed. It wasn't coincidence that the man who built the capital city of leisure was a small-town boy, who had to start working early and never stopped.

At 17, Carl started a bicycle shop and promoted sales by becoming a master cyclist. Later he began selling and racing automobiles as well, hurtling around the primitive dirt tracks, unable to see much further than the hood. But Carl's poor eyesight provided the challenge that made him a millionaire. This was "Prest-O-Lite," the name Carl gave to the acetylene gas which an elderly inventor named Fred Avery had managed to compress and store in a metal tank. "It's for use on automobiles so people can see the road at night," Avery explained.

Carl, conscious of his own poor vision, was excited. He bought into the company, and Prest-O-Lite tanks became familiar on the running boards of the early cars. When Carl sold out to the Union Carbide Co. a few months after our honeymoon, his share was \$10 million. Friends urged him to retire. But his life until then was only a preparation for the creation of Miami Beach.

PRETTY LITTLE TOWN NAMED MIAMI

Fate carried us there on the *Eph*, a yacht Carl ordered and named after a dog he had loved as a child. The boat was delivered by a young engineer named John Levi. Impulsively Carl invited him and some cronies to cruise down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico. When the *Eph* was beached by a hurricane on the west coast of Florida, Levi volunteered to sail the boat around to Jacksonville, where we would meet him. A couple of weeks later, Carl got a telegram: "Miami pretty little town; why not meet me here?"

We loved Miami at first sight, and Carl bought a house there, which we called "The Shadows." The front windows looked across Biscayne Bay to what was then a swampy.

jungle-covered island. One day we were exploring in the *Eph*'s dinghy when we heard a gentle voice call, "Is thee lost?" Before us stood John S. Collins, a 75-year-old Quaker horticulturist who had come to Florida 30 years earlier to pioneer the growing of avocados. Collins had gone broke trying to build a bridge to the mainland. Carl so admired Collins' courage that he lent him \$50,000 to complete it. One of the main thoroughfares in Miami Beach is named Collins Avenue.

A little later Carl bought the big tract of swampland. When he told me, he had that faraway look I knew so well. I can say truly that I saw Miami Beach when it was only a gleam in Carl Fisher's eye. Then he said it, softly, "Honey, I'm going to build a city here."

A GREENHORN WILLING TO TRY

So in 1913 the dream was born. From The Shadows I watched the work gangs fight their way through centuries of swamp jungle. The palmettos, anchored with roots that twisted the steel blades of machetes, had to be pulled out by mules with chains and grappling hooks. As the swamp was cleared, it had to be filled. That meant pumping millions of cubic feet of sand and mud out of the bay. Men loved working for Carl because he believed that they could do anything. "Experts tell me why something can't be done," Carl said. "Give me the greenhorn who's willing to try anything."

Two years later there were 6 miles of glistening white sand. Trees, flowers and grass were planted. Butterflies took the place of mosquitoes. But only a few houses went up. To get things started, Carl offered choice oceanside acreage free to friends who would build homes or hotels. But they shook their heads. One night early in 1915 when we were sitting before the fire, Carl said suddenly, "By golly, I've got it." He would build his dream city himself. Risking every penny he owned, he started building hotels, shops and even office buildings. Later that year, Miami Beach was incorporated as a city—with John Levi as mayor.

One day Carl burst out, "All these yachts, and no slips to hold them."

"What yachts?" I asked.

Carl was impatient. "Everybody will bring their yachts to Miami Beach. We will have to build yacht clubs." Eventually, he built a yacht basin that could accommodate all the yachts on the eastern seaboard. It was not until 1920 that land began to sell on Miami Beach. Then the great Florida land boom started here and spread outward. Carl had opened up a new frontier. It was just as wild and raucous as the old Wild West, but with yachts instead of covered wagons, millionaires instead of cowboys and real-estate operators instead of rustlers.

Carl used his flair for showmanship to sell Miami Beach. The leading polo players of the world were invited to bring their ponies to Miami Beach at his expense. (He started work on the stables before he had a single reply.) Carl laid out the world's finest golf courses before most Americans had even heard of the game.

Our new home, "the Beach Shadows," became the center for all that went on in Miami Beach during those early years of the twenties, and life there was a continuous party attended by just about every celebrity. James Whitcomb Riley, our Hoosier poet, was a regular visitor. Will Rogers once wisecracked, "Carl Fisher is the man who took Miami Beach away from the alligators and gave it to the Indians." In the midst of all the stir and glitter, Carl remained the unpretentious Hoosier. None of his many hotels, office buildings, or boulevards were named for him.

UNDAUNTED DREAMER

Once Carl's dream city had been caught up in the great Florida boom he helped cre-

ate, he started building a new "paradise" at Montauk Point, the sandy tip of Long Island, where he envisaged a summer playground in a great transatlantic harbor. Carl was in Montauk with a thousand-man crew, building roads, power stations, and hotels for his summer paradise when the great hurricane of 1926 hit Florida. "Miami Beach total loss," his agent wired him. Carl had used his Florida holdings to guarantee the bonds for building Montauk. Within months the huge Montauk project fell apart, and Carl knew that he must lose everything.

One by one over the next few years his properties were taken away—the hotels, golf courses, finally even his house on Biscayne Bay. Carl went right on making plans for vast new projects, even when he knew that a liver ailment left him little time to live.

"Hells bells, Jane," he told me a few weeks before he died, "I always did want to explore new territory."

In his own way, Carl was a great American frontiersman. Beneath the bronze bust in the little Miami Beach park is the inscription, "Carl Graham Fisher: he carved a great city out of a jungle." For all the adventurous Americans who are pushing back new frontiers, I think he would add this post script: "If you can dream it, you can do it."

EXCHANGES HELPFUL

MR. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

MR. REES. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Los Angeles Times of March 23 hails the new 2-year cultural exchange agreement which has been signed by the United States and the Soviet Union. The paper points out:

The fact that the exchange program has endured for almost a decade is proof enough that both sides find it worthwhile.

The United States favors the program because it enables at least a limited number of American scholars to get an inside look at Soviet society, and offers a breath of fresh outside air to many thousands of Russians who are otherwise cut off from Western ideas.

My colleagues will find this editorial most interesting and I have asked permission to have it included in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGES HELPFUL

A new 2-year cultural exchange agreement has been signed by the United States and the Soviet Union—but only, apparently, after President Johnson made it clear he expects the Russians to live up to this one.

The pact continues through 1967 the broad range of cultural exchanges which began in 1958.

As a result, American audiences will see the Bolshoi Ballet, the Moscow Philharmonic Chamber Orchestra and the Russian Festival of Arts group.

Among U.S. groups which will go to the Soviet Union are the Earl Hines jazz band, the New England Conservatory Chorus, and the Boston Symphony Orchestra's chamber group.

The exchanges also include scientists, technicians, scholars, motion pictures, publications, and such sports events as the United States-U.S.S.R. dual track meet to be held in Los Angeles, under sponsorship of the Times, next July 23-24.

The fact that the exchange program has endured for almost a decade is proof enough that both sides find it worth while.

For the Soviets, the advantages include the favorable image created by their touring theatrical groups and, more importantly, the opportunity to expose their scientists and technicians to American developments in their fields.

The United States favors the program because it enables at least a limited number of American scholars to get an inside look at Soviet society, and offers a breath of fresh outside air to many thousands of Russians who are otherwise cut off from Western ideas.

Unfortunately, the Soviets have not always honored the agreements.

The last violation occurred last year, when the Soviet Government refused to admit the Broadway musical, "Hello Dolly," despite its inclusion in the pact.

Mr. Johnson is said to have emphasized, before the new signing, that any breach of the agreement, or any harassment of Americans visiting Russia under the arrangement, will invite U.S. retaliation.

This is only proper. Furthermore, the retaliation should be where the Soviets least want it—in the sphere of technological exchanges.

AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce an amendment to the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit the admission of single or widowed women and men, aged 50 or over, to low-rent housing projects where unoccupied units are available for them.

In Bethlehem, Pa., alone, within the past 5 years, they have had to turn away as unacceptable for public housing—due to the age limitations—some 300 persons, most of whom are women in the age 50 through 61 group. There is rarely a week that goes by that a request for application is made and they must be turned away because the law says they are ineligible. This is unfortunate in face of the vacancies that exist now, and have for several years, in this particular public housing development. Other housing authorities of comparable size have the same problem. They have the space, the men and women in the age group 50 to 61 are desperately in need of this type of housing, and they are not permitted to accept them. This amendment would not apply to the housing authorities who are filled and have no difficulty keeping their units occupied with families of the low-income bracket, which of course public housing is basically intended for.

But in many instances, because of the rising economy and tenants moving out to purchase homes, with little or no pool of applications, this presents a real threat to local authorities insofar as their operating economy and increased maintenance cost is concerned.

Many persons, particularly women, live on a small income, and decent housing is a big item in their financial picture. I have been told that women have begged and pleaded to be allowed to rent vacant units and have gone away in tears after they have been told that the law says they are ineligible because of their age. The units are available, they are decent respectable men and women—the majority being widows—in the low-income bracket, the local authority needs the income from the units to meet their expenses, but the law reads that only the disabled or physically handicapped are eligible in that particular age group.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to place before this House an amendment to the housing code which will be beneficial to everyone concerned. It will provide housing to that in-between group who are now denied safe, decent, and adequate housing because of their age. It will augment the local authorities finances which in turn will work for the benefit of all.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TODD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, what appears to be unsound management practices have been disclosed by an investigation of Small Business Administration financing. The Committee on Banking and Currency has just concluded a series of hearings on the financing of Small Business Administration lending activities by the device of selling off loans and other evidences of indebtedness held by the Administration.

This financing approach also contemplates the sale of participations in pooled loans through the Federal National Mortgage Association as provided by legislation currently before the committee. This approach is being urged upon Congress in preference to the more normal method of obtaining operating funds through the appropriations process.

Aside from the merits and demerits of these different approaches, Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House should be aware that the Small Business Administration has recently sold about \$75 million of debentures acquired in the course of financing small business investment companies. The agency hopes to sell a total of about \$110 million of the debentures to institutional investors at a yield of 5 3/4 percent. This is an unprecedented rate for an obligation carrying with it the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. Furthermore, the manner in which these debentures were brought to market has been incredibly sloppy and unbusinesslike. No doubt the high interest rate—which is markedly higher than other agency obligations—reflects the poor management of this financing arrangement.

It seems to me that the taxpayers deserve more careful handling of their financial affairs, particularly when public spending is at an alltime high.

But even more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is the question raised by both the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], as well as several other members. All these committee members have challenged the legal authority of SBA to dispose of these debentures. This is indeed a serious charge to make—that the legality of a \$110 million sale of Government assets is under a cloud. As I have mentioned, \$75 million of these debentures are already in the hands of innocent investors whose title to these certificates may be invalid.

When faced with this charge, the best SBA could do was cite an opinion by the General Accounting Office. They had not bothered to check first for an opinion of the Attorney General. Furthermore, both our committee staff and the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress have prepared legal opinions sharply critical of the GAO's decision that the debentures could be legally sold.

In fact, GAO's recent concurrence with SBA represents a reversal of a previous GAO opinion rendered in 1962 that SBA's statute does not permit the sale of SBIC obligations held by SBA. Further doubt is shed on the legality of this \$110 million transaction by the fact that in 1963 specific legislation was considered necessary to permit SBA to enter into participating agreements with lending institutions with respect to loans to SBIC's. Also, if SBA has such broad authority as SBA and GAO seem to think, why is SBA currently before the Congress for authority to sell participations in pooled loans?

These questions demand straight answers, Mr. Speaker, and I expect by April 19 when we resume consideration of the participation bill, S. 2499, that we will have them. I am pleased to report that the committee staff has been instructed to look fully into this matter before we reconvene.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO DEFENDS ADMINISTRATION'S COINAGE PROGRAM BEFORE COIN COLLECTORS

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a speech by one of our most able members of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] concerning our Nation's coinage problem has come to my attention. In his address before the United Coin Collectors Alliance in Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois spells out in a reasonable and logical way the problems and pitfalls

which faced the Treasury Department because of the increased use of coins, the shortage of silver for the minting of coins, and Congress answer to this problem, the Coinage Act of 1965.

Too often, citizens cannot understand the reasons for Government actions, especially concerning those situations which affect them directly. When the critical shortage of coins became evident during the past few years, the public, especially the coin collectors, became very much disturbed. The Banking and Currency Committee passed the administration's Coinage Act of 1965, changing for the first time since 1790 the amount of silver in our coins. Mr. ANNUNZIO was an active member on this piece of important legislation. I commend the gentleman from Illinois' brilliant analysis of the coin shortage problem, the Coinage Act of 1965, and his own illuminating remarks on his work as an active legislator to the Members of the House.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN FRANK ANNUNZIO, DEMOCRAT, OF CHICAGO, AT MEETING OF UNITED COIN COLLECTORS ALLIANCE, LA-SALLE HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 2, 1966

I am certainly happy that I was able to leave Washington in time to meet with you this morning. It is most unusual for the House of Representatives to meet on a Saturday, but it can happen and it has happened, and so there is always a degree of uncertainty about scheduling appearances at meetings like this, even for weekends.

Fortunately, nothing intervened—no emergencies in the Nation's Capital to keep us in attendance on the House floor. When the House is not meeting on a weekend, I find I can accomplish much more by being here in Chicago, meeting with constituents and business groups and organizations of all kinds, than trying to find anyone who will come to the telephone in the deserted offices of the Federal Government. I am not against the 5-day week, but L.B.J. and I, and a lot of others in elective office, largely have to just imagine what a 5-day week is like from the standpoint of our working schedule.

This is work—being here with you—but, like so many of the tasks which go with my office, it is pleasant work—work which I enjoy. When you are engaged in that kind of work, the hours are never burdensome—at least not to the spirit.

Coming here today to meet with the coin collectors—amateur and professional—in the United Coin Collectors Alliance is a continuation and extension of an important part of my congressional responsibilities as a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The jurisdiction of this committee is very broad. Much of the legislation we consider and pass upon is of vital and direct concern to every American citizen, and to our role in international affairs as the preeminent industrial Nation of the world and as the greatest factor today in the maintenance of what peace the world now enjoys.

I am proud that in my first term in the Congress, I was honored by the leadership of my party in being placed on this important committee. In keeping with the responsibilities which go with that honor, I take my assignment on the banking committee most seriously, and try my best to study and become thoroughly acquainted with the complex issues we must consider, from the activities of the Federal Reserve System to the interest rates charged a serviceman on his purchase of a car.

One of the happier chores in that assignment is to work on legislation affecting the monetary system of the United States. The

decision by our Founding Fathers to provide a decimal system of coinage was one of many—a great many—fortunate judgments which were made in the earliest days of this Nation for which we can always be deeply grateful. Now that Australia has gone over to the decimal system, and Great Britain is following suit, we can derive further satisfaction and pride from the foresight of the men who first helped George Washington to free our land as a Nation and then to build it into an enduring political structure—the oldest democracy under a written constitution in the world.

As everyone knows who is interested in coin collecting, this hobby provides a valuable insight into the history of mankind and of nations, and it certainly provides many fascinating echoes of the exciting history of our own Nation.

Therefore, as a Member of Congress who believes deeply in the American political system, I welcome the entry of more and more Americans into the field of coin appreciation, if that is a good term for numismatics. The idea that some people have that coin collecting is some sort of exercise in miserliness is completely false. Society has always despised the miser—a person who covets money not for the good which can be done with it, or the useful purposes to which it can be put, but as something to hide away where no one else can derive any use or enjoyment from it. I have yet to run into an honest-to-God coin collector who fits into that category. One thing I have noticed about a genuine coin collector is that he wants everyone else to share with him the pleasures of a great "find". In that respect, you are like lovers of painting or sculpture or music, who recognize greatness in a piece of art and want everyone to have the opportunity of enjoying this same pleasure.

Unfortunately for your quiet pursuit of this hobby, a lot of factors conspired in the past few years to change the environment of coin collecting. The most dominant factor, of course, was the increasing, world-wide demand for silver, for photographic purposes—which, alone, require more silver than the United States produces a year—and for electronics, and missile and submarine components. As we became more comfortable, economically, with more and more people working at better wages, the demand for silver jewelry and silverware also rose. We finally reached a point where the deficit in silver supply could be overcome only by tapping the huge reservoir of silver in the vaults of the Federal Government at West Point.

These things were happening just at the time when demand for coins in our economy was reaching fantastic dimensions. The tremendous expansion in the vending machine industry was a major factor in this hunger for more and more coins, but a lot of other factors also came into the picture. Hence, in only a relatively few years after the closing of the San Francisco Mint because we had "too much" mint capacity in the country, we found ourselves in a situation where the Federal Reserve System had to ration coins to the banks, and the Treasury Department, running the Philadelphia and Denver Mints day and night around the clock, were unable to overcome the shortage.

That's when a lot of fast buck operators, who never were legitimate coin hobbyists but were the kind of fellows who rush into any unusual business situation in order to try to make a killing, began to muscle in on our silver supply and our coins—anticipating a rise in silver prices. Where a coin collector might be interested in several specimens of each coin, and a coin dealer might be interested in reasonable inventories to sell to collectors, the speculators were interested not in bags but in tons.

I am glad to say that the Congress rose to meet this challenge. We did not pass

panic legislation aimed at the coin collector. We did not make it a criminal offense to save coins, or to buy and sell them on the numismatic market. We avoided action, too, which would have had the consequence of raising substantially the costs of doing business for American businesses dependent upon supplies of silver for their products.

The steps we did take were not particularly happy ones, but they were reasonable and necessary ones.

First, the Congress relieved the intense pressure on Government silver stocks by authorizing the Federal Reserve to issue Federal Reserve notes in the \$1 denomination, to replace silver certificates. Thus, it was no longer necessary to have \$1 worth of scarce silver immobilized forever in the Treasury to back up every single \$1 bill in existence. This released large quantities of silver for industry.

Next, and reluctantly, Congress temporarily froze the date of our coins to ease the pressure from those buying them in huge quantities for future numismatic value. This step was taken concurrently with a vast expansion in the production of coins, under a crash program which put to productive use every inch of space in our mints, and every machine which could be found and put into operation making coins. The results have been truly astounding—phenomenal.

And then, last year, after a comprehensive study into all phases of coin metallurgy by an outstanding private research institution, the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio, Congress enacted the Coinage Act of 1965 which made profound changes in the composition of our subsidiary coins and gave us the new clad coins in which little or no silver is used. We now have had some experience with the new silverless 25-cent pieces and just in the last month we have begun to see some of the silverless dimes and the 40-percent silver half-dollars.

Let me say that, as between a 90-percent silver coin, such as we have used in this country for so many generations, and the new clad coins, I prefer the looks of the old coins. The new dimes and quarters take some getting used to. The new half dollars looks so much like the 90-percent silver ones that only the date reveals the difference to most people, but nevertheless, I am sure no one really prefers the new coins to the older ones. So I am not going to try to pretend that the new coins are better looking or more desirable.

But don't ever let anyone shortchange the new coins or disparage them, without giving that person a rebuttal. The new coins work, and they work well. They make possible the continued use of millions of vending machines which supply this Nation with billions of dollars worth of merchandise in a fast and efficient and effective manner. They are worth their face value—for they carry the full faith and trust of the United States of America, and you can't ask for better than that.

Furthermore, as a result of having the new clad coins, we do not now face the dangerous prospect of being without necessary supplies of silver for defense and essential civilian needs, nor do we face any curtailment of our enjoyment of photography as a hobby, or the purchase of a handsome sterling silver gift to a June bride. Had we continued making the 90-percent silver coins at the rate we need coins for commerce, our silver supplies would now be approaching exhaustion, the price of silver would inevitably rise substantially—on a worldwide black market if we had tried to impose controls—and the value of the silver in our coins would have outstripped the face value of the coins to the point where they would be going into melting pots instead of vending machines and cash registers.

The solutions which Congress and the Johnson administration devised for this serious crisis were imaginative and resourceful; and we can all be thankful for the resilience of this Nation in solving a problem which could have been disruptive of our entire economy. We can maintain, and are maintaining what amounts to an effective ceiling on silver prices so that the existing silver coins are not jeopardized, while at the same time assuring the silver mining industry sufficient incentive—through a floor on silver ore values—to expand production. Eventually, a Joint Commission on the Coinage, authorized under the Coinage Act of 1965, will recommend a policy for the future role of silver in our monetary system.

In the meantime, all of you who are interested in coins, as a hobby or professionally, can help us in the Congress by sharing your ideas with us for future legislative actions in this field. The silver dollar, for instance, is still the symbol and standard of our coinage system, but, as you know, we have minted none for 31 years and will not do so for at least another 4 years. Should we consider a nonsilver, or low-silver-content dollar coin? The degree of success of the new half-dollar will probably help give us some guidance on that idea. I have received so far no indication of any failures on the part of the new coins in doing their job as mediums of exchange, but there are still many problems to be overcome, including the construction of facilities in the new mint at Philadelphia which can handle the production of the clad strip from which the coins are stamped.

These are factors, too, in the prospects of repealing the section of the new law dealing with mint marks. Had we continued to use mint marks, the immediate demand for new coins from all three mints now in operation—even though we do not officially refer to the San Francisco operation now as mint—would have been tremendous on the part of all coin collectors. Now that we have 1965 dates again, with the prospect that we can also go to 1966 and thus assure continuity of dating in coin collections, I don't think we are unreasonable in asking for some patience at this point on mint marks. I am sure they will return—they serve a useful purpose from a practical sense as well as for the hobbyist—and if the production at the mints meets our expectations, I think the day of the return of mint marks can be brought much nearer than originally intended.

Much as I want to make you happy and give you every possible assistance in the enjoyment of a wonderful hobby, I would not promise mint marks a moment before we can achieve this goal from a practical standpoint. On the other hand, I would not be willing to delay their return any longer than necessary. I will pursue this matter with great interest, and if and when the time arrives for appropriate action, I will introduce legislation—but only when I am convinced the time has arrived. I know that Mr. Minzer and others feel that this can be accomplished fairly soon and I am perfectly willing to study the problem further.

The newly announced mint sets are a great step forward which I am sure all of you applaud. The price is high: \$4 for a single set of 5 coins, compared to the \$2.10 which used to be charged for genuine proof sets and the \$2.40 for the 10-coin mint sets issued up to 1964. But considering the many hand operations which will go into their production, and the tremendous demand for numismatic material of this kind from all over the world at comparable prices, I would rather see a \$4 set available which everyone could buy than a \$2.10 set which could be produced only in limited volume and would instantly be worth far more to the lucky few who obtained them than the Treasury price. I think, once again, we should wait a bit to see how this new

activity works out in operation. Mr. Minzer has advised me that he has seen the new mint set at Miss Adams' office and that both he and your president, Mr. Forman, were very much impressed by its appearance.

I was asked to discuss the fate of the 2,977,555 silver dollars now on hand in the Treasury. The chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, one of the greatest men to serve in Congress, whose interests as a legislator range over a remarkably broad field as the author of the Robinson-Patman antitrust law, the originator of the House Select Committee on Small Business, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and author of one of the most informative books ever issued on the structure and functions and operation of the U.S. Government, has brought forward a widely discussed solution for the distribution of these desirable coins through several of our great, national, non-profit organizations, the Cancer Society and the Heart Association. A majority of the members of the committee, including myself, have introduced identical bills to that introduced by the chairman. We have not yet held hearings on this legislation, but interest in it is very high.

I saw the recent editorial in Numismatic News suggesting that the proceeds of the sale of these rare coins go to the Smithsonian Institution for the further development of its numismatic collection. Any such suggestions, of course, are worth considering. However, I believe your primary interest is in making these silver dollars available on a fair basis to collectors, who will enjoy them as examples of a fine art, and who would be proud to add them to collections which would be shown to other collectors and to children who have never had the thrill of getting a "cartwheel" of their own.

In conclusion I would like to leave this thought with you: we in the Congress have many responsibilities to the public. Different groups in the population believe some things we do in which they are primarily interested are more important than other things we do which affect different groups. The pressures on us are many and varied. We cannot succeed in our jobs if we try to please everyone, or if we bend to pressures we believe represent bad public policy. We must use our good judgment and weigh the consequences to the entire country of every action we take. So it is not how much noise a group makes which gets results in Congress, it is how much sense it makes in its arguments for legislation.

As students of our coinage system, you want, I know, only what is best for a country you love. You couldn't be coin collectors without having a deep-seated love and respect for the distinctive features of our political system. Therefore, I know we can count on your help to do, always, what is best for the country. In that spirit, I welcome any suggestions you may make to me for future legislation. Thank you.

DECLARATION ON AMERICAN UNITY AN ANSWER TO THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, the right to be free is the most cherished of all rights. It is the most

basic of all rights, and yet, it is a right for which man has had to struggle and fight since the beginning of his time on earth. This struggle and this fight continues today, for without this constant struggle there would be an erosion of freedom until it was lost irretrievably.

It seems strange and incomprehensible that in today's civilization and in this age of scientific achievement and other wonders, many peoples of the world have lost their freedom—albeit the struggle to regain it persists.

With these few words, I should like to call attention to a declaration on American unity recently adopted by the Association of Cuban University Professors in Washington, D.C.:

DECLARATION ON AMERICAN UNITY AN ANSWER TO THE TRICONTINENTAL CONFERENCE

Men are born free and have the right to live in freedom.

The responsibility we all have to defend this liberty cannot be delegated.

Communism has canceled, at the Tricontinental Conference, its policy of specific coexistence with the developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The Soviet Union, Red China, and Castro have coincided in the support of the so-called wars of national liberation against the peoples of Latin America, and have emphatically and overtly stated their purposes and their means for the aggression and subversion which they are using for the overthrow, through violence, of the governments established in Latin America.

The appeasement, the temporized pacifism, the repetition of Communist slogans about the social and economic problems, minimizing the danger and hiding the truth from the people is a manner-conscious or unconscious—of cooperating with the enemies of liberty, of the dignity of the human race and the survival of our peoples.

There is but one communism, its menace is not diminished because of the slant adopted.

The aggression, direct or indirect, of communism against any of the peoples of the free world, is in fact, and must be recognized, as an aggression to the rest of the peoples. The people thus attacked have to have the solidarity and the support of the rest of the free peoples, as it happens with Vietnam.

The Republic of Cuba, a member of the Inter-American system and signatory of its principles and norms, has had its territory turned into one occupied by a Communist regime, through deceit and the use of terror and force.

The people of Cuba are, and of right should be, free and independent, and it is the duty of America to help the Cubans in reinstating their liberty and to guarantee their independence.

America must exercise the right of legitimate defense, be it individually or collectively, against Communist intervention which keeps a sovereign state, member of the inter-American system, submitted and enslaved, preventing it thus from exercising its self-determination, and which from there is promoting subversion in all of Latin America.

The speeches, agreements, and resolutions of the so-called Tricontinental Conference, which took place in Havana, gave form to the violations through aggression and intervention in the internal affairs of the American states, associated by international law and repudiated by the *Jus Gentium*.

America's hour has struck in history's clock. The American people cannot wait indefinitely for the diplomatic process, nor for the appeasement which they reject. The time for definitions has arrived; we are ready for combat; the peoples are demanding of

their leaders intelligence and courage, and from their institutions, strength.

The peoples, lulled by Communist propaganda and for lack of decision, lose their fighting capability and become easy prey to deceit and subversion.

Those who today do not understand what the responsibility of America is, should step aside so the legitimate heirs of Washington and Bolivar, Marti and Sarmiento, of Juarez and San Martin, of O'Higgins and Artigas, of Morazan and Sucre may step forward and occupy the leader's position.

We, free men of America, with but one right, our irrevocable decision to offer our lives to defend the principles and the values of the inter-American system, invoking the help of God, declare—

That the principles of communism are incompatible with the inter-American system.

That communism is not negotiable in this hemisphere.

That the continental unity and the democratic institutions of this hemisphere are at present in danger.

That the purpose of the subversive offensive launched from Cuba is the destruction of our democratic institutions and the establishment of totalitarian dictatorships at the service of extra-continental powers.

That in order to achieve their subversive purposes and to conceal their real intentions, the Communist governments and their agents exploit the legitimate needs of those sections of the population that are less fortunate and the just, national ambitions of the peoples.

With the excuse of defending the popular interests, freedom is suppressed, democratic institutions are destroyed, human rights are violated, and the individual is subjected to the materialistic way of life imposed by the dictatorship of one sole party.

That maliciously utilizing the principles of the inter-American system, they try to undermine our democratic institutions and to consolidate and protect their political infiltration and aggression. The subversive methods of the Communist governments and their agents constitute one of the most subtle and dangerous manners of intervention in the internal affairs of other countries.

That the essential constitution of each nation and of the inter-American system for the collective effort directed to protect the freedom and the security of the human being, must be, has to be, the use, in self defense, of the adequate means of repelling aggression and of sanctioning the aggressors.

That the warning of the inter-American system addressed to the Castro government contained in the fifth resolution of the Ninth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers has been disregarded and violated by that government, that contrariwise it has persisted in its subversive and interventionist activities.

That communism is intrinsically perverse and extrinsically dangerous for liberty, security, and peace.

That any time communism attacks a people, violates its sovereignty and endangers its independence, no matter where, we must resist and repel its aggression.

Vietnam is the most recent example. For this reason, we support the struggle of the people and the Government of South Vietnam for the maintenance of their independence; we also support the policy of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, and of the rest of the free world concerning Vietnam.

Also for the same reasons we support the Organization of American States (OAS), the body which represents the inter-American system, we proclaim—

That America is more than a geographical area. It is a spiritual and material unity based on the principles and values of the inter-American system, the stronghold of liberty, security and peace.

That the peoples of America are brethren, united by one ideal, one common destiny; therefore, there cannot be liberty, security, or peace in the whole if none of these exists in one of its parts.

That the values and principles of the inter-American system have to have full sway in all of America.

That communism is incompatible with the inter-American system, and at the same time, is also its worst enemy.

That the inter-American system is obligated, historically, judicially, and morally, to assist, with the closest solidarity, the Cubans who fight for the reinstatement of the principles and values of the same system.

That at the Tricontinental Conference which took place in Havana, Cuba, Castro and other Communist governments declared subversive war to the death and until final victory, against the established governments in Latin America. There is no alternative; we have this war before us, whether we do or do not like to recognize this reality.

It is a war—

Of liberty against slavery;

Of love against hatred;

Of God against militant atheism;

Of economic and social development, and the security and peace of America against terrorism and subversion;

Of democracy against communism.

America has the floor. Sanction must be raised against the aggressors. Cuba must be liberated and reinstated in the inter-American system. Thus, the unity of America will be integrated.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for April 4 and 5, on account of Jewish holiday.

Mr. DYAL, for April 5, 6, 7, and 11, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WAGGONNER, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBOOK (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.), for 30 minutes today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Saylor, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 19, 1966.

Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. Saylor), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, April 19, 1966.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARRETT and to include a talk given by Mr. PATMAN, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. BERRY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. WRIGHT.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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;

S. 2573. An act to validate the action of the Acting Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, in extending the 1955 leave year for certain Federal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 2719. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the purchase of Alaska by the United States from Russia; and

S. 2831. An act to furnish to the Scranton Association, Inc., medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Scranton, Pa.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4599. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for the Congregation Emanuel, Denver, Colo., and of certain chipped colored glass windows for St. Ann's Church, Las Vegas, Nev.;

H.R. 6568. An act 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;

H.R. 6845. 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;

H.R. 7723. An act to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to suspend the duty and certain tropical hardwoods; and

H.R. 9883. An act to amend subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 6, 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:

2274. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facility project concurrently being approved under the exemption provided by

statute, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1)(b), and pursuant to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2275. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (43 U.S.C. 315g); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9070. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 777. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 803. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or any subcommittee thereof to travel to the Republic of the Philippines and South Vietnam; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 811. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7406, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 812. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 7524, a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 13881. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 14224. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to extend through May 31, 1966, the initial period for enrolling under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1419). 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. ADAMS:

H.R. 14279. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and

other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 14280. 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.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 14281. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 14282. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 14283. A bill to provide that the value of annuities and pensions payable under the Civil Service Retirement Act or any other Federal law shall not be taken into account for State inheritance tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14284. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide monthly insurance benefits for dependent or surviving sisters of certain insured individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 14285. A bill to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 14286. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to reduce the amount of matching funds required from the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 14287. A bill to provide a special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14288. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to prohibit, except in certain circumstances, the expenditure of funds by any department for the acquisition or use of personality inventory tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.R. 14289. A bill to establish a nationwide system of trails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 14290. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 14291. A bill to provide for the strengthening of American educational resources for international studies and research; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 14292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for additions to a reserve for certain guaranteed debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14293. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H.R. 14294. A bill to extend and amend the Library Services and Construction Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 14295. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 7-percent increase in all annuities and pensions payable thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 14296. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit the admission of single or widowed women aged 50 or over to low-rent housing projects where unoccupied units are available for them; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHISLER:

H.R. 14297. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the determination of American selling price in the case of certain footwear of rubber or plastics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 14298. A bill to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include lined or unlined drainage ditches, pipes, or channels as soil conservation expenditures and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 14299. A bill to provide a system for the return of Federal income tax revenues to the States to be used exclusively for educational purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 14300. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to provide more equitable and realistic benefits thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 14301. A bill to establish a Bread and Butter Corps for the purpose of implementing the foreign policy of the United States by strengthening the agricultural economies of friendly nations, improving agricultural skills and knowledge in such nations, promoting world peace and friendship, and combating the threat of world food shortages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 1030. Joint resolution to provide for the administration and development of Pennsylvania Avenue as a national historic site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 1031. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 1032. Joint resolution expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 1033. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1034. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER:

H.J. Res. 1035. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.J. Res. 1036. Joint resolution to establish an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 1037. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.J. Res. 813. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and

Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H. Res. 814. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Basic Human Rights and Peaceful World Order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H. Res. 815. Resolution relative to the anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,
444. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to orderly development of public

lands, including utilization of sufficient water therefor, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 14302. A bill for the relief of Ettore Perovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 14303. A bill for the relief of Masayoshi Arashiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 14304. A bill for the relief of Antonina Lombardo and Angelo Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 14305. A bill for the relief of Petroula Doula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 14306. A bill for the relief of Estrella Vespertina Zamora-Vega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 14307. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleftheria Yannitsiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 14308. A bill for the relief of Bruce R. Zeller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 14309. A bill for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 14310. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Cuervo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 14311. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giuseppe Sebastino Saglimbeni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rural Landowners in Single Texas County Set Conservation Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district of one county is at least half urban in area and predominantly urban in population, but the extent of soil and water conservation work being carried on by landowners is so impressive that I wish to call attention to it.

The Dalworth Soil and Water Conservation District in Tarrant County has 1,573 cooperators. These cooperators own and manage 255,668 acres of land, all of which is covered by updated agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to provide assistance in carrying out longtime soil and water conservation and resource use programs as outlined in the district work plan.

About 97 percent of the cooperators have basic farm conservation plans prepared on 70 percent of their land with a number of practices underway. Soil surveys have been completed on 326,000 acres, involving a portion of the urban land.

Tarrant County is in the Trinity River watershed and is included in 5 of the 52 subwatersheds of the Trinity River flood prevention project, authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Construction and land treatment in the five subwatersheds are at various stages of completion, but already rural and urban residents are beneficiaries of installed works of improvement that have reduced floodwater damages in a number of areas.

I believe this is an exemplary showing in a county where the urban area matches the rural in acreage and where urban interests and influence in many ways predominate.

It is a tribute to the rural landowners in Tarrant County and the leadership of the soil conservation district supervisors that soil and water conservation programs on the land have increased.

The Nation needs this kind of community initiative in its rural areas. Tarrant County is demonstrating that soil and water conservation work can help to provide the impetus.

I am hopeful that during this crisis this reservoir of skilled doctors will make another fine humanitarian contribution.

I commend this excellent idea of Dr. Waldbaum to my fellow Congressmen, and ask for your ideas and comments.

Tight Money Is Threatening the President's Housing Program:

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 5, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine, Dr. M. G. Waldbaum, a practicing physician and surgeon, in Omaha, Nebr., has proposed a noble and humanitarian idea. It is this: He believes that there are many retired doctors who would volunteer their services for an indefinite period for the Vietnam war effort.

These men could relieve younger doctors for more responsible duties in battlefield hospitals. The retired doctors could assist the wounded on military aircraft ambulances in their flights to hospitals outside of Vietnam. These men could give routine physical examinations, provide treatment, perform surgery, and myriads of other medical tasks.

According to the American Medical Association there were 10,293 retired physicians and surgeons in the United States on March 1, 1966.

There would be a number of ways the program could be handled. Volunteers could ask for overseas, or domestic duty, and select the length of time they desire to serve.

I have always found the medical profession to be helpful in the time of need.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Housing Conference celebrated its 35th anniversary and was addressed by our distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. No Member of this House is better qualified and more involved in housing programs from New Deal days to the present than the gentleman from Texas.

The National Housing Conference has long been a powerful and moving force in aiding the Nation's housing and urban development programs. The combination of WRIGHT PATMAN and the National Housing Conference is a force which has been a prime mover in providing better homes for all our citizens.

As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have had the privilege of presiding over the hearings on the President's demonstration cities program and other housing bills. Chairman PATMAN's somber warnings on the effect that the tight money situation and high interest rates have on the housing market, the individual homeowner, the Nation's economy, and the President's Great Society programs are warnings that must be heeded if our housing and urban programs are to move forward.