United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Therefore I tell you, whatever you ask in prayer, believe that you receive it, and you will—Mark 11: 24.

In response to the call of our President that we unite in prayer for our country—we pause in Thy presence this moment praying that Thy spirit may come anew into our hearts and into the hearts of all our people. May we not only hear the cry of humanity for justice and freedom but may we heed it. May violence cease, may understanding between the races increase, may intelligent good will prevail, may the needs of the needy be met that there be no cause for bitterness and hatred.

We pray that everyone may have his chance to grow and to work and to live that our Nation may be in deed and in truth the home of the brave, the land of the free, and the one country which has liberty and justice for all. In the Master's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro;

H.R. 1564. An act for the relief of Antonina Rondinelli Asci;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of John Joseph Shea;

H.R. 1724. An act for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa;

H.R. 1814. An act for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro;

H.R. 1818. An act for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos;

H.R. 2532. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez;

H.R. 3631. An act to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land;

H.R. 5224. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh;

H.R. 5862. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves;

H.R. 5996. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcelo; and

H.R. 9080. An act for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Munoz.

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

H.R. 678. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Upper and Lower Chehalis Tribes of Indians in Claims Commission docket No. 237, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Demetria Messana Barone; and

H.R. 4538. An act for the relief of Dr. John E. Yannakakis.

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

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila;

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas;

S. 491. An act to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 528. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming;

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski;

S. 811. An act for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich;

S. 828. An act to amend section 5(b) of the act of March 18, 1966 (Public Law 89-372), so as to make the prohibition contained therein on the filling of certain vacancies in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania inapplicable to the first vacancy occurring after the enactment of such act;

S. 946. An act to amend the Tucker Act to increase from $10,000 to $50,000 the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation;

S. 1105. An act for the relief of Dr. G. F. Valdes-Faull;

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Montes;

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Santiago Vidal Santiago;

S. 1406. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Mestas;

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Tran Van Nguyen;

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee;

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez;

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto;

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Lopez Garcia;

S. 1500. An act for the relief of Dr. Adela Aurora Rubio Madariaga;

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini;

S. 1544. An act for the relief of Jose Eduardo Aunon;

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias;

S. 1701. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes;

S. 1898. An act for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmassy; and

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An Act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 68-2.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

JULY 31, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on July 31, 1967, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agreed to the Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6098) entitled, "An Act to provide an extension of the Interest Equalization Tax, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PERTAINING TO SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the author-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ity granted him on Monday, July 31, 1967, he did on that day sign the following enrolled bills of the House:

H.R. 6098. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11089. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

DAHOMEY'S SEVENTH BIRTHDAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the close and friendly relations between the United States and the Republic of Dahomey are a source of pleasure and pride to us all. We continue to be impressed with the objectivity and sense of responsibility which the Government of Dahomey has maintained in assessing and acting upon the flammatory international issues of the day; Dahomey's role in the recent U.N. General Assembly session on the crisis in the Middle East is a clear case in point.

Today Dahomey is 7 years old. While working with energy and determination to solve the problems of economic development and nation building at home, Dahomeans have shown the significant part a small country can play in the broader context of developments on the African continent. A leader in the field of education, this nation of two and a half million people has helped to fill the trained manpower needs of many of its French-speaking neighbors. Dahomeans have also served frequently and with great distinction in responsible staff positions in the various African regional and subregional organizations.

On this day of independence of the Republic of Dahomey, we take joy in expressing to His Excellency President Christophe Soglo and the people of Dahomey our heartiest congratulations and best wishes for a bright future. My personal good wishes go also to Dahomey's Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Maxime-Leopold Zollner.

THE NATIONAL GUARD SHOULD BE COMMENDED FOR ITS PERFORMANCE IN THE HANDLING OF CIVIL DISTURBANCES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 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 Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the news media have been very critical of the performance of the National Guard in the riots which have occurred in our big cities. I am sure these have been isolated cases where mistakes have been made by the guardsmen. But as a whole the National Guard has performed a very fine job. Their assignments have been dangerous and undesirable.

Only today the Washington Post carried headlines stating "Guard Accused of Three Murders." The article is based upon hearsay and upon general charges. But it will be read as an indictment against the Guard.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen and heard on television and radio some of the abuses and insults that guardsmen have had to take during these riots. We have also seen and heard the dangers involved.

Let us not forget the fact that these men are citizen soldiers and that they only train once a month. It is true that the training program for the Guard has been almost void of riot training. However, some States have taken the initiative to see that troops have had ample training in riot control. The responsibility of requiring riot training lies with the Secretary of Defense and the Continental Army Command. Any deficiencies in training cannot be the fault of the Guard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that these men have risked their lives and that they are running the risks of losing their civilian jobs. My personal experience has shown that about 5 to 10 percent of these guardsmen who are called upon for an extended period of duty lose their job as a result of their service.

Mr. Speaker, these guardsmen should be commended for their personal sacrifice and duty, and not made the scapegoat of this sad tragedy.

PRIORITIES OF OUR NATIONAL BURDENS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in facing immense issues of this painful time in our Nation's history, I hope that we will set priorities, saying what is first and second and third.

For these issues involve staggering costs. How can we handle all of them at once? The antiballistic missile system would cost perhaps $33 billion. The hostilities in Vietnam are costing near that figure in the course of just 1 year alone. The cost of regenerating our once great cities, where decay has set the inhabitants to burning them down, could easily be $33 billion, too.

Thus, in total, $100 billion are needed now, Mr. Speaker, to handle what faces our country today. Such a figure approximates the annual Federal budget in those happy days before any of the three burdens settled upon our shoulders.

Of these three tasks, I am certain that the restoration of our cities is first. Our cities should be the bone and sinew of our society. If this part of America is consumed with cancer, our body cannot exist.

The defense of our country, whether by antiballistic missiles or by other means, is a priority that cannot be ignored. The possibility exists that binding guarantees among the nations to limit missile use could spare us this cost.

As for Vietnam costs—being spent with such poor success—these we can certainly reduce. I hope we will do it soon by taking the initiative to end our involvement on that far Asiatic coast.

THE SALE OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT ABROAD

Mr. SIKES. 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. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, present discussions of America's role in providing weapons to other nations is resulting in a very serious problem for the only friend we have left in the Mideast. In part as a result of efforts to put a brake on the sale of American military equipment abroad, Israel again is being confronted with a threatening situation from Arab nations. Israel's losses in aircraft were moderate, but there have been no replacements for these losses. More serious is their inability to get spares—engines and parts—with which to maintain first-line efficiency on the aircraft remaining in the Israel inventory. France is now refusing to help Israel with supplies. The failure of the United States to do so leaves Israel with no reliable source of aircraft and spares.

By contract, the Arab forces, whose equipment was heavily depleted by the effectiveness of the Israel strategy, are being resupplied rapidly by the Russians. The United Arab Republic has received more than 200 Migs, most of them more modern than the ones destroyed and this represents substantially more than a 50-percent replacement of war losses. It is also estimated that approximately half of the tanks which were lost have been replaced and this accounts for only a part of the newly arrived Russian military equipment.

Control of the air was a vital part in the smashing success enjoyed by Israeli

forces. Control of the air continues to be vital in the volatile Mideastern situation. The threat of a renewed confrontation continues to hang over the area and the rapid buildup of Arab weapons and aircraft from Russian stocks adds tinder to a still-smoldering fire.

Obviously, the Arabs know of this country's refusal to help Israel and this encourages Arab belligerency. Refusal on our part to help Israel is most untimely and it could produce highly undesirable results. Israel should be allowed to acquire needed replacements of aircraft and spares from available U.S. stocks in areas other than those required for Vietnam.

SAFETY RECORD

Mr. WAGGONNER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I always like to call attention to remarkable achievements whenever they are brought to my attention. The July-August issue of the Shreveporter, the publication of the Western Electric Co. in Shreveport, calls attention to the plant's safety record. The Shreveport plant passed its first 26 months of operation without a single lost hour due to accidental injury. This 5-million-hour achievement is truly remarkable considering the more than 1,700 employees working at the plant. In recognition of the achievement, each of the employees was presented with a multipurpose silver tray.

SHREVEPORT OBSERVES NEW SAFETY RECORD

More than 1,700 employees at Western Electric's Shreveport Works have each been presented small, multi-purpose silver trays in recognition of their having attained more than five million hours of operation without a lost-time accident.

This record marks a period of more than 26 months in which the Shreveport Works has recorded no days lost due to on-the-job injuries.

The new safety figures have been posted on huge safety signs located in the plant.

General Manager F. C. Boswell, in offering his congratulations to the employees, said, "More than five million safe hours is in itself an outstanding accomplishment. To me, however, the fact that you have worked since operations began—more than two years ago—without a single lost-time injury, is even more impressive."

"I fully realize," Boswell added, "that this achievement is one in which each of you had a very personal part in attaining. You have put real meaning into the Bell System's safety slogan. 'No job is so important and no service is so urgent that we cannot take time to perform our work safely'."

Official presentation of the first tray was made to Kent Lynn, representing the production employees as president of Local 2188, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Boswell said, "Because of the cooperation and active part you and other members of your union have taken in administering our safety program, I am pleased to present you with this silver tray as a memento of this occasion. We are extremely proud of the safety performance of all our employees."

MAKING THE COUNTRY SAFE FOR MOOCHERS, LOAFERS, AND LEECHES

Mr. WAGGONNER. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal judiciary has never been outstanding for paying the least bit of attention to the practical ramifications of its utopian rulings, so the recent decision invalidating the Connecticut residency requirement for aid to dependent children should not cause them any grief either. But it would be interesting to know if they really realize what they are doing when they scramble to make the country safe for moochers, loafers, and leeches.

There is no reason to hope that the Supreme Court will not uphold the lower court's decision. And this appears to be just the first of a series of assaults of residence requirements for all forms of welfare. The funds for this suit against the Connecticut Welfare Department were provided through a poverty program grant, showing that mediocrity does indeed feed on itself. We can now expect to see the welfare programs grow with even greater vigor, now no longer hindered by any of the controls which in the past have kept it within reasonable bounds much of the time.

This was just another battle in the war against fiscal and social stupidity—a war that could yet be won if the Congress will continue to show its independence and commonsense in dealing with these hairbrained schemes. For the information of all I am including the following editorial from the Shreveport Times of July 14, 1967, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WELFARE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS

Louisiana is one of 40 states that will be affected, if the U.S. Supreme Court upholds the 2-1 ruling of a three-judge federal court in Hartford, Conn., invalidating Connecticut's residency requirement for aid to dependent children. Our state law, similar to the revoked Connecticut statute, requires residence of one year by the child or one year by the parents or relatives with whom the child might be living, prior to application for assistance.

The Connecticut law is unconstitutional, according to the majority opinion, because it violates the right to travel. Federal Judges N. Joseph Blumenfeld and J. Joseph Smith based their decision on the equal protection clause of Amendment 14. As they construe it, "the right of interstate travel also encompasses the right to be free of discouragement of interstate movement."

In other words, a state has no right to try to safeguard its welfare funds from moochers looking for the largest handouts available in the country. The increased burden on the state and its taxpayers when indigents flock to it has no bearing on the matter so far as this ruling is concerned. The possibility that a heavy increase in welfare rolls might cause deterioration of services to deserving clients who are long-time residents of a state was completely ignored.

Ironically, public funds were used to bring the suit against the Connecticut welfare department. A community action group, supplied with anti-poverty money, initiated the suit. Instead of going for the training of poor persons for lucrative employment, these funds were spent to boost welfare rolls in states offering the most help to dependent children.

Suits to revoke residency requirements for other forms of welfare can be expected. Sen. Vance Hartke (D-Ind.) last month introduced a bill to outlaw residency requirements for aid to the blind. He insists such a restriction is inequitable and unnecessary.

Naturally, they are inequitable, because the states, even with federal help, cannot afford to provide identical amounts of assistance to welfare clients in the different categories. But the senior senator from Indiana is not taking a realistic view of mounting state welfare problems.

It is not surprising that the first of the residency requirements to be attacked in the courts was the one for aid to dependent children. Naturally, that welfare program is the largest and it is growing faster than any of the others. Also it is creating the worst problem for state and local welfare agencies.

Aid to dependent children cases have jumped from 2,271,000 to 4,817,000 during the past decade. More than half of all welfare expenditures goes to support this program. U.S. News & World Report this week says that many of the persons who know the program best think the aid has become a racket. In certain states it is possible for families with a large number of children to collect as much as $6,000 or even $7,000 per year through the welfare system. Illegitimacy runs high among these unfortunate children, and many of the unwed mothers continue to have offspring.

In 1965 (the latest year for which national figures, state by state, are available) there were 106,672 recipients of aid for dependent children in Louisiana as compared to 77,774 in 1950. Average monthly per recipient payments rose from $13.96 in 1950 to $23.09 in 1965. For the fiscal 1965–66 year, out of the $10,830,674 expended for all forms of public assistance in Caddo Parish, $2,269,639 went for aid to dependent children. Just one other category, old age assistance, accounting for $7,383,753, outranked that program.

Welfare problems will become much worse than they now are, especially in big cities, if the federal court ruling in Connecticut is allowed to stand. States with rapidly increasing welfare rolls will cry for more federal contributions and the Washington bureaucracy can dig deeper into state and local affairs with every increased allotment.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, because duties required my presence in New Hampshire I would like to give an explanation of how I would have voted yesterday—Monday, July 31—on roll No. 190 on the conference report on H.R. 6098, the Interest Equalization Tax Extension Act of 1967.

I would have voted "nay" on this conference report consistent with my nay vote on the bill when it came to a vote

before us on March 15, 1967, on roll No. 36.

THE VICE PRESIDENT INSULTS CONGRESS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Vice President of the United States, in a time of domestic national emergency for which his administration is directly responsible, attempts to blame the Congress of the United States for abetting rioting, I am appalled. This is political demagogy of the grossest kind.

Coming from a man who within a year told the people of this country that if he lived in a slum he could lead a pretty good riot himself, it is in the poorest of taste. The Vice President should apologize to the Congress for his unwarranted slur.

We in the Congress just do not happen to agree that the answer to the problem of riots is more handouts. What is it suggested that we should do—pay off rioters with more giveaways?

This Congress has the deepest reservations about Great Society programs. We know that this Nation is on the edge of fiscal bankruptcy because of the Johnson-Humphrey administration overspending. We know that the added debt this year will approach $30 billion more.

We also know that every country in the history of the world that has taken this road of monstrous debt has gone down to disaster.

Why does not the Vice President admit that the record of his administration has been one great big failure for the people of America—from debt to crime to war? Some difference from the days of a Republican administration when there was no war, we were not in debt up to our ears, and crime was not rampant all across the land.

The truth of the matter is that the Great Society is now so bankrupt of responsible proposals that like a drowning man the Vice President bleats defiance at a Congress that seeks to achieve responsibility in government once again. This we have not had in government since L. B. J. and H. H. H. came into office whether in law enforcement or the conduct of our foreign affairs.

The mess we are in is the direct responsibility of the Johnson-Humphrey administration. It is their baby, not that of the 90th Congress. I hope the good people of this land are beginning to realize this and that they will remember it well on election day 1968.

More and bigger handouts is not the answer, Mr. Speaker. It is not even a beginning of an answer. This Congress does not want to see the country go broke. This Congress realizes the cost of the Vietnam war and with all due respect to the Office of the President of the United States differs fundamentally with the President when he says that the country can afford continued Great Society freewheeling spending and a war at the same time. This Congress, and particularly those of us on the Committee on Appropriations, solemnly realizes that the debt in the current fiscal year of the Johnson administration will probably increase by nearly $30 billion. This Congress knows that history tells us that no nation in the world, even the great United States of America, can stand this sort of fiscal drain without its currency going somewhere in a hack. This Congress knows that the working men and women, the homeowners, the savers, the thrifty, the responsible are being cheated left and right by the Great Society. This Congress, Mr. Speaker, in brief, is for certain going to slow down and look and listen before it takes us further down such a road to debt and inflation.

Perhaps the most disturbing part of the latest bitter attack by the Vice President on the Congress of the United States at this particular juncture in American affairs is that he should deliberately undertake to undermine the working relationships between Congress and the executive branch at a time when there is serious and even urgent need for cooperation. This is not the hour to play politics with the public interest. Yet, this is precisely what Mr. HUMPHREY is doing.

President Johnson did it the other day with respect to Detroit by attempting to claim Governor Romney was to blame for losing control of law and order in that city. The President did it again the other night on national television by reciting Great Society programs and suggesting that a Congress that took a dim view of $40 million for an additional Federal rat control program was against the people and would, with indifference, allow children to be bitten by rats when the President knew that this was not so, that there was a proliferation of existing Federal programs in rat control, that money was short and that this was in no sense the proper function and role of the Federal Government in any event.

Just how bankrupt this Nation has become under the Johnson-Humphrey administration's irresponsibility in government is readily apparent from a recitation of but a few dismal facts.

First. Under the Johnson-Humphrey administration we have come to open warfare in the cities of this land, with thousands dead and billions in property losses; with white people fleeing to the suburbs, hatemongers inciting to riot left virtually unrestricted, the tax base in urban metropolitan areas sharply narrowed, and general chaos everywhere.

Second. The Johnson-Humphrey administration has us involved in a major war on the continent of Asia, 10,000 miles from home, against the best judgment and recommendation of every military adviser—a war which it does not permit the military to fight to win, a war in which there are already more than 12,000 American dead and 90,000 American casualties, a war the cost of which defies imagination and already runs in excess of $2,000 million each month.

Third. A world in which the foreign policy of the Johnson-Humphrey administration has been so horribly mismanaged that we have virtually no friends, no allies or alliances worthy of the name, and a distintegrating Western cooperation against communism to a point which all the Johnson-Humphrey administration can talk about while the Communists make war against us is building bridges to the Soviet Union. This would be ludicrous if it were not so awful in its implications for the men who are drafted and asked to die in Vietnam.

Fourth. Contrasted with the Republican administration of General Eisenhower, the people of America now grasp the full significance of what "moving ahead" with the New Frontier and the Great Society has meant for them. There were no race riots under a Republican administration. There was no runaway crime in the streets. There was no governmental leadership so amoral that it was permissive toward a court that refused to restrict the flow in commerce of narcotics or the blatantly pornographic, encouraged experimentation with belief in the existence of God Almighty, refused again and again to protect the law-abiding members of society by overprotecting the known and admittedly guilty criminal element; a court that in recent years has decided directly or indirectly nearly 100 cases in favor of Communists and communism often against the national security of the United States of America.

The American people are aghast that the Johnson-Humphrey administration does not instruct its Attorney General and its Department of Justice to proceed full-blast against the militant inciters to riot and hatred or individuals who in specific places in this country are allowed to say in public such things to Negroes about white people as "You're going to have to decide who your enemy is, where you are going to kill him and how you are going to kill him. If you're going to loot, loot yourself a gun store. You've got to arm yourself, brother."

There are ways and means for the Attorney General to deal with this sort of situation in cooperation with State enforcement authorities but the order has not gone out from the Johnson-Humphrey administration to crack down. It might cost a few votes. Let the cities burn. Let the people suffer. Play the role of the Pied Piper. After all, tragically, the Johnson-Humphrey administration apparently prefers to play politics with rats to settling down to the firmness and responsibility necessary to run the Government of the United States the way the people of this land so desperately want and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the days of the Great Society, its waste, its indifference, its crime, its war, and its riots are numbered. The people's will is for a Republican administration to restore responsibility in government again. I predict that if the choice in November 1968 is between the Johnson administration and almost any responsible Republican team there will be an overwhelming vote to turn out of public office those whose years of playing politics with issues of vital importance to the national security have now been shown to have sown what some of

us have repeatedly warned would be the case—fruit of the grapes of wrath.

The Vice President owes this Congress an apology for an unwarranted slur.

VANDALISM BUT NOT VIOLENCE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. KYL. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in the early morning hours today, Northwest Washington was the scene of widespread vandalism. A number of store windows were broken. Apparently there was no substantial theft connected with the window breaking. There seemed to be no special pattern for the offenses.

Anticipating something far worse than the actual situation warranted, some reporters were quick to call this a "riot," tending to link the activity with other events around the Nation. This was not the case. Reporters have not used the term "riot" when hundreds of windows have been broken in schools of the District on a recurring basis.

Thirteen juveniles were arrested. I am informed that all but two of these were known to the police. They were charged with disorderly conduct, throwing missiles, and so forth. There was no classic "inciting" of a riot. There was no one to sustain a riot. The police acted with dispatch and, I believe, with fairness. The Youth Aid Division men acted in accordance with their usual policy which I call a policy of "forceful restraint."

A few weeks ago I called attention of the House to certain areas of the city where there is an overabundance of vice and petty crime or worse. Juveniles have no business on the streets in such areas, or any other areas, at 2 or 3 a.m. These are areas of rapidly deteriorating property, yet areas where there are large numbers who have taken pride in property improvement.

This morning the sector is quiet but concerned. The concern is nothing new, for the experience is too usual. There was vandalism but not violence. That vandalism was probably extended by the prevailing climate. A riot, it was not.

PRAYER OR POLITICS?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, with great fanfare and much nationwide publicity, President Lyndon Baines Johnson declared Sunday, July 30, 1967, as a national day of prayer, urging, and I quote, "citizens in every town and city in the land to go into their churches to pray for order and reconciliation among men." The President evidently has faith in the power of prayer.

At the time the President made this statement last week, bills to allow voluntary prayer and scripture reading in public schools were pending in the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittees of both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

President Johnson has not taken a stand in favor of these bills. In each year since the Supreme Court struck down school prayer in the 1962 case of Engel against Vitale and the 1963 case of Murray against Curlett, Members of Congress have attempted to overturn these decisions and permit voluntary prayer in our public schools. The President of the United States has remained silent.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask where does the President stand on this subject of prayer? I fervently believe that our Nation was founded on Judeo-Christian principles and that it is of utmost importance that our children be reminded of these principles in our schools as well as in our homes. Perhaps the moral environment of laxness and disdain for authority, the very climate that has encouraged the riots the President asked the Nation to pray to prevent, would not exist if these principles were recognized in our schools.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge the President to use the powers of his office to encourage passage of the Dirksen prayer amendments pending before Congress to further show that he does, in fact, believe in the importance and the necessity of prayer in these troubled times.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

Mr. COWGER. 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 Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I join with other of my colleagues in calling upon the President to establish a Neighborhood Action Crusade across America.

It has been my good fortune to serve for 4 years as the mayor of one of the largest cities in America. During those 4 years there was not one brick, there was not one bottle, there was not one bloody head in Louisville, Ky.

Each weekend I returned to my district to discuss the problems of America and its street fighting. I have found, as others have, a readiness on the part of everyone to help.

As the President asked for prayers last week, so we ask him this week to declare our Neighoborhood Action Crusade with volunteers across America.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

Mr. BUSH. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday four of us wrote the President in that we believed to be a constructive vein. We proposed that he use the great powers of the Presidency to create a Neighborhood Action Crusade, a locally controlled program designed to enlist volunteers from the cities to patrol their own blocks and their own neighborhoods.

Today we are introducing a resolution urging the President to initiate this program.

Our basic thesis is that Negroes do not want violence and riots and disorders. Like all Americans, they are concerned and fearful.

We offer this voluntary program not as a cure-all, not as a substitute for any existing program, but as something that should be tried now. We offer it as a temporary program to help keep the peace, and we offer it without political partisanship.

In this tense and troublesome situation, we must guard against a gigantic reaction which will cancel out the progress which this country has made, and the best way to do this is to encourage the leaders in the neighborhoods to stand up for law.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we have confidence in the people in our cities. They will demonstrate to all Americans and to the world, through the Neighborhood Action Crusade, that civil strife is the tool of the few and that it will not become a way of life in America.

I urge all Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, to cosponsor this resolution and to encourage the President to act now.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

Mr. STEIGER 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. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have joined my colleagues in introducing this resolution as a step toward inspiring the involvement of the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans to whom violence and riots are repugnant.

The Neighborhood Action Crusade will provide a vehicle for all local neighborhood leaders to work and contribute direction and leadership to a national effort to restore orderly progress toward a realization of the expectation of all Americans.

It is our hope to bring together all Americans and all American institutions in a united front to defuse today's tension so that we can get on with the job of rebuilding America's cities.

We are attempting to foster a nationwide program aimed not at politics but at the problem. It is time to halt narrow partisanship. We have called for the cooperation of all segments of our population.

The young men and women of the ghettos are increasingly assuming a more responsible role through such programs as the Tampa White Hats, and I laud their dedication. But, this crisis is a tragedy for all of us. There is a clear and present need for drawing the mature stabilizing influences within every tense neighborhood into active participation in preventing further loss of life and property in America's cities.

LET'S HAVE MORE LIKE JUDGE LOBLE

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on April 10 of this year I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a provocative article which appeared in the Washington Star entitled "Why Not Try Teaching Moral Precepts Again?" by Reed J. Irvine. The article advanced the possibility of again reintroducing into our schools the subject of moral training through character building and the respect for the law and the rights of others. It is indeed distressing that with the stories of riots in the headlines from day to day there is hardly any references to moral training as one of the preventive recommendations.

Emphasis on moral training would, of course, be a long-range approach. Of a more immediate nature are the corrective phases of the treatment of lawless conduct. A recent book, "Delinquency Can Be Stopped," by Judge Lester H. Loble and Max Wylie, demonstrates how in the State of Montana legislation was passed permitting the press to be present at felony hearings in juvenile courts. Concerning the publicizing of juvenile felony proceedings Judge Loble stated:

I was aware of the school of thought, for example, that tells us that wherever there is aggression there must be an underlying frustration. It occurred to me that if you accepted that as flatly as it was urged upon us, you would also have to accept Hitler and forgive him. I determined to make young felons publicly answerable in my court in Montana.

Whereupon Judge Loble drew up legislation, appeared before a legislative committee and waited while the proposal died in committee. Taking his proposal to the people, Judge Loble spoke all over Montana. His appeal to the people was forthright and simple:

If a youth is old enough and tough enough to topple a tombstone, to wreck a church or a schoolhouse, to snatch a woman's purse, to hold up a filling station with a gun, to beat an old man over the head, steal a car, break into a store, participate in a gang-rape or a kidnap—then he is old and tough enough to be tried in open court with his parents sitting in the front row, and full newspaper coverage of the entire action.

In 1961 the Loble law was passed.

The persevering efforts of this one man should serve as encouragement to those who are working long and hard in a cause in which they believe. I insert the article, "Juvenile Crime Is Real Crime," from the Washington Star of July 31 in the RECORD at this point:

JUVENILE CRIME IS REAL CRIME

(By Judge Lester H. Loble and Max Wylie)

What were the young offenders doing in Montana that I, as a judge, was not allowed to reveal? Not pranks and peccadillos, I can assure you. They were real crimes, ferocious, unprovoked, often planned; attacks against the innocent, the weak; savage attacks. We had them all: Robberies, holdups, beatings, rape, gangrollings, lush-rollings, bum-rumbles, kidnapings, knifings and arson.

No different in Montana from your own town and state, no matter where it is.

Young criminals were returned to my court time after time after time. There, again, it was the same story for my state as for yours.

There are a number of sociologists who don't like to admit that such horrors as I was seeing can ever be the work of what they always refer to as children. There are a number in the status-quo set who will claim there is no alarming increase in youth crime.

TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN-POUND CHILDREN

But I see these children—age 17, say—at the peak of, or approaching the peak of their physical and sexual powers—215 pounds of hard muscles, no discipline, and no mercy. And I see the victims after these children get through with them. The victim hurts just as much if the knife went in by the thrust of a 15-year-old arm as by one of thirty. The old lady bleeds as badly, her money is just as far gone, her fracture as painful and slow to mend.

Few sociologists have ever talked to a victim of a gang rape. Or of torture. They've read about it.

That isn't enough.

My city was going to hell. My court was forbidden to reveal its happenings.

Whatever days, or years, might be left of my life I resolved to give them all in one endeavor: To set right some of the loose nonsense about who should be rehabilitated, and who should be turned over and looked at.

A law began taking shape in my mind. Long before it was formulated, however, many other thoughts banged about in my head. I was aware of the school of thought, for example, that tells us that wherever there is aggression there must be an underlying frustration. It occurred to me that if you accepted that as flatly as it was urged upon us, you would also have to accept Hitler and forgive him.

NONREALIST IN CHARGE

I determined to make young felons publicly answerable in my court in Montana. This seemed a good start. Certainly it was overdue if you believe what I believe. It's as true now as it was then. In one sentence, where are we? The nonrealist is in charge of America's most explosive reality—crime. And the method the nonrealist is perpetuating this reality.

If a man, or a committee, can look at a fact and declare it to be something other than what it is, and if that man or that committee is in a position to send forth this declaration unchallenged, social chaos isn't something that may follow—social chaos is something guaranteed. It is an inevitability.

This is a natural law, not a lab theory. And all over America right now we are—just as we were in 1956—sitting in the presence of its evolution.

"Of all the world's calamities, the most frightful is ignorance in action."

To correct the spreading problem of crime-without-criminals, I set to work to draft a law. It's a clear and simple law, but it took me a long time to write it. All simple things take time.

THE LOBLE LAW

Here is the law that has now come to be known as the Loble Law:

". . . that whenever the hearing in the juvenile court is had on a written petition charging the commission of any felony, persons having a legitimate interest in the proceedings, including responsible representatives of public information media, shall not be excluded from such hearing.

"No publicity shall be given to the identity of an arrested juvenile . . . except where a hearing or proceeding is had in the juvenile court on a written peition charging the commission of any felony."

That's the heart of the law. Most will agree that any felon is a community hazard. I believe something beyond this: I think any felon who gets away with a felony will commit another. For 50 years I've seen it.

I took this law to the legislature and appeared before a legislative committee to answer questions.

DIES IN COMMITTEE

It was the beginning of another long agony, the worst I'd ever known.

The Loble Law went to committee. And stayed there.

And there in committee it smothered to death.

I was pretty sunk in spirit. I couldn't give up on this.

For the next few years I spoke all over Montana. I spoke anywhere: to lodges, farm groups, ranchers, bankers, miners, PTA, prisons, and churches. I even spoke in stores.

From local people, at every level, I was amazed at the reception I got. It was the direct and the instant reverse of what had happened to my earlier efforts in Helena. Everywhere I went in Montana, the alertness and the desire for change was far ahead of the thinking of the area's own representative in the legislature. Crime had hit a few of these people. Others had kids in trouble. Pain can be instructive. So can frightfulness. So can fear.

Here is the essence of what I was preaching, and what I still preach:

If a youth is old enough and tough enough to topple a tombstone, to wreck a church or a schoolhouse, to snatch a woman's purse, to hold up a filling station with a gun, to beat an old man over the head, steal a car, break into a store, participate in a gang-rape or a kidnap—then he is old and tough enough to be tried in open court with his parents sitting in the front row, and full newspaper coverage of the entire action.

BACK TO LEGISLATURE

This is simple. This is easy to understand. And for my lonely tours all over the West it covered most of the crimes that were being committed by the young—by the lawless, reckless, heartless 3 percent of the young who were and who are doing so much of the damage.

The simplicity of this message had good pick-up value. Enthusiasm for the plan grew from day to day. It became something more than enthusiasm. Montanans began to demand that this very thing be set in motion.

The years whirled by. They were not wasted. When I felt the momentum was right, I went back to the legislature with the same bill. This time I offered it separately but simultaneously to the Democratic and Republican leaders of the two main factions.

These two party leaders read what I had. Both leaders had the same reaction and made the same proposal.

"Let's offer it jointly, not as a party issue."

I agreed. It passed in the House, 89 to 6. It passed in the Senate of 56 members with only one vote against it. Then it was signed by Governor Nutter and became a law. This was 1961.

What is meant by "open"? It means the trial is open to the public, that anyone may attend the hearing. And it means it is open

to the press, as I've said, that newspaper reporters may attend, take notes, publicize everything that takes place in the courtroom during the full term of the trial.

ALL DETAILS PUBLICIZED

Cameras are not allowed in my court. But coverage of every other kind, in detail, is permitted: name and address of the offender, exact description of the felony, full background of the offender, his parents, his father's occupation, the offender's school record.

In short, I expose to the public the very things that the oppressive apparatus of our social services has so successfully been hiding from the public; the very public this same offender has just struck.

I reverse the whole process.

I bring the boy out where everyone in the state can see him. I encourage full newspaper publicity. I want everyone in the state to read about him—who he is, what he did, and what happened to him as a consequence of his crime.

It doesn't make any difference who the boy is, who his family are, how respectable, or wealthy, or how influential. I've even had the son of my own clerk of the court in front of my bench, in an open trial. It can't be permitted to work any other way.

It can't work any other way.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend my three colleagues, whom I joined this morning. They provided the genesis of the idea that the Congress and the President call upon communities all over this country to mobilize the constructive spirit, the constructive energies of the overwhelming number of the people who live in the ghettos of our cities and who respect law and order.

This was and will be a totally nonpartisan appeal. It was sent quietly to the President last week.

We are calling upon the Congress to do this through a joint resolution.

We believe it is only a small minority who are triggering these riots.

It is time we stopped giving simplistic explanations of the riots. It is too easy to say that riots come because we did not pass this bill or that bill, or that we should pass a new bill to prevent them.

I think the country at this time requires that we on both sides of the aisle join in a 60-day moratorium on narrow partisanship with reference to the whole issue of civil strife that is sweeping our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Neighborhood Action Crusade would be a good start in this direction.

CIVIL STRIFE AND RIOTS IN OUR CITIES

Mr. CEDERBERG. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest yesterday to the remarks of the chairman of my committee, the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], as he took on the mayor of Detroit in his unfounded attack upon the Congress of the United States. Then yesterday we find the Vice President of the United States criticizing the Congress.

Strangely, Mr. Speaker, I find no one on the Democratic side of the aisle who has defended the Congress at all in view of the Vice President's attack. If it were in order I would ask unanimous consent that the reply of the distinguished gentleman from Texas to the distinguished mayor of Detroit, be amended to include the Vice President of the United States, because I think it would be appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I think the most important thing that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], said in his remark is, and I quote:

> The more we appropriate to these programs, the more violence we have. Thus, this refutes the idea that money alone is the answer to this problem.

Yet we are requested to enact additional programs which would provide for the expenditure of additional billions of dollars in order to improve the problem.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention as a result of one survey which was made in my own State of Michigan where 300 people were apprehended, that only 12 of them were unemployed. Also of the automobiles that were impounded for containing loot, the majority of them were 1965 and 1966 models.

This indicates a moral decay has set in in this country.

Mr. Speaker, until we have a restoration of law and order, the millions and billions of dollars which we provide for the inhabitants of our cities will not cure this situation.

Mr. Speaker, we must investigate the conspiracy which is involved here, because you and I know that this is more than hoodlums who are being agitated, but that it is a conspiracy which is agitating these people by persons dedicated to the destruction of this country.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who just preceded the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] in the well stated that we ought to have a 60-day moratorium on politics. Is the statement of the gentleman from Michigan a statement in support of that suggestion?

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mine is just a statement of the facts. The gentleman from Texas can place a connotation of partisan politics upon it if he so desires, but these are the facts and the Congress ought to be defended.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE MAHON FITS THE SITUATION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will not think that my part in this discussion is in any way motivated by partisan politics.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members that when I came to the 74th Congress, I came without any thought as to what might happen in the years ahead. One of the greatest privileges I have derived as the result of my serving as a Member of this body, has been my contact with some of the finest extraordinarily able gentlemen with whom I became associated. One of those men of whom I speak is the Honorable GEORGE MAHON, of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I have served with him for many, many years. He came to Congress at the same time as I.

Mr. Speaker, I look upon GEORGE MAHON as one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known. To be sure I disagree with him upon occasion. But I think on yesterday he performed a service not only to his country, but especially to our House of Representatives as the body that speaks for the people. I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for the courage he displayed in standing there in the well of this House on yesterday to make the forthright factual statement he made.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, I wish I had made the statement myself, but the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, had available to him official facts and figures on which to base his conclusions. The gentleman made his case in no uncertain terms. I repeat, I commend him for it.

Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed and somewhat shocked to learn of the statement made by the Vice President of the United States with respect to this Congress. Of course, Mr. Speaker, Congress is not infallible. We can and do make mistakes. Of this the Vice President is aware. Having served in the legislative bodies of this Congress he should also be aware of the actual facts as presented by the gentleman from Texas. Instead, he ignored the fact and sought to pass the buck to the Congress of the United States. He apparently has adopted the intrigue of Secretary Freeman—"Slip, slide, and duck," an issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard Speakers of this great body say time and again, including the predecessor of our present distinguished Speaker, what the great Sam Rayburn of Texas often repeated, "I love this institution of the Congress of the United States, and though we do err, it is the last bulwark of support and strength for this great country of ours."

To have the Vice President of the United States ridicule the Congress for not doing what he thinks is right leaves me amazed. I hope he thinks it over once more and begins to realize that this body, the House of Representatives, does not need all the advice that he seems to give so freely.

We channel our ways so as to be objective and purposeful in handling the situations that face our Nation, and we do this in the best possible way.

I abhor the Vice President making an attack upon the Congress which has no foundation in fact. The fact presented by the gentleman from Texas entirely disproves what the Vice President is reported to have said about the failures of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President should have known better. But after all, I guess we must remember, he is a politician in high office.

APPOINTMENT OF DAVID GINSBURG TO COMMISSION ON CIVIL DISORDERS QUESTIONED

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President announced that he has selected Washington attorney David Ginsburg as executive director of the Commission on Civil Disorders headed by Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner. In this post he will be responsible for directing the staff of the Commission in its effort to determine the causes of the recent urban riots and to recommend administrative and legislative action to prevent future disorders.

This is an appointment of vital national importance, and it should be filled only by a person who can bring total objectivity and complete nonpartisanship to the position. There can be no doubt of Mr. Ginsburg's vast experience. There can be no doubt that he is a man in whom President Johnson has full confidence, for within the past year he has been named to panels on the airline and railroad strikes, and according to the current issue of the Washingtonian, "David Ginsburg still handles individual—Democratic—party problems."

Mr. Speaker, this appointment raises a number of questions:

Is it true, as the Washington Post reports this morning, that the President did not consult with Governor Kerner or any other member of the Commission about Mr. Ginsburg's appointment?

Can a man, who is reported to serve as an intimate adviser of the Democratic National Committee provide the kind of objective, nonpartisan staff support that will be required in assessing the responsibilities of municipal, State and Federal agencies for the tragic disturbances?

Will the Commission become an apologist for the administration and provide a forum for the Democratic Party?

These are questions to which the American people deserve a response. The recent outbreak of riots in our Nation's cities is far too serious a matter to become a political football.

Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to the answers.

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

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the gentleman, does not Mayor Lindsay, of the city of New York, hold the same position with the Republican Party?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. He is not a member——

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman question whether he could carry on the same responsibilities?

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Lindsay is not a member of the staff.

SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], suggested that U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, ought to be given his walking papers. I agree. But the reasons therefor do not originate with the recent war between Israel and the Arabs in the Middle East. U Thant deserved to be given his walking papers long before that. The fact of the matter is that it was President Johnson and Arthur Goldberg, Ambassador to the United Nations, who saved U Thant's hide a few months ago by supporting his reelection as Secretary General of the United Nations.

Let those who supported him now find ways and means of issuing the walking papers.

THE PRESS OF OKLAHOMA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take some pride as an Oklahoman in the fact that most of the press in our State has dealt in a very responsible way with the very inflammatory matters that have been the subject of nationwide attention in recent weeks.

I believe a prime example of this is a page 1 editorial which appeared on July 29, 1967, in the Tulsa Tribune, which counseled the citizens of the city of Tulsa to check very carefully into some of the rumors that are circulated throughout the community about riot situations before they begin to jump off halfcocked into individual action or individual response to those rumors.

In the words of the Tulsa Tribune:

Tulsans can—if they are stupid enough—talk themselves into a riot.

We can get innocent men, women and children killed by repeating every cock-and-bull yarn that comes down the grapevine.

We can create the appearance of a mob by leaping into our cars and speeding to any point where rumor has it that there is trouble.

We can, in 30 minutes, undermine years of painstaking efforts at racial understanding and good will. And if we do, we all lose.

The editorial goes on further and says:

It is only if citizens pay attention to baseless rumors, if they arm themselves in panic, and if they hysterically conclude that their own safety requires them to take vigilante action that we would get into deep and bloody trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I think this front-page editorial of the Tulsa Tribune would make very good reading matter on all the front pages of the newspapers of the Nation. I think that newspapers can exercise a much more responsible role in helping to restore law and order than many of them have been exercising in recent days. The Tulsa Tribune has set an outstanding example in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Tribune editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the complete editorial is as follows:

EDITORIAL

Heard any exciting rumors lately?

You bet you have.

So has The Tribune. But a newspaper is a little different from the average citizen. Instead of repeating the rumor it tries to check it out. Would you like to have some samples of what we found?

Rumor—Forty or 50 Negroes are "sacking" Oertle's discount store.

Fact—The Oertle cop says he has seen maybe two or three casual Negro shoppers all afternoon.

Rumor—Panic sweeping Northland shopping center because of big white-Negro fights. Stores all closed.

Fact—One store did close half an hour early because of—guess what!—rumors. Small group of Negroes and whites gathered together in a bowling alley to discuss alleged high prices at a grocery. One carload of youngsters driving recklessly. Sent home.

Rumor—Carload of armed Negroes circling the area of Admiral Place and Lewis Avenue.

Fact—Negro woman and her four children circling the block waiting for an older sister to get off work. Two kids in back seat shooting off cap pistols.

Rumor—Mob gathering at Admiral Place and Memorial Drive preparing for knife-gun battle.

Fact—Three employees of city street department standing at the intersection checking the flow of traffic.

Rumor—Three busloads of Michigan Negroes just roared into the parking lot at Camelot Inn.

Fact—One busload of white and Negro salesmen arrived at Camelot for a convention.

Tulsans can—if they are stupid enough—talk themselves into a riot.

We can get innocent men, women and children killed by repeating every cock-and-bull yarn that comes down the grapevine.

We can create the appearance of a mob by leaping into our cars and speeding to any point where rumor has it that there is trouble.

We can, in 30 minutes, undermine years

of painstaking efforts at racial understanding and good will. And if we do, we all lose.

Make no mistake about it. If any small group of provocateurs tries to set Tulsa on fire there is plenty of law enforcement power to squash it quick. And it will be squashed with the overwhelming approval of Tulsa's white and Negro citizens.

It is only if citizens pay attention to baseless rumors, if they arm themselves in panic, and if they hysterically conclude that their own safety requires them to take vigilante action that we could get into deep and bloody trouble.

The next time you hear a big, squishy, inflamed, throbbing rumor, ask the teller one question:

"Did you see it?"

You'll be surprised how the spooks will vanish.

POSTAL RATE INCREASES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am highly alarmed at the legislation reported by the Postal Subcommittee on proposed postal rate increases. These provisions, if enacted, could cause immeasurable harm to the small publishers and local newspapers which make up the heart of the communications media in the towns and communities of rural America.

I call the attention of my colleagues to a few figures which bring out the drastic nature of the increases proposed by the subcommittee. As of July 27, the subcommittee proposed that the within-county second-class minimum rate be increased 300 percent. The in-county pound rate is to shoot up 68 percent. Increases in these categories go far beyond what was recommended by the Postmaster General.

In addition to the proposed increase in other phases of second- and third-class rates, the subcommittee has asked a 25-percent surcharge on second-class publications receiving "newspaper handling."

My colleagues are aware of the invaluable public service provided by local newspapers. For example, they publish news releases from a whole array of municipal, State, and Federal agencies as well as civic organizatioins free of charge.

The disappearance of so many great newspapers from our national scene is one of the tragedies of urban America. Let us heed the lesson of our loss, and do all we can to spare rural America a similar blow.

In the final analysis, the increases put forward by the subcommittee as they would affect small publishers could prove to be disastrously false economy. I urge that the plea of local newspapers be kept in mind as postal rate increases are considered.

SUPREME COURT

Mr. HUNGATE. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday one of our distinguished colleagues remarked that the 1-minute speeches were truly a remarkable thing, for in 1 minute we were able to solve most of the problems besetting the world, and that this put him in mind of Alice in Wonderland. The reference to Alice in Wonderland put me in mind of the Supreme Court.

There is a phrase from Alice in Wonderland in which someone says, "When I use a word it means what I say it means and no more and no less."

It seems to me that some of the problems which beset us might be relevant to the judicial changes that we have been seeing in the laws—the law of arrest, the law of interrogation, the law of search and seizure, and the right to counsel.

It seems to me we are going to have to take some action to strengthen the hands of our law enforcement officers and the police departments who know where these people are but are powerless even adequately to interrogate.

And that brings to my mind, you will recall 30 years ago when a great Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, proposed in 1937 that that august body, the Supreme Court, which was then swimming against the tide of American public opinion be augmented, and I am preparing with necessary amendments that have accrued during 30 years' passage of time to reintroduce that measure.

I hope that, like medicare, which matured after 20 years of germination, after 30 years—this proposal to augment the Supreme Court to 15 members will meet with a favorable reception at your hands.

ISRAEL'S OVERWHELMING VICTORY

Mr. DORN. 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 South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Israel's overwhelming victory is without parallel in the history of the world. This little nation, striking out in self-defense, destroyed in 5 days the combined armies of a whole coalition of Near East nations with a total population many times that of her own. She destroyed or captured military equipment poised for aggression which cost her enemies and their Communist allies billions of dollars.

Israel, on land, in the air, and on the sea, achieved fantastic and incredible success. Israel wrote another chapter in the history of courage, daring, and military efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, the following article by Winston Churchill appeared in the Washington Post Sunday, July 23. I recommend a careful study of this superb article to Congress, to our own military and to the military leaders of the free.

THE ISRAELI'S TIMING WAS INCREDIBLE

(By Winston Churchill)

At 7:45 a.m. (8:45 Cairo Time) on the morning of Monday, June 5, the first wave of the Israeli air strike went in. It was directed against ten airfields, of which nine were hit at exactly the same moment. The tenth, Fayid, was attacked a few minutes later as it was still half covered by the morning mist over the Canal.

The aircraft had taken off at precise intervals in order that they should all arrive on target at the same moment and thereby achieve the maximum surprise. Each attack was made by four aircraft, flying in pairs. Every aircraft reached its target, carried out its mission exactly as instructed and every single bomb exploded.

By far the greater part of the Egyptian air force was caught on the ground. The only Egyptian aircraft airborne at the time the Israeli strike went on was a training flight of four unarmed aircraft flown by an instructor and three trainees.

A RELAXED ALERT

There were four reasons why the Israelis chose 7:45 as the time to attack:

1. The Egyptian state of alert was past its peak. It was safe to assume that the Egyptians, ever since they began their aggressive troop concentrations in Sinai three weeks before, had several flights of Mig–21s waiting at the end of the runways on five-minute alert at dawn every morning. They were also probably flying one or two Mig airborne patrols at this time of day, a most likely time for an enemy to attack.

However, it was calculated to be most unlikely that they would have stayed at this state of readiness indefinitely. When no attack had materialized within two or three hours after dawn, the Egyptians would more than likely have lessened their alert and switched off some of their radar scanners for maintenance. The Israelis felt it safe to assume that by 7:30 the Egyptians had lowered their guard.

2. Very often attacks are made at dawn. But since pilots have to be on deck at least three hours before getting airborne, that would have meant their getting up at about midnight, or getting no sleep at all that night. By making the initial strike at 7:45, the pilots were able to sleep until 4 a.m. or so.

3. At this time of year there is a morning mist over much of the Nile, the Delta and the Suez Canal. By 7:30 this has just about dispersed. Around 8 a.m. the weather is usually at its optimum. The visibility is at its best because of the angle of the sun and the air is at its stillest, which is important when it comes to placing bombs accurately on runways.

4. Why 7:45 rather than 8 o'clock or 8:15? Egyptians get to their offices at 9 a.m. (Cairo time). Striking 15 minutes before that time would catch generals and air force commanders on their way to their offices and pilots and air force personnel on their way to training courses and other activities.

Gen. Hod, the Israeli air force commander, was in his command center when the last of the Egyptian early morning patrols got airborne and appeared on the Israeli radars. He pressed his stopwatch. He knew exactly how long the Mig–21 can stay airborne. By 7:45 the patrol would be almost out of fuel and on the point of landing.

THE MAJOR AIM

The primary objectives of the first strike were to make the runways unusable and to destroy as many Mig 21s as possible. The Mig 21s were the only Egyptian aircraft that could effectively prevent the Israeli air force from achieving its major objective: the destruction of Egypt's long-range bomber force, which posed such a threat to the civilian

population of Israel. Eight formations of Mig 21s were destroyed as they were taxiing to the end of the runways.

A couple of days before the start of the war, the Israelis had managed to persuade the Egyptians to move 20 of their front-line aircraft—12 Mig 21s, eight Mig-19s—from the area around Cairo and the Canal, where Egypt's major air bases are concentrated, to Hurghada in the south, where they were effectively *hors de combat*.

The Israelis had achieved this by sending several strong probes of aircraft south over the Gulf of Aqaba, which persuaded the Egyptians that the Israelis might well be planning to attack with a left hook around the southern end of the Sinai Peninsula instead of, as in fact was the case, by a right hook out over the Mediterranean.

At Hurghada they were effectively removed from the chief area of Israeli activity. These 20 Migs, once the Israeli sledge-hammer had fallen, foolishly headed north to the bases near the Canal, where they found they had no runways to land on and fell prey to the Israeli air force. More victims of deception.

Apart from these, only two flights of four Mig-21s were able to get airborne, and these succeeded in shooting down two Israeli aircraft which were attacking Egyptian air bases before they themselves were shot down.

"We went in right on the deck," Brig. Gen. Ezer Weizman, the Israeli chief of operations, said later. The Israeli strike aircraft flew at no more than 30 feet above ground or sea level, so as to remain beneath the Egyptian radar.

As the first wave of Israeli aircraft struck its target, the second wave was already on its way and the third wave had just got airborne. They were spaced at 10-minute intervals. Each flight of four aircraft was given seven minutes over its target—enough for three or four passes, one bombing run and two or three strafing passes. An extra three minutes were allowed for navigational error or for an extra run over the target. The Israelis were operating an incredibly fast turn-around time. For aircraft striking the main Egyptian bases in the vicinity of the Canal, the rotation would have been as follows:

Time to target: approximately 22½ minutes.

Time spent over target: approximately 7½ minutes.

Return to base: approximately 20 minutes.

Ground turn-around time: approximately 7½ minutes.

Total: approximately 57½ minutes.

The almost total destruction of the Egyptian air force on the ground was not merely due to surprise but in part at least to an ingenious bomb which the Israelis have devised and perfected for the specific purpose of destroying runways.

As soon as the bomb leaves the aircraft, a retro-rocket is fired to stop its forward impetus. Then another rocket is fired driving it vertically into the runway. Once it has penetrated the concrete a time fuse explodes it. The fuse may be instantaneous or may be set on a variable time-delay. Normally, runways are considered easy to repair, but it is not so easy when the runway keeps exploding.

The point of this unique bomb is to enable an aircraft to bomb runways while flying at low level and high speed. A conventional bomb released in this way would bounce and do only superficial damage. The Israeli bomb obviates the necessity of flying down the barrels of the enemy antiaircraft guns in a dive-bombing attack.

Nevertheless, by no means all the Israeli aircraft were armed with this weapon and many of the runways were destroyed by dive-bombing from 5000–6000 feet with conventional 500-pound and 1000-pound bombs. The Egyptian aircraft both on the ground and in the air were destroyed almost exclusively with cannon fire. The Israelis say they did not use one of their Matra air-to-air missiles; they find good, old-fashioned cannon more effective.

Antiaircraft fire over the Egyptian bases was lighter than the Israelis had expected and not particularly accurate. Although the Egyptians loosed off several of their Soviet-made SA–2 surface-to-air missiles, not one Israeli aircraft was shot down by them.

At the levels at which the Israelis were operating, the missiles proved totally ineffective. They gain speed very slowly and for this reason are useless below 4000 feet above ground level.

On one occasion an Israeli pilot out of the corner of his eye saw what appeared to be another aircraft moving in in a leisurely way as if to join in formation with him. He looked again and realized it was a missile. It was flying in the same direction as he was and closing in on him from the side. He moved his aircraft smartly towards it and let it pass under him. It flew on out of sight.

Nothing came of Nasser's much-vaunted surface-to-surface missiles, produced by German and East European scientists at a research complex outside Cairo. It would appear that for the time being, at least, they are a myth.

To return to the air battle, for 80 minutes without let-up the Israeli Air Force pounded the Egyptian airfields. Then, after a 10-minute break, there followed a further 80 minutes of Israeli air strikes. In these two hours and 50 minutes the war was virtually won. The back of the Egyptian Air Force had been broken.

The Egyptian airfields attacked in the first two waves on the Monday morning between 7:45 and 10:35 were as follows: El Arish, Bir Gifgafa, Bir Thamada, Gebel Libni, Abu Sueir, Deversoir, Fayid, Kabrit, El Mansura, Inchas, Almaza, Cairo West, Helwan, Cairo International (after fighters had been dispersed there), Beni Sueif, El Minya, Luxor, Ras Banas and Hurghada.

The Israeli Air Force estimates that it destroyed over 300 out of some 340 Egyptian combat aircraft, including all 30 of the Egyptians' long range TU–16 bombers.

The major Sinai airfield of El Arish was the only one of the bases attacked whose runways were not put out of action, since Israeli plans called for its use as a forward supply and casualty evacuation base. Already by the Tuesday evening it was in use as such.

At more than one of the Egyptian bases the Israeli Air Force had destroyed all the aircraft but left the dummy mockups under camouflage covers untouched. When asked if this was because they were such bad dummies or because Israeli intelligence was so good, Weizman said that it was the latter. But he added that at Abu Sueir, which is near Ismailia, they did in fact blow up some dummies as well as hitting all the actual aircraft.

CRUCIAL HEADSTART

Just as Gen. Hod had reckoned against the Soviet warships in the Mediterranean having a direct link with the Egyptian Command and being able to pass information from their radar to the Egyptians inside 10 minutes, so too he counted on having a couple of hours' head-start in which to deal with the Egyptian Air Force before having to cope with those of Jordan, Syria and Iraq.

In fact he had four hours. They joined in the fray about mid-day on Monday, bombing the seaside resort of Netanya and attacking the Israeli satellite air base of Kefar Sirkin near the Jordanian border.

By that time the Israelis had completed the destruction of the greater part of the Egyptian Air Force and were in a position to turn their full power against these new forces that had belatedly joined in the battle.

"We were able to deal with Syria and Jordan in 25 minutes," Hod remarked dryly.

Before dusk on the Monday the Israelis paid further visits to most of the 23 airfields they had struck earlier in the day. Besides using regular bombs they used delayed-action bombs so that they would go off periodically throughout the night and hamper any attempt to repair the runways. As if this was not enough the Israelis continued with their air strikes throughout much of the night, using flares.

As night fell on the second day (June 6) the Israelis added up the amazing tally of enemy losses—416 aircraft destroyed, 393 of them on the ground.

It is estimated that about 100 of Egypt's 350 Air Force pilots were killed in the strike. In view of the large number of Mig 21s destroyed while taxiing on the ground, this figure probably includes a high proportion of their most experienced men.

Nasser knew very well that by Egyptian standards at least the Israelis did not have a large air force. They had in fact a total of about 300 aircraft, some 50 or 60 of which were Fouga Magister trainers that had been equipped with rockets for the specific purpose of tank-busting.

Yet reports were coming in to him of wave upon wave of Israeli aircraft attacking some 19 of his airbases at 10-minute intervals for two hours and 50 minutes with scarcely a break.

MAYBE HE BELIEVED IT

In his bogus resignation speech on June 9, President Nasser declared: "It can be said without fear or exaggeration that the enemy was operating an air force three times its normal strength."

This statement is perhaps significant. He was no doubt basing his estimate of the attacking force on the turn-around time of his own air force. The Israelis have learned from top secret Egyptian Air Force plans they captured at El Arish that the Egyptians had based their plans on their aircraft being over their targets every three hours—instead of every hour or less, as was the case with the Israeli air force.

While the Egyptians reckoned on two sorties a day per aircraft, many of the Israeli pilots flew eight, and a few of them even more on the Monday of the war.

The disparity of these figures speaks for itself and in it undoubtedly lies a major cause of Israel's victory. No wonder Nasser found it inconceivable. Perhaps it was not only a convenient excuse for the lamentable failure of the Egyptian Air Force when he made the accusation of British and American aircraft being involved in conflict on Israel's side. Maybe he really believed it.

The accusation originated in the now well-known telephone conversation which the Israelis monitored between Nasser and Hussein at 4:50 a.m. on the Tuesday, the second day of the war.

Since the end of the war King Hussein has stated in London that he no longer believes this story. Nor was the fabrication about British and American air intervention ever believed by the Russians. Indeed, it is known that it made them very angry. However, the peoples of the Arab countries still have not been told the truth.

ISRAELI LOSSES

As for the cost to Israel of inflicting this crippling blow, by night-fall on the Tuesday, after more than 1000 sorties, Israeli losses amounted to 26 aircraft, including six of the Fouga Magister trainers. They lost 21 pilots, of whom about one half were taken prisoners of war in Syria or Egypt.

The Israeli aircraft destroyed were either shot down by ground fire or "jumped" from above while carrying out ground attack. Gen. Hod was insistent: "In actual aerial combat, between aircraft the score was 50-nil. We shot down 50 Migs in 64 dogfights without losing a single one of our aircraft."

How did the Israelis manage to achieve

such absolute success in so short a time? Gen. Hod gave the following reasons:

1. Sixteen years' planning had gone into those initial 80 minutes. "We lived with the plan, we slept on the plan, we ate the plan. Constantly we perfected it."

2. Intelligence—of enemy air movements and activities, the location and details of the enemy air bases; the deployment of his aircraft; the location of his radar and missile sites—was high class.

3. Operational control—the ability to absorb and integrate with the existing plan new information as it came in, and to pass new information and new targets to the pilots in the air—played a vital part in the success of the operation.

4. The execution of the plan by the pilots was the fourth vital link in the chain of success. It reflected years of training—in flying, navigating and bombing precision. "Normally we expect results in war to be some 25 percent less than in peacetime exercises, because of the excitement of the situation and because of the distraction of antiaircraft fire. As it turned out the results were even better than in the peacetime practices. We would have been happy with each aircraft destroying one enemy aircraft every mission. In fact the figures were usually many times this." (On one occasion two Israeli aircraft destroyed 16 Egyptian bombers on the ground in the space of four minutes.

The Israelis have been practicing this sort of attack for years. There are four or five ranges in the southern Negev which have been hit with several thousand bombs each in practice raids. At least once a year they do all-out raids on these targets, and, as a result, when it came to the real thing, not one aircraft failed to reach its target at precisely the correct moment, even though they were using only dead reckoning for their navigation.

Gen. Weizman recalled: "Three or four months before the war a large contingent of Americans from their Air Force Staff College came to Israel. They had been to Cairo and had been very impressed there; they had visited Jordan and had equally been impressed by what Hussein had told them. When I had to talk to them, I had the feeling they thought we were in a tight spot. I told them how during the Second World War we used to say 'The Germans have surrounded us again—poor bastards.' And I added that it was still true today: 'The Arabs have surrounded us again—poor bastards.' I had the impression that they thought we were rather cocky. We were, and with good reason."

In the little-reported naval war of these first two days, it was the same story of heavy adverse odds being more than made up for by Israeli audacity and Israeli bluff.

On the day war broke out, the comparative strengths of the Israeli and Egyptian navies were as follow:

	Israel	*Egypt*
Destroyers	3	7
Submarines	3*	12
Missile carrier		18
Antisubmarine craft	1	12
MBT's	8	32

*One, the Rahaf, was unable to submerge.

Because of its ludicrously small size and the antiquity of its vessels compared with those of the Egyptian Navy, deception of the enemy was, if possible, of even greater importance to Israel's navy than it was to her army and air force. The major Israeli interest was that Egyptian naval forces in the Mediterranean should be as weak as possible, for only there could they pose a threat to Tel Aviv and Israel's populated coastal regions.

ISRAELI DECEPTION

The Israelis therefore set about persuading the Egyptians before the war began to move some of their vessels from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. They did this by sending four tank landing-craft overland across the Negev Desert to Eilat, the Israeli port at the northern end of the Gulf of Aqaba. The landing-craft were seen arriving in Eilat by day.

But the same night, under cover of darkness, they were taken back into the desert 10 or 15 miles north of Eilat, and brought down for a second time by daylight the following day. By the time the Israelis had repeated this maneuver a few times and had sent the only three MTBs they had in Eilat on patrols toward the Red Sea, the Egyptians evidently believed that the Israelis might be preparing an assault on Sharm el-Sheikh, as they had in 1956. At all events, the outbreak of war found 30 per cent of the Egyptian Navy bottled up in the Red Sea.

Even after the war was over the Egyptian naval forces in the Red Sea were unable to return to their Mediterranean bases, for the Canal had been blocked on the orders of President Nasser. This stranded portion of the Egyptian Navy—more powerful than the whole of Israel's Navy—had to make its way to the Yemen port of Hodeida at the southern end of the Red Sea, where it still is.

On the night of Monday, June 5, the Israeli Navy attacked Port Said and Alexandria harbors—the two main bases of the Egyptian Navy in the Mediterranean. As Israeli forces, consisting of a destroyer and some MTBs, approached Port Said, two Egyptian OSSA missile-carriers came outside the breakwater of the harbor to meet them. The Israelis opened up on them with 20 mm. cannon fire and the OSSAs turned tail and ran back into harbor without firing a shot. Both were damaged.

Although the Israeli Navy's attack on Port Said was not a success in terms of enemy vessels destroyed, it achieved one major objective—to guard Tel Aviv from the 18 Egyptian missile-carrying craft, whose missiles had a range of 35 miles and carried a 1000-pound warhead. For the following morning (Tuesday, June 6) the Egyptian Navy evacuated Port Said harbor and retreated to Alexandria, from which the OSSA and KOMAR vessels no longer had the range.

FROGMEN'S MISSION

At the same time as Israeli naval forces were attacking Port Said, Israel's only operational submarine made its way stealthily to the entrance of Alexandria harbor. A force of frogmen, loaded with explosive charges for blowing up Egyptian naval vessels, made their way out of the submarine's escape hatch and penetrated into the harbor.

It was a dark and moonless night—ideal for such operations. The Israelis believe that the frogmen succeeded in damaging, possibly destroying, two Egyptian submarines and two of the OSSA missile-carriers. But, although the submarine waited until it was nearly dawn before making for the open sea, the frogmen did not return.

The submarine went back the following night, but again in vain. The government-controlled Cairo newspaper Al Ahram reported that at about mid-day on Tuesday, June 6, four Israeli frogmen had been captured in the water in the vicinity of the yachting harbor just east of Alexandria. A further two were captured about four hours later. It is thought they might have been trying to seize a power-boat and make a getaway.

The only offensive action undertaken by the Egyptian Navy that came to the notice of the Israelis was on the night of June 6, when a force of three submarines approached the shores of Israel—one just north of Haifa, one to the south of it and one near Ashdod. Whether they came with the intention of attacking shipping or of landing saboteurs, as the Israelis had done in Port Said and Alexandria, is not clear.

However, the Israelis, although they had only four sonar devices in the whole of their navy, succeeded in detecting all three of the Egyptian submarines and attacked them with depth charges. At least one was damaged, as was evidenced by a large slick of oil that came to the surface, but they all managed to escape.

Gen. Erell, Commander of the Israeli Navy, commented afterwards: "They used their periscopes too much. With the equipment they had, the Egyptians could have had picnics here outside Haifa."

The Israeli Navy, feeling that its exploits were in no way comparable with those of the Israeli Army or Air Force, prefers to remain the "silent service."

Nevertheless, starved of resources and with no modern equipment, it had successfully protected the coasts and the population of Israel from a seaborne attack, it had assured the safe passage of merchant ships to and from Israel's Mediterranean ports throughout the war and it had succeeded in penetrating the enemy's main naval bases at Alexandria and Port Said, in the face of a navy many times its strength and equipped with some of the most modern vessels that the Soviet Union could supply. As Gen. Erell himself put it: "It was a gross impertinence on our part."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FOUNTAIN. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business in my congressional district yesterday when the conference report on the interest equalization tax extension, H.R. 6098, was called up. I wish to state that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

LET US LOOK FOR THE ANSWERS TO OUR PROBLEMS

Mr. BOGGS. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened, as have all of you, to the remarks made here during the last 50 minutes.

I do not feel that I have any special competence to give the House of Representatives or my colleagues any advice, but I would make a few observations which I think might be pertinent.

It seems to me at this critical time in our history rather than beat our breasts and seek to place blame we should look for the answers to the problems that confront us.

It is time that we emphasize the positive aspects of our society.

I was interested in the editorial which was read by the gentleman from Oklahoma from a newspaper in his State. The editorial noted the impact of false statements about riots happening here, there, and elsewhere when there was no evidence to support such statements. The editorial noted the harmful impact of wild rumors.

I might add to that the tremendous impact of national television. No one mentions the fact that by giving 10, 15, or 20 minutes on national television to

agitators like Brown, and Carmichael, or the others that have been mentioned, the criminal elements are encouraged in every community in our country. Rather than pointing out the many local neighborhood action programs and others that were mentioned by the gentlemen a few moments ago which seek to reconcile and bring our people together and bring constructive solutions, I am amazed that our vehicles of communication would use their time and effort to put these people on nationwide television to spread this kind of disorder and incite people to riot in our country.

I would hope that we would have constructive approaches.

Mr. Speaker, we do have grave problems in our country. There is no point in our beating our breasts and blaming one another. It is time that we went to work to look for solutions. I cannot believe that a nation that was able to perfect an atom bomb when we had to perfect one in the midst of a great world war; a nation that was able to marshal the talent of our country when we saw the Russians launch their Sputnik—was able to bring together the brains, the energy and the know-how to put together a space program—cannot find solutions to the problems that now confront us in the cities of our country.

The problems are there. There is no doubt about it. I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who was so quick to criticize the appointment of a general counsel, secretary, or whatever he may be, to the bipartisan commission appointed by the President, that the only way on earth that this can succeed is if it is bipartisan.

I served on the Warren Commission. It was a bipartisan Commission. The general counsel selected was Lee Rankin, who had formerly been the Solicitor General of the United States under President Eisenhower, and who now is the city attorney for the city of New York. So I would suggest earnestly that we stop this business of, Who killed Cock Robin? I suggest that we take a look at these problems. Anyone who lives in the cities knows that the problems are there.

In my own city as I walk down to my office every day. I see buildings crumbling. I see slums. I see filth. I see dirt. I see poverty. I know it is there. This does not justify riots. God knows it does not. The idea that lawlessness is synonymous with poverty is one that I reject out of hand. There are too many people who sit within the sound of my voice who were reared in poverty, who grew up in poverty and have become great Americans. But having said that, that does not mean that we in this country, with a gross national product of three-quarters of a trillion dollars, can blind ourselves to these problems.

I commend the gentleman who recommended a neighborhood youth program, a voluntary program. I suggest that we do not say now that we are going to abolish the poverty program, that we are going to abolish the rent supplemental program, and that we are going to abolish the model cities program in order to bring about answers to these problems. I suggest that we look at it from a nonpartisan American point of view and recognize that the problems exist and try to solve them. But Congress can only do its part of the job. We must have family, local, and State responsibility. The rules of the church, the community service groups, the schools, the university must be expanded.

But Americans working together can and will solve this problem.

PREROGATIVES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the distinguished Democratic whip for his statement and to associate myself with his remarks. Mr. Speaker, I stand with those who stand ready at any time to defend the prerogatives of the House of Representatives, because unless the Members defend it, who will come to its defense? I love this institution, this citadel of democracy, for "here, sir," as Alexander Hamilton said, "the people rule."

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the fact that somebody may have said the Congress has been derelict or did not do certain things which he thinks it should have done automatically means that such things are unimportant and should not be considered by the House. I think those measures which have been recommended by the President of the United States to assist the cities of our Nation and the poor of our Nation, and to curtail criminal activity in this country, should stand on their own merits, and the Congress will be subject to criticism if it fails to give them the consideration which they deserve.

MARKED COPY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my majority leader and my majority whip that they take the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today and yesterday and send a marked copy to the Vice President of the United States and ask him to read the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] on pages 20596 and 20597.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

E. F. FORT, CORA LEE FORT CORBETT, AND W. R. FORT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of an absent Member, 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.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

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

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

MRS. INGE HEMMERSBACH HILTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6096) for the relief of Mrs. Inge Hemmersbach Hilton.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

MRS. CHIN SHEE SHIU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 636) for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu.

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.

CLARA B. HYSSONG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1655) for the relief of Clara B. Hyssong.

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

FRANK I. MELLIN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1674) for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.

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

H.R. 1674

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 annual leave account of Frank I. Mellin, Junior, postal employee of West Orange, New Jersey, there shall be added a separate account of one hundred hours of annual leave, in full settlement of all claims of the said Frank I. Mellin, Junior, against the United States for compensation for the loss of such leave which was earned by him in the period January 1, 1962, through December 31, 1964, inclusive, while he was employed in the United States post office in Orange, New Jersey, and which through ad-

ministrative error, was not credited to his leave account.

SEC. 2. Section 203(c) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended (65 Stat. 680, 67 Stat. 137; 5 U.S.C. 2062(c)), shall not apply with respect to the leave granted by this Act, and such leave likewise shall not affect the use or accumulation, pursuant to applicable law, of other annual leave earned by the said Frank I. Mellin, Junior. None of the leave granted by this Act shall be settled by means of a cash payment in the event such leave or part thereof remains unused at the time the said Frank I. Mellin, Junior, is separated by death or otherwise from the Federal service.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike "one hundred hours" and insert "one hundred two hours."

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.

MRS. LESSIE EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1680) for the relief of Mrs. Lessie Edwards.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, the application for benefits which Mrs. Lessie Edwards, of New Cumberland, West Virginia, completed in September 1959 following the death on August 29, 1959, of her husband, the late George L. Edwards (XC20-741-307), shall be held and considered by the Veterans' Administration as timely filed; and the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to make retroactive payments in accordance with the entitlement established pursuant to such application.

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.

CHILDREN OF MRS. DORIS E. WARREN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2454) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Doris E. Warren.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

COMDR. ALBERT G. BERRY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2757) for the relief of Comdr. Albert G. Berry, Jr.

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.

MAURITZ A. STERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3865) for the relief of Maurice A. Sterner.

Mr. TALCOTT. 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 California?

There was no objection.

T. MICHAEL SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4015) for the relief of T. Michael Smith.

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

H.R. 4015

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $17,577.49, to T. Michael Smith, of Washington, District of Columbia, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for payments made by him for disbursements and fees in connection with the successful prosecution of his claim in the United States Court of Claims, in Court of Claims case numbered 261-55, decided November 2, 1960, in which the court concluded that the action of Government officials in effecting his separation was "arbitrary and capricious, and in bad faith".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,679.58 and interest thereon at 6% per annual from November 2, 1960, to the date of approval of this Act to the said T. Michael Smith, representing interest on salary withheld from him for a period of approximately seven and one half years, and such sums are to be paid not as interest but in satisfaction of his claims for damages for the wrongful withholding of salary during that period. 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:

On page 1, line 5, strike "$17,577.49" and insert "$6,705.11".

On page 1, line 6, after "District of Columbia," insert "in the nature of punitive damages and".

On page 2, lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, strike: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,679.58 and interest thereon at 6 percent per annum from November 2, 1960, to the date of approval of this Act to the said T. Michael Smith, representing interest on salary withheld from him for a period of approximately seven and one-half years, and such sums are to be paid not as interest but in satisfaction of his claims for damages for the wrongful withholding of salary during that period."

On page 2, line 13, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

MRS. HAZEL M. LAFRANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5025) to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Mrs. Hazel M. LaFrance against the United States.

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.

FRED W. KOLB, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6189) for the relief of Fred W. Kolb, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

DR. EMANUEL MARCUS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7599) for the relief of Dr. Emanuel Marcus.

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

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

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8091) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

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

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

There was no objection.

SETSUKO WILSON (NEE HIRANAKA)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 534) for the relief of Setsuko Wilson (nee Hiranaka).

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

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

There was no objection.

RAMIRO VELASQUEZ HUERTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3497) for the relief of Ramiro Velasquez Huerta.

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

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

There was no objection.

ROBERTO MARTIN DEL CAMPO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5216) for the relief of Roberto Martin Del Campo.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JAN DROBOT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8254) for the relief of Jan Drobot.

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

H.R. 8254

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Jan Drobot, who was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 27, 1960, shall be held and considered not to be within the classes of persons whose naturalization is prohibited by the provisions of section 313 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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.

RICHARD K. JONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones.

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

S. 454

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard K. Jones of Avondale Estates, Georgia, the sum of $15,000, in full satisfaction of all his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Richard K. Jones as a result of an automobile accident occurring on January 23, 1957, while he was officially engaged in pursuing suspected violators of the Internal Revenue Code as an investigator of the United States Treasury Department: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$15,000" and insert "$5,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

ELI ELEONORA BIANCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3195) for the relief of Eli Eleonora Bianchi.

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

H.R. 3195

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, Eli Eleonora Bianchi 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 Romildo and Eleonora Bianchi, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

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

MARIA KOLOMETROUTSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7427) for the relief of Maria Kolometroutsis.

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

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

There was no objection.

ROY A. PARKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1448) for the relief of Roy A. Parker.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

SEVASTI DIAKIDES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2668) for the relief of Sevasti Diakides.

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

H.R. 2668

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, Sevasti Diakides 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. Anthony Diakides, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

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

DR. ALFREDO F. MENDEZ, M.D.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7324) for the relief of Dr. Alfredo F. Mendez, M.D.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Alfredo F. Mendez, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 5, 1960.

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

JOHN J. McGRATH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2477) for the relief of John J. McGrath.

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

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

There was no objection.

HUBERT ASHE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4404) for the relief of Hubert Ashe.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

JOANNE MARIE EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5368) for the relief of Joanne Marie Evans.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARILYN SHORETTE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6666) for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette.

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

H.R. 6666

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marilyn Shorette, of Plainville, Connecticut, the sum of $1,228.03 in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for the expenses which she incurred for medical care at a civilian hospital during the period beginning November 1964 and ending September 1966. During such period, the said Mrs. Marilyn Shorette, relying upon erroneous information furnished by the Department of Defense, assumed that she was eligible for medical care, at Federal expense, in civilian medical facilities.

SEC. 2. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of 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 section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike "$1,228.03" and insert "$1,693.03".

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.

COL. GILMOUR C. MACDONALD, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10932) for the relief of Gilmour C. MacDonald, colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired.

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

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

There was no objection.

REFERENCE OF THE BILL (H.R. 9826) ENTITLED "A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF BRANKA MARDESSICH AND SONIA S. SILVANI" TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 1492 AND 2509 OF TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 743) to refer the bill (H.R. 9826) entitled "A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. 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. 191]

Anderson, Ill.	Diggs	McCulloch
Anderson, Tenn.	Eilberg	Morton
	Feighan	Resnick
Andrews, N. Dak.	Flood	Rogers, Colo.
	Ford, William D.	Rostenkowski
Ashbrook		Sisk
Ashley	Gibbons	Smith, N.Y.
Bell	Hansen, Idaho	Stephens
Brademas	Hawkins	Taylor
Brown, Calif.	Howard	Teague, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.	Ichord	Teague, Tex.
Burke, Fla.	Jones, Mo.	Udall
Burton, Utah	Kornegay	Williams, Miss.
Celler	Kupferman	Willis
Conyers	Laird	Wilson, Bob
Corman	Long, La.	Wright
Derwinski	McClure	Wyatt

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 383 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the General Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 828 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 828 provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 11722 to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The military construction requirements for fiscal year 1968 were developed on the same basis as were the departments' requirements previously presented to the Congress for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. This concept involved the so-called package program method of identifying our military force structure with their primary missions and then assigning to these forces the weapons, equipment, and facilities necessary to effectively discharge these assigned mission responsibilities.

The authorization program for fiscal year 1968 is based on a 5-year projection of the missions and forces to be supported through fiscal year 1972.

The program this year is substantially increased over fiscal year 1967, and proposes new authorization in the total amount of $2,378,843,000. Of this amount, $60 million was a portion of the President's budget but was not included in the original bill as submitted. This $60 million merely represents a bookkeeping transaction and transfer of the authorization from the President's general defense budget to this particular bill.

The total authorization is: For the Army, $379,830,000; for the Navy, $474,202,000; for the Air Force, $433,511,000; for Defense Agencies, $169,000,000; for Southeast Asia support, $75,000,000; for housing, $787,000,000; for homeowners assistance, $22,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 828 in order that H.R. 11722 may be considered immediately.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 828 provides an open rule with 3 hours' debate for the consideration of H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to commend the members of the House Armed Services Committee for the outstanding work they continue to do. Particularly do I commend the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. We are fortunate, indeed, to have such a thorough committee in connection with matters involving our armed services. Very few Members not on the committee could possibly find the time to become knowledgeable on a bill such as the one before us today. As an example of the time involved, H.R. 11722 authorizes construction at 447 military bases throughout the world. Included in the construction authorization for these 447 bases are approximately 1,702 line items.

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1968. The bill is necessary from an authorization standpoint before the Appropria-

tions Committee can act to provide financing.

The total authorization is $2,378,843,000. The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense was $2,635,238,000. So the committee has reduced the request but by the same token, in its opinion, has provided for authorization of everything that is in any way deemed necessary and appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. RIVERS] will once again explain the contents of the bill in a thoroughly minute, detailed manner when we resolve ourselves into the Committee of the Whole House. Accordingly, I will not attempt to go into further detail but will simply urge the adoption of the rule and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do have a request for time and I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services as well as the ranking minority member of that committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and all the members of this distinguished committee for the excellent job which they have performed in bringing this bill before the House for consideration today.

This committee has spent long hours in hearings and receiving testimony. As a result thereof, it is thoroughly knowledgeable about the problems of the military. In addition to this, the Committee on Armed Services is thoroughly familiar with all of the implements of war, with all of the hardware purchased by the military used throughout the world.

Another point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Committee on Armed Services is also very conversant in respect to our political situation and its relationship with other nations of the world.

Now, I notice in this bill that there is some military aid to other countries, to NATO, South Vietnam, and some of the other countries which are our allies in Southeast Asia.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the military aid program is handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and is included in the foreign aid program, it seems to me that we have a duplication of effort and that it would be more efficient and more practical and eliminate a double system of bookkeeping if all of the military aid programs were transferred to the Committee on Armed Services, which committee is completely knowledgeable in this entire area.

Therefore, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services as to his reaction to this suggestion that his committee handle all of the military aid under our governmental programs.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that for years we have known that we had to have our military assistance programs and that this year in the supplemental bill and in this regular appropriation bill, we are handling the military assistance to Southeast Asia, and it does simplify the bookkeeping problem, as the Secretary of Defense has recommended. The Secretary of Defense has stated that it helps him to keep his accounts straight. There is intermingling or intertwining and it is impossible to segregate this situation, so says the Secretary of Defense.

Also, we have the infrastructure of NATO, in response to the gentleman's query, and I think we could very well handle it. I think it would be well if in the future our committee had the consideration of this responsibility.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. I would like to ask the gentleman his definition of "handling."

Mr. MARTIN. I feel the jurisdiction—and I believe it would be wise and economical and much more efficient—if the jurisdiction of the military aid program were transferred to the Committee on Armed Services which I believe is composed of the most knowledgeable Members of the House in regard to the military situation and the needs of other countries as well as the equipment that we have in our arsenal.

Mrs. KELLY. In other words, the gentleman is referring to the appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN. No, I am referring to the authorization.

Mrs. KELLY. You are referring to the authorization? Of course, the gentleman realizes, I believe, that the authorization from the very beginning of the NATO infrastructure and the military commitments abroad have been handled by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, does he not?

Mr. MARTIN. I do. I realize that.

Mrs. KELLY. I also realize that this year the Defense Department had the NATO infrastructure put in the military construction bill, is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN. I would hope that the joint committee that was appointed regarding the reorganization of the Congress would take cognizance of this fact, and perhaps in their extensive hearings to determine the facts in regard to transferring jurisdiction over the military aid program from the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN. I would be glad to yield further.

Mrs. KELLY. I thank the gentleman.

I realize that the $60 million for the NATO infrastructure is authorized in this bill, but I would like to say that I feel very badly that this committee has assumed, at the request of the Defense Department, has included in this bill the authorization for the NATO infrastructure.

It has been included in the foreign assistance legislation since 1951, and it should remain there.

The inclusion in H.R. 11722 of an authorization for the appropriation of funds to finance the U.S. share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area marks a significant departure from precedent and from the procedure which has been followed by the Congress since 1951.

This language deals with what has been known over the years as the NATO infrastructure program. The authorizations and appropriations for NATO infrastructure have been included in the foreign assistance legislation since 1951.

The NATO infrastructure involves the construction of a variety of military facilities in various NATO countries for the use of NATO forces.

The only thing different about the infrastructure construction is that it has been financed jointly by the NATO countries. Instead of the United States financing the entire cost of the airfields, petroleum pipelines and telecommunication systems which have been built, our allies have paid more than half of the bill.

In the beginning, the United States contributed 44 percent, and our share has been reduced to 26 percent. Next to the forces of the home countries where these installations are located, U.S. forces have generally been the largest users of these jointly financed facilities.

The U.S. investment in the NATO infrastructure is a little over $1 billion, all of which has been provided in foreign aid appropriations.

In addition to the infrastructure to which the United States has contributed, the United States has paid the entire cost of constructing a large number of military installations to serve our forces, including airfields, pipelines, storage depots, and missile sites.

There has never been any problem of military control over the infrastructure.

The nature of the installations to be constructed, their location, and the priorities as to their importance have always been handled by the NATO military command. We do not need a new legislative approach in order to improve the military control over infrastructure. They have it now.

The most difficult and, in a sense, the most important problem confronting the United States with respect to the infrastructure is to get our allies to pay more of the bill. This is important not only because the more they pay, the more we save, but also because their interest in and commitment to their own defense is reflected in their willingness to assume financial responsibility.

It is important not only that military installations be made available, but also that the countries of Europe regard them as their responsibility and as existing to carry out a defense strategy to which they are committed.

The questions of how much military construction is to be jointly financed and of what share each government will pay are not primarily military. They are basically economic and political.

They involve questions of national

budgets, burdens of taxation, and internal political pressures.

They are not matters to be decided or to be negotiated by military commanders. Such decisions and negotiations involve ministers who are responsible for political and economic decisions.

The infrastructure program becomes an unimportant item in the military construction bill, and we ought to consider very carefully whether by putting it in the hands of the Defense Department, we are going to get our NATO allies to spend more for military construction than they are now doing or whether the tendency will not be for them to spend less.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs takes the position that the United States will be better able to bring pressure on our allies and to withstand pressure from them if the funds for NATO infrastructure continued to come from the military assistance program than would be the case if they were submerged in the Defense Department budget.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. 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. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

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

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. 11722, with Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

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

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today to present the fiscal year 1968 military construction authorization bill.

After 6 weeks of continuous sessions concerning this bill, we believe we have brought to the floor today legislation which strikes a proper balance between military necessity and other demands upon our Government. Later in this presentation, I will detail our actions but, at the outset, let me say we deferred—I repeat, deferred—not denied—projects costing $321,775,000.

The purpose of this bill is to provide military construction authorization and related authority in support of the military departments during fiscal year 1968.

This is an authorization bill which is necessary for enactment before appropriations can be provided to finance these activities of the military departments during fiscal year 1968.

Our military strength today presents a unique combination of nuclear and conventional war capability.

Our nuclear capability consists of:

Our strategic bomber force which presently consists of B–52's and B–58's, and which will be further augmented in the near future with the FB–111A's. Through the period fiscal year 1968–fiscal year 1971, the older B–52C–F's and B–58's will be phased out as planned, leaving a force of 225 B–52G–H's and 210 FB–111A's.

Our growing fleet of Polaris submarines which now number 41 carrying some 656 nuclear tipped missiles. This force will be further strengthened in the coming years through the addition of poseidon missiles under a phased retrofit program.

Our intercontinental ballistic missile force which totals 1,054 consisting of Minuteman and Titan II missiles. This force is being measurably strengthened and more effective by conversion of the earlier Minuteman I's to Minuteman II's and III's.

Complementing this array of nuclear capability, is a conventional military force which includes:

An Army force which at the end of fiscal year 1968 will consist of the equivalent of 27⅓ division forces in the Active and Reserve structure combined—18⅓ Active and nine Reserve components.

A Marine force of four Active divisions and one Reserve division, and four aircraft wings—three Active and one Reserve.

A Navy force consisting of 938 commissioned ships in the fleet, including 411 warships and 158 amphibious assault ships; and

Our tactical air support.

This combination of nuclear and conventional forces will require a total military strength of 3,464,302 personnel by end of fiscal year 1968, which is an increase of 77,484 over the estimated end fiscal year 1967 strength. The composition of this force is as follows:

	End fiscal year 1966 (actual)	End fiscal year 1967 (estimated)	End fiscal year 1968 (planned)
Army	$1,199,046	$1,454,200	$1,520,000
Navy	744,469	753,394	762,288
Marine Corps	261,687	280,624	294,914
Air Force	886,350	898,600	887,100
Total, DOD	3,091,552	3,386,818	3,464,302

By the end of fiscal year 1968, the Defense Department will have added about 373,000 military personnel to the strength which existed at the end of fiscal year 1966. These necessary increases as we all know have not been bought cheaply, and are reflected in the increased cost of our defense budget for fiscal year 1968.

The bill as submitted by the Department of Defense totals $2,635,238,000 for new authorizations.

The bill submitted by the Department included $814,000,000 for all housing expenditures of the Department proposed for fiscal year 1968. This sum included authorization for construction of 12,500 new family housing units at an estimated cost of $267,000,000, including improvements to existing quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments and planning.

Therefore, the bill, exclusive of housing costs and deficiency authorizations represents a total of $1,821,238,000 for construction.

Last year the Department requested a grand total of $1,044,654,000 for new authorization, including $521,900,000 for family housing. The comparable figure for new construction authorization last year exclusive of family housing was $522,754,000. That figure compares to the $1,821,238,000 which I have just mentioned.

Under any comparison, however, the Defense Department's request this year is some two to three times the magnitude of last year's request, and represents the largest single military construction request the Armed Services Committee has considered during the last 5 years.

It reflects a drastic change from last year's request when the Department submitted an austere program based on meeting only its most pressing military needs necessary to accomplish operational schedules, new missions or for other urgent and compelling requirements.

At that time, your Armed Services Committee told the departmental witnesses that we believed they were making a grave mistake that they would have to rectify in coming programs. It now appears from the size of this year's request that the Defense Department has come around to agreeing with the collective judgment of the Armed Services Committee.

Because of the sheer bulk of the Defense Department's fiscal year 1968 request, the committee was faced with a tremendous task in reviewing this $2.6 billion program. Including the four military services and the Defense Agencies, there were over 1,700 separate projects requested at over 471 individual bases and installations. The committee bill which we now seek to bring before the House, totals $2,378,843,000 for new authorization. Additionally, the committee provided $28,240,000 for deficiency authorization against projects authorized in prior years.

After extensive hearings by the full committee, and review of each individual line item requested by the Department, the committee was successful in effecting reductions of $261,775,000 in the bill. In actuality the committee's reduction was $321,775,000 because the total authorization now shown in the committee's bill, $2,378,843,000, contains $60,000,000 for NATO infrastructure costs which the Department's submission had not previously included in their bill total inasmuch as they were requesting it under general or continuing authorization. In the committee's judgment it was considered unwise to grant this authorization as standing authorization and unspecified as to amount, and accordingly the committee has included this request as a specific line item in the Army title in the amount provided in the President's

budget. The committee intends that the Department should seek congressional authorization annually for such sums as they may need to fulfill U.S. obligations with respect to NATO infrastructure construction.

Although the total actual reductions accomplished by the committee, $316,395,000, may seem large, they are proportionately some 12 percent of the total request and were accomplished only after painstaking review of each project. The reductions were made in those areas and projects which the committee felt were not of immediate or critical urgency and which would work no hardship on the services if deferred for reconsideration at a later time.

The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that these reductions will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

This bill authorizes construction at 447 military bases throughout the world.

Included in the construction authorization for these 447 bases are approximately 1,702 line items.

All the construction authorized by this bill will occur at existing bases and military installations throughout the world, there being no new bases proposed in this bill.

Included in H.R. 11722 are authorizations amounting to approximately $80 million for medical facilities of all types. These include hospital additions, dispensaries, dental clinics, and complete hospitals.

Approximately $47 million of this total authorization is allocated for construction of nine new hospitals.

These nine hospitals are distributed as follows:

Service	Place	Number of beds	Cost
Army	Fort Ord, Calif	440	$14,060,000
Do	Fort Jackson, S.C	435	10,365,000
Navy	Adak, Alaska	15	2,927,000
Air Force	Barksdale AFB, La	110	3,794,000
Do	Bergstrom AFB, Tex	50	3,052,000
Do	Mather AFB, Calif	105	5,473,000
Do	Otis AFB, Mass	45	2,621,000
Do	Webb AFB, Tex	30	2,121,000
Do	Reese AFB, Tex	30	2,100,000

Here in the case of medical facilities, the committee found itself in almost complete agreement with the program that the Defense Department submitted. The committee feels strongly that the pace of replacement for many of the outmoded World War II hospitals should be accelerated. This year's program represents the first time in many years where the Department has seen fit to recognize the committee's longstanding concern in this area, and submit a program which in the committee's judgment adequately meets the many overdue requirements for improved health facilities.

The Committee on Armed Services has made a determined effort over the past years to continuously reduce the amount of unfunded and unused construction authorization available to the military departments.

In order to avoid the unnecessary accumulation of unused authorization, the committee has reduced the period of validity of authorizations provided in the annual military construction bill to a 2-year period for all facilities other than military family housing.

In the case of military family housing, the authorization is limited to a 15-month period.

It is heartening to be able to report that based on estimated data furnished to the committee this year, the residual authorization estimated to be available at the end of the coming year for all three Services will be the lowest figure over the past 5 years and will total less than $80 million.

The bill as submitted by the Department proposed the acquisition of approximately 10,151 acres of land at a total estimated cost of $24.9 million. This is less than half the acreage that was requested last year, but the price of acquisition is much higher than last year's $2.5 million.

The major part of the proposed land acquisition involves acquiring the town of Port Chicago, Calif., which is the site of major naval ammunition outloading activities. A special subcommittee looked into this subject thoroughly and recommended that the authority be granted.

The single most important aspect of the matter is the subcommittee's recommendation that the town of Port Chicago be acquired in order to eliminate the real and everpresent hazard to life which now exists.

The committee approved a total of $22.9 million for real estate acquisition including $19.8 million for the town of Port Chicago. The remaining $3.1 million was authorized to the Air Force and Army for expansion of a bombing range and acquisition of mineral rights on a major training base.

The military construction authorization for fiscal year 1968 as reflected in H.R. 11722 contains two distinct parts:

A. The authority to provide and construct new operational facilities in the amount of $1,569.9 million to support the active and reserve forces; and

B. The authority for military family housing in the amount of $809 million.

Now, I would like to briefly review the $1,569 million authorization for the active and reserve forces by relating it to the nature of the support facilities which this construction is intended to provide the operating forces.

For purposes of simplicity and brevity I will describe the contents of this bill in the nine principal categories of facilities which are provided. Two of these, medical facilities and real estate, I have already singled out for special comment and have discussed for you the committee's recommendations. For the remaining seven, I will attempt insofar as practicable to group those which lend themselves to related and allied discussion.

The first of these are operational and training facilities. These categories which represent some 27 percent of the total amount provided for the Active and Reserve Forces total $419.5 million for the three military services. The facilities provided under these categories represent a broad spectrum of requirements and contain essential airbase, fleet operations support, communications, security, command and control facilities, training ranges, classrooms, technical instruction buildings and unit and individual training facilities for all levels of professional and technical military competence. The expanding size of our military forces during the past 2 years have laid heavy emphasis on the need for facilities to rapidly and adequately train large numbers of men. Similarly, the expanded nature of our overseas deployments have generated operational needs not envisaged a few years back. For these categories the committee has recommended $419.5 million distributed as follows:

	Million
Army	$173.3
Navy	113.3
Air Force	132.9

The next categories which I would like to bring to your attention are those for troop housing and utilities. These are especially susceptible to simultaneous discussion in that they both represent severe and longstanding needs which have been allowed to remain in low priority much too long. They are closely related inasmuch as their needs stem from continued and uneconomical use of outmoded and obsolescent facilities which were constructed many years ago under austere criteria, and now simply are unacceptable or completely inadequate by modern-day standards. The Armed Services Committee has fought strenuously over the years to secure a more rapid replacement of such facilities, most especially troop housing, a large portion of which are World War II temporary facilities which have far outlasted their emergency need.

This year, Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense has heeded our pleas and has come forward with a program which our committee considers is long overdue. The Department proposed a total program of new troop housing and utilities which aggregated some $502.3 million and provided a total of 81,500 new and improved troop housing spaces and approximately $150.4 million for new utility systems and additions. Our committee has recommended $455.4 million for this program, $331.3 million for 71,000 new troop and officer quarters and $124.1 million for utility systems. This recommendation also contains a modest number of religious, welfare, and community support facilities. The Committee on Armed Services feels very strongly that new troop housing for our officers and men is one of the most critical areas of shortage in our defense military construction program.

The next two categories of facilities which I would like to bring to your attention are those for maintenance and supply, and administrative facilities. Maintenance and supply facilities today especially play a most important role in keeping our modern defense forces combat ready and capable of responding to any emergency on short notice. This category of facilities includes all the structures necessary for the maintenance, repair, and overhaul as well as stockage and warehousing of equipment and parts for all of our complicated modern weap-

ons systems. These include aircraft, tanks, artillery, guided missiles and rockets, ammunition, and all of the complex electronic gear needed to direct and operate them. In modern day warfare, an armed force is no better than its logistical train of supply and repair or reequipment.

For these requirements, and for a relatively modest amount of administrative and command and control facilities to provide the headquarters and supervisory facilties for various commands and bases, the Department of Defense requested $273.1 million, of which the committee has seen fit to recommend authorization for $229.2 million. This recommended authorization is distributed as follows:

	Million
Army	$44.3
Navy	97.4
Air Force	87.5

Mr. Chairman, the final category of facilities which I bring to your attention are those for research and development. In the bill as proposed by the Department they had included $132.6 million. This sum was designed to provide facilities for many and varied research and development programs and for continued development of the Nike X ABM. The committee inquired carefully into all of the programs and determined to recommend a total authorization of $80.9 million.

This sum will permit new laboratory facilities and test facilities for all vital systems and fields of research that are most promising from military aspects, and in the committee's view will meet all urgent needs. The recommended authorization is distributed as follows:

	Million
Army	$21.5
Navy	10.4
Air Force	49.0

This, Mr. Chairman, completes my summation of the composition of the new authorization recommended in H.R. 11722 for the Active Forces.

For the Reserve Forces, the Department had requested $18.3 million for Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and Navy and Marine Corps Reserve activities. The Department stated that they did not request funds for the Army Reserve components because of the unresolved status of the restructuring of the Army Guard and Reserve, and because they felt that sufficient uncommitted prior-year authorizations were available to finance additional construction if needed once the force structure was resolved.

The committee disagreed with this assumption and feels that the Army Guard and Reserve which have been in deferred status for 2 years should be accelerated. Toward this objective the committee recommends $10 million of new authorization for each of those components, thus making the total of $38.3 million in new authorization available for all Reserve and Guard construction in fiscal year 1968.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few general observations concerning the reductions in this bill. As I stated earlier, we deferred a number of projects totaling $321,775,000. We did this in spite of the fact that almost all of the projects are desirable and will have to be built in the future. But in view of the increased costs of our efforts in Southeast Asia and the pressures for a tax increase, we deferred for the present, those projects which could safely be postponed without impairing our national security. In doing this, I feel the committee fulfilled its responsibility not only to the services but also to the American taxpayer.

We reduced the contingency authorization for the Secretary of Defense by $50,000,000. We reduced the authorization for Southeast Asia over $21,000,000 and restricted the use of the funds to eliminate frills and nonessential projects.

To demonstrate the painstaking care taken in consideration of this bill, the full committee held 29 sessions, and the hearings contain well over a thousand printed pages. During the markup of the bill, we considered individually 198 amendments.

Turning now from the reductions, a number of new provisions are contained in this bill which I will briefly enumerate. Many of them relate to military family housing.

First, the average unit cost of family housing is increased from $17,500 to $19,500, exclusive of the cost of land acquisition.

Second, the space limitations for the commanding officers at each installation are increased over officers of the same rank to permit a slightly larger house in recognition of his position.

Third, the house of the commandant of the 9th Naval District at Great Lakes, Ill., where the tragic fire took the life of Admiral Yeager and his wife last March, may be repaired at a cost not to exceed $40,000.

Fourth, this bill would permit the Secretary of Defense to enter into guaranteed rental housing agreements for 5,000 units of family housing in foreign countries, under which 97 percent occupancy is guaranteed for a period not in excess of 10 years, and the average guarantee rental shall not exceed $185 per month, including the cost of maintenance and operation.

Fifth, this bill permits the establishment of a separate account with the Treasury for the purpose of debt service on encumbered military family housing, incomes from the disposal of family housing at closed military installations.

Sixth, it continues the domestic leasing authority for 7,500 units of family housing but raises the rental from a maximum of $160 to $175 per month, and extends the rental authority to include units which are owned by any agency of the United States or were built in consultation with the Department of Defense under governmental financing.

Seventh, in connection with the homeowners assistance program, as contained originally in the Housing and Urban Renewal Act of 1965, and as amended by the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966, the Congress was requested to authorize $27,000,000 to reimburse both military and civilian employees of the Department of Defense for losses resulting from the base closure program. The committee reduced the amount to $22,000,000 and restricted the payments to military personnel only. Unlike civilian employees, the military man is ordered to a specific location and has no choice to reject the assignment. The committee believed that civilian employees of the Department of Defense must be treated on the same basis with all other civilian employees of the Government where no such relief is provided.

Eighth, the committee slightly increased the cost limitations for cold-storage warehousing, regular warehousing, permanent barracks spaces, and bachelor officers quarters.

Ninth, we included a provision requiring the retention and operation of the Naval Academy dairy farm as an economic and morale-building asset to the Department of the Navy.

Tenth, we also included a provision amending the military construction authorization bill of last year to give to the services a greater latitude in the construction of minimum fallout protection in new construction.

Eleventh, lastly, we have included a section establishing by law the location of the various naval districts as they are currently constituted and requiring that the commandant of each naval district be an officer of not below the rank of rear admiral.

This is the bill. I believe it is a sound one, meeting not only the needs of the services but responsive also to the American public in these troublesome times.

I want to make it perfectly clear that no one in this Congress is more economy minded than I am. But at the same time I think of economy, I also think of military necessity and whatever projects are required, I feel we have a responsibility to authorize. Naturally, we don't depend solely upon ourselves but must place reliance upon the factual presentations made by the Department of Defense and the various services. It is only then that we exercise our individual and collective judgments as members of this committee in determining what we believe to be the items of military necessity.

Ladies and gentlemen, I urge you to support this bill which would provide the necessary facilities for our military forces.

Some of you have asked me to discuss a little more in detail title VII of the bill regarding homeowners' relief so, even though I have concluded my statement, I will try to comply with your request.

Gentlemen, probably the most complex subject in this bill is title VII, the Homeowners Assistance section. The Department of Defense requested authorization in the amount of $27 million to implement the provisions of section 1013 of Public Law 89-754. But to understand the request, it is necessary to understand the basic law.

Section 1013 of Public Law 89-754 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to military or civilian homeowners by reducing their losses incident to the disposal of their homes, when the military installations at which they were serving or employed are or-

dered to be closed in whole or in part. To provide such assistance, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to acquire title to, hold, manage, and dispose of or in lieu thereof, to reimburse the military or civilian employee for certain losses upon the private sale of or foreclosure against any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling.

The act establishes in the Treasury a fund to be available to the Secretary of Defense for extending such financial assistance to qualified homeowners but subsection 1013(i) requires that appropriations for the acquisition of properties must be authorized by a military construction authorization act and that no moneys in the fund may be expended except as may be provided in appropriation acts.

This means that while we have a law on the book permitting such payments, it is necessary that an authorization be made in order that funds may be appropriated to implement this act. During the consideration by the committee, we learned that DOD studies had been made and it indicates that there are about 124,600 military personnel and 81,200 civilian employees who will be affected by the base closures and that, of these, 12,980 military personnel and 32,370 civilian personnel will be eligible homeowners.

The law is quite specific as to the persons who will be eligible for assistance. The Secretary of Defense under this basic legislation may provide assistance with respect to any property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling which is situated at or near a military base or installation which the Department of Defense has subsequent to November 1, 1964, ordered to be closed in whole or in part, if he determines that, first, the owner of such property is or has been a Federal employee employed at or in connection with such a base or installation—other than a temporary employee serving under a time limitation—or a serviceman assigned thereto; second, that the closing of such a base or installation has required or will require the termination of such owner's employment or service at or in connection with such base or installation; and third, that as the result of the actual or pending closure of such installation there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions.

To be eligible for the benefits under this law, the employee or military personnel must be or have been, first, assigned or employed in connection with the installation at the time of the public announcement of the closure action; second, transferred from such installation or activity or terminated as employees as a result of reduction in force within 6 months prior to the public announcement of the closure action; or third, transferred from the installation or activity on an overseas tour unaccompanied by dependents within 15 months prior to public announcement of the closure action.

Then, there is a further limitation: At the time of the public announcement of the closure action or at the time of transfer or termination of employment, such personnel must, first, have been the owner-occupant of the dwelling or, second, have vacated the owned dwelling as a result of being ordered into on-post housing during a 6-month period prior to the closure announcement.

The benefits conferred by this legislation represent an attempt to prevent a catastrophic loss to employee homeowners who were affected by the base closure decision. The relief can be in several forms. For those whose homes have been foreclosed, the Government will pay the deficiency judgments debts owing to the VA or FHA and other foreclosure costs directly on behalf of the applicant. To the extent that the applicant may have already paid all or part of his valid foreclosure cost, the Government would reimburse him. For those whose homes have been already sold, the Government will obtain fair market value appraisals, both current and prior to the base closure announcement for the property for which the assistance is sought, and will remit to the applicant a check in the amount by which 90 percent of the prior fair market value exceeds the current market value or the actual sales price, whichever is higher.

For those who are still in possession of their home, the Government will obtain a current and a prior fair market value appraisal and inform the applicants of the amounts of such appraisal so that they may elect to first, sell privately and claim loss compensation or, second, assign their properties to the Government for the amount of outstanding mortgages or, third, assign their properties to the Government for 90 percent of the fair market value.

In essence, gentlemen, this is the basic legislation which was considered not by our committee but by another committee of the House and of the Senate. As you will recall, this was voted on as a portion of the conference report of the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 after many amendments had been made to this section on the Senate floor.

As I said previously, the bill as requested by the Department of Defense this year would have provided $27 million in authorization of funds to implement the basic legislation.

Frankly, many questions were raised during the hearings concerning this matter, and we found ourselves somewhat in a dilemma.

Some Members believed that this was the beginning of a vast new program guaranteeing to Department of Defense employees benefits against losses occasioned by the closing down of installations. Those who argued this position felt that civilian employees of the Military Establishment should not be given any greater rights than civilian employees of a veterans hospital or any other governmental activity which has been closed. In other words, they believed there was discriminatory treatment in this legislation between civilian employees of the military and other branches of the Government. Others contended that if we start this type of program, there is no stopping point because the small businessman such as the motel owner or the service station owner also is vitally affected by a base closure, and suggested that if we begin to provide relief to civilian employees we should also provide them to members of the business community. Others believed that if this program should commence at all, it should date from the date the present Secretary of Defense made his first base closure announcement.

Counterarguments were made by some other members of the committee. They pointed out that the closure of a military installation was similar to closure of a major industry in a one-industry town, and that the housing market would be completely depressed, thus forcing catastrophic losses on all homeowners who were required to leave their homes in order to seek employment elsewhere. They also argued that coincidental with the base closure program, economic assistance for development of the community is provided to the local civilian and business leaders, frequently with the result that the community is in as good economic position as had the military base continued in operation.

There was extensive discussion over the governmental responsibility to the military and civilian employee with the recognition that the military employee had no choice of assignment unlike his civilian counterpart. Upon being assigned to a military installation and finding no military quarters available, the military man could only acquire family housing in the private sector of the economy if his family were to be with him.

Thus, while the nature of the losses may be the same to both the military and civilian employee, the circumstances leading to the losses are somewhat different.

Therefore, the committee took a middle-of-the-road position providing reimbursement or payment to military while excluding civilian employees from such coverage.

The committee discussed the fact that the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 which required the armed services to authorize this money, could be amended so that of the Congress desires civilian employees who are thus affected could be reimbursed by some other means but not through authorization by the Armed Services Committee.

I can assure you that we have enough problems and responsibilities taking care of the military without overseeing a program which takes care of the civilian employees for this type of loss.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding.

Is the chairman saying that some other committee should concern itself with civilians or is the gentleman saying that because these are civilians you have rejected them?

Mr. RIVERS. We have rejected civilian coverage.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The gentleman is not suggesting that another committee of this body ought to consider this particular phase of this problem?

Mr. RIVERS. I am not going to suggest anything, because if trouble develops, they would pick us out of the crowd.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am sure that the gentleman knows that in my home city, the city of Mobile, Ala., there is located the Brookley Air Force Base, one of these bases affected, and I might say that it is the largest installation of its type of all those ordered closed back in 1964. We had some 13,000 civilians, as the gentleman in the well knows, and some 1,000 military personnel involved.

I think one of the theories behind this original proposal was that this impact would find many people with their life's savings invested in their homes and who would find their life's savings wiped out. I say this particularly with reference to 13,000 civilian employees who had investments in their homes all of a sudden thrown on the open market and who could not hope by any stretch of the imagination to come out with anything like their original investment in these homes. This, of course, was the reason behind the civilians being included in the model cities bill to which the chairman referred.

I think that there are civilian employees left all over the country, many of them who have come from our city of Mobile, who have been desperately waiting on the day when this legislation would be passed which would have included them and which was included in the President's budget. This is going to represent a considerable drain upon them, perhaps, even to the point of bankruptcy in many cases, as the result of the omission of this part of the bill.

I would remind the chairman that the committee has included $22 million for the military while the President's budget only called for $27 million which would have included the civilians as well.

Mr. RIVERS. Now let me ask the gentleman—has the gentleman finished his statement?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. The thing that worried our committee was this: Where would we start? I am fully aware of the Brookley Air Force Base which is located in Mobile, Ala. One of the worst mistakes the Secretary of Defense ever made—that is quite a statement I am making—one of the worst mistakes he has ever made was when he closed down Brookley Air Force Base.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. The gentleman from South Carolina and I agree on that point.

Mr. RIVERS. He also closed Rome, N.Y.; he closed down Middletown, Pa., two other materiel bases; he has closed down the Brooklyn Navy Yard. He closed down numbers of other large installations. And, we wondered where to start and where we would end. I do not think that our policy for civilians has been thoroughly worked out. Hence, I do not think that our committee had the time to look into this thing. But we did have the time to look out for the military people who are assigned to go to a certain community and there may not be any housing there.

I can tell you about the Donaldson Air Force Base in Greenville, S.C. The real estate lobby prevented our committee from building one house—not one house—and the military had to deny housing in this community, whether they liked it or not. The same way in Savannah, Ga., at Hunter Air Force Base. McNamara closed it out overnight. And these people are definitely limited. Take, for instance, a master sergeant with $100 a month for his basic allowance for housing. He could not stand much of that. And when by direction of higher level he is sent to some other place, this is manifestly unfair, and this we know, and we were willing to present that in the committee. And we are going to continue to look at this and bring it to the attention of Mr. PATMAN'S committee to handle it over there. I know it passed in the other body. I am sorry to say, but a lot of things passed the other body.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield further, you take in a place where it ends naturally, say, a small place in a town where there are not too many people involved, or too many employees involved—those homes can be absorbed into the local economy. And of course, naturally with bases that are going on working every day and people leave for whatever purposes it may be, those homes can be absorbed, but when you dump them on the market like that overnight because of the action of the Secretary of Defense, it then leaves not only the community in a bad way when that occurs, but it also affects those many homeowners who have been forced from their homes certainly not for anything they have done. And there are a few cities like that, certainly Mobile is one of them, where it has had such a severe impact that it is almost impossible to overcome it. We have over 1,200 vacant homes in the city of Mobile today, because of the closing of the Brownsville Air Force Base. Most of those homes are owned by civilian employees who had to be transferred in order to keep their jobs, and in order to keep their seniority, and those homes are sitting there with no one in them, and no prospects of purchasers for them.

Certainly it is my feeling that when the Secretary of Defense arrives at such an unwise decision that some provision should be made to see that these folks are not left penniless insofar as their survival is concerned.

Mr. RIVERS. I might state to the gentleman that I supported his contention in the committee, but the committee voted me down, and I am here this afternoon to favor the action of the committee, because the committee in its wisdom turned this down, and I must support the position of the committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I am aware of the position of the chairman.

Mr. RIVERS. I believe that if we start on this perhaps we ought to know more about it than we know now, but I know we are right as far as the military bases are concerned.

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

Mr. RIVERS I yield to the distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding. I would simply like to say to my colleague from Alabama that I fully understand his concern for his people, because in my district there was a similar action with respect to the air materiel area, as the chairman has already indicated, but the date that was selected here did not happen to include that action.

Therefore, the chairman is exactly correct when he says that there has to be a study to determine the time when this should be effective and the ground rules which should control, because we do not wish to be unfair to people who have given good service to their country and who are hurt by actions over which they have no control. But the same situation sometimes results from arbitrary cancellation of contracts where an area is similarly affected.

I would like to join my chairman in the statement that we do intend to be fair and we wish to do what we can to properly protect the national interest. It is not an easy problem to resolve.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. I have listened with great interest and appreciation to the comments of my distinguished friend, the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services.

This is a bill to which the subcommittee that I am honored to head, the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the Committee on Appropriations devotes much time.

I am particularly pleased to note that the bill now before us authorizes substantially more in funds and carries many more line items than has been the case in a number of years.

In this measure we are approaching a level which permits the military services to achieve a reasonably satisfactory degree of modernization. Particularly is this needed in areas such as barracks, bachelor officer quarters, and family housing. These have been so seriously neglected for years. Equally important are training facilities, which are so essential to the adequate preparation of the military forces for their job of winning wars and that of providing protection for this Nation and support for its commitments worldwide.

I recall, very well just 2 years ago that the committees of Congress went through the difficult and trying job of providing an authorization and an appropriation bill for a fully justified military construction program only to have a very substantial part of that program deferred for months by the Secretary of Defense. There was no question about the need for the facilities, and nearly all of them subsequently were built but at higher cost. Despite the efforts of the Congress to provide the needed construction facilities with the assurances of witnesses from the Pentagon at that time that all of the facilities were needed and were going to be built, the program was subjected to the deferral pe-

riod, with its delays in securing needed facilities and its added costs.

I take this time to ask the distinguished chairman whether he has concern that a similar situation may prevail this year. We have gone through this once and a whisper is going around that something of the kind may be in the making again. I will be extremely disturbed if after the work of the committees of Congress and the assurances of need from defense witnesses, that we should find ourselves again going through deferral or postponement. Does that gentleman have information on this matter?

Mr. RIVERS. Let me try to respond to the gentleman. A few days ago I saw a release in a paper—and that is where I get most of my information—I saw a release in the paper where the Secretary is going to cut $3 billion—I think it was $3 billion—or it may be $10 billion. But I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] to check my figures. It was either $3 billion or $10 billion that he said he was going to cut of fat out of the military budget.

Mr. BATES. I was going to cover this in my remarks.

Mr. RIVERS. I see.

Mr. BATES. But reference was made to a 15 percent cut.

Mr. RIVERS. Anyway, it was around $3 billion that he said he would take of fat out of the budget. I did not know that there was any fat in it. If we had any fat in it, we tried to get it out. It was on the 19th of July when we reported this bill out that I directed this letter to the same committee that just reported out the authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Committee, I would like to read a letter which I sent to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and his response hereto:

JULY 19, 1967.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The Committee on Armed Services has today ordered reported H.R. 9356, the Military Construction bill for Fiscal Year 1968.

Prior to bringing this bill to the Floor of the House of Representatives I wish to have your assurance that funds will be requested for the construction of the projects authorized by the bill and that all the projects so authorized will be constructed.

I will appreciate your responding to me at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 28, 1967.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With reference to your letter of July 19, 1967, this is to assure you that with the exception of the several additions made by the Committee, the appropriation estimates now before the Congress support all the new projects proposed for authorization in the 1968 program that are contained in H.R. 9356. Depending on appropriations actually granted by Congress and subject to our regular and continuing review of the requirements for individual projects as they come up for execution, we propose to go forward with the 1968 construction program in the normal manner.

The President's Budget estimates for 1968 do not contain any new appropriation estimates for either the Army National Guard or the Army Reserve construction programs.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. That letter gives no real assurance. It is as wide open as a barn with a busted door. Anything could happen under that language.

Mr. RIVERS. If I understand the letter correctly, it says:

In response to your letter, we will do the same thing we have been doing. We will continue to review, and after review if we decide to spend the money, we will spend it. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, you are informed that the things you have added have not been authorized by the President's budget. Furthermore, you authorized $10 million for the Guard and $10 million for the Reserve, and these are not in the President's budget and, in so many words, we do not plan to spend a nickel more than we have said to you and that is that.

Mr. SIKES. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the essential thing is that the authorization committee has worked long and hard to bring forth a good bill containing needed projects. The Appropriations Committee is engaged in similar work. As soon as we have an authorization bill, we will be on the floor with the appropriations bill. Having gone through this exercise, and depending for our basis upon the assurance of those men from the Pentagon whose responsibility it is to know what is needed in new military facilities, I hope that the Congress will insist that the projects be built and built speedily. I trust the gentleman will concur.

Mr. RIVERS. I do concur.

I will say this to the gentleman: We do not get too many assurances, but we have added only one or two projects. One of them is for the Reserve and the other for the Guard. If we have ever needed a Guard, that day is now.

This morning I appointed a special committee to look into the readiness of the Guard and to see whether or not it is equipped to do the pressing things it may be called upon to do.

The most important thing on earth to this country now, with the exception of the deaths in Vietnam—with the exception of the young men who are giving their lives to a war of no resolution, with the exception of that, law and order are the most important things in this country today, and indeed it will be the most important issue in the next presidential election. Mark you that today. That is the only force the Government has had, the National Guard.

The Constitution gives the States the right to have State militias. That is the Guard, and we are going to insist on its readiness, its equipment, and its training of men. I have notified the committee that I will appoint a special committee to look into this matter and report back to the committee, which means to you [Mr. GROSS], and every other Member of the House of Representatives.

I believe the answer to that is "Yes," Mr. Chairman, and I will say this to the gentlewoman from New York. Her intense interest in this area brought this dramatically to the attention of the committee, and we had a special inquiry made into this to take care of those men assigned up in Iceland. It was because of her interest in this. This is not the first interest she has brought to the committee about the welfare of these young men. I am sure the answer is "Yes." If not, I will look into it, and I will give the gentlewoman a complete written report on it.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. Also, I hope he realizes we can absorb the 500 units requested in that area. The gentleman will see that it is done?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentlewoman has my assurance on that.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, for yielding to me at this time. Naturally, I expect to support the bill which he brings to the floor today, as I always do, and I shall do so with a great deal of pleasure. But, with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I would like briefly to reopen the discussion and colloquy between the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Alabama a few minutes ago with regard to title VII of this bill.

I hope that the chairman of the committee who brings this bill to the floor, during the remainder of the time allocated to general debate and, as far as possible, when we get under the 5-minute rule, with his colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services, will perhaps reconsider as we seek to ask him to support relief for these people who, in many instances, have been the innocent victims of base closings in many parts of the United States.

Let me say that in the district I represent we have been very fortunate and have not had any bases closed, but we have many fine civil service employees who have been transferred into one or more of the bases in and near the boundaries of our districts who are being imminently faced with bankruptcy proceedings unless they can obtain some relief under the provisions of Public Law 89-754. It would seem to those of us who have discussed this with these innocent victims of base closings, that the request which they have presented to us seems to be fair and reasonable.

If the gentleman from South Carolina will yield further, I believe the cost to the Government will be negligible. In all probability, the Government will recoup and recover most, and possibly all, of the funds which would be expended if an appropriate amendment could be adopted. I believe sincerely that no actual loss will accrue to the Treasury of the United States. On the other

hand, there will be hundreds and perhaps thousands of civilian employees who will lose their life savings and who may, as a result of this, be forced into involuntary bankruptcy, and lose their jobs and means of livelihood. However, by a simple amendment to include both military and civilian personnel, we can grant to each the benefits which are now provided only to military personnel under the provisions of title VII of this act. Certainly, I support the language of the bill, as far as it goes, to extend these benefits to the military personnel who are covered under the language of the bill which the committee in its judgment and wisdom has before us.

I do hope, when we reach the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, that the members of the Committee on Armed Services will be inclined to accept an amendment which will extend to the displaced civilian employees who are about to lose their homes and their life's savings, the same benefits which the bill in its present form extends to military personnel.

Mr. RIVERS. We have not closed our eyes to this entire problem. Indeed, we do not believe it has received sufficient thought by the proper committees.

I do not believe we have enough information now to include all the civilians. The military personnel are different. They were assigned there.

I do not know what size house John Smith, who may be a GS–12 or a GS–14, might have. He might have a $60,000 house. He might decide he had much equity. I do not know.

I believe that this has not had the thought it should have had. The parent committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, which created the organization downtown to take the paper on these houses, perhaps should address itself to these problems.

NASA may put up a lot of installations at New Orleans or at Houston or at some other place in the West. The Atomic Energy Commission, or the Veterans' Administration, may do that. Those things involve civilians.

I believe this problem should be considered from an overall standpoint.

As to the military personnel, we know where we are.

I am not closing my eyes. I had the same thing happen in my district. That may surprise the gentleman. I have had military installations closed in my district. We do not read that in the Washington papers, but it has happened.

Mr. FLYNT. In this connection, I fear that the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, may be confusing the issue, if he believes the only people who are going to be adversely affected by this omission are civilians in the grades of GS–15 or GS–16.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course not, I did not say that.

Mr. FLYNT. Let me refer to the wage board employees.

Mr. RIVERS. Where do we stop? What date would we put on this? Would we start after World War II?

Mr. FLYNT. The amendment I would propose to offer would simply implement the provisions of section 1013 of Public Law 89–754.

Mr. RIVERS. We may want to include Rome, N.Y., where Mr. PIRNIE comes from. We may want to include San Bernardino, Calif. We may want to include Middletown, Pa.

Mr. FLYNT. Would not the gentleman agree we could at least take a step in the right direction, and if further implementation should be needed later we could do it? As I said before, I do not believe this legislation will be a burden on the Treasury. I believe the Treasury will recoup nearly every dollar it expends. At the same time, this will protect the life's savings and perhaps the gainful employment of many hundreds or perhaps thousands of dedicated and devoted civilian employees at these installations.

Mr. RIVERS. That could happen. We know where the military personnel are. I do not believe we can handle the whole program.

The gentleman would not want to overlook the VA employee who has a $4,000-a-year job, would he?

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. In answering that question, the gentleman from South Carolina is the one who suggested extending it across the board. What I would suggest doing is simply implementing the provisions of Public Law 89–754, to which title VII applies, to let it extend to the people who have been innocent victims of these base closings by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. RIVERS. Generally the gentleman is right, but he is wrong now. I will tell him why. They imposed this on the Committee on Armed Services, to take care of the civilians, but this is out of our line.

Normally the gentleman is right.

Next year, if they can bring in something that comes within our jurisdiction, I may be the first one to support it. Indeed, I supported this.

But, I think the committee was wise—I think the committee was wise. Now they have a whole year to look at the whole spectrum and let the proper committee have it. I am sure, however, that our committee acted wisely.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding. And, on this subject I wish to say that the committee exercised real good wisdom in omitting indemnification on the bases that has been discussed here.

The question—and I apologize because I did not hear all of the gentleman's previous remarks—where did he say, and what is the location, of this highly important outloading ammunition city?

Mr. RIVERS. Port Chicago, Calif.

Mr. GROSS. Port Chicago, Calif.?

Mr. RIVERS. Port Chicago, Calif. That is in the congressional district which is represented by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I shall not ask the gentleman the question, but I am curious to know if the gentleman has the answer and I would be glad to have it—I am curious to know what happened to all of that real estate that was closed up when the San Jacinto Ammunition Center was closed out some years back? The gentleman from South Carolina will recall that we had quite a hassle over that question on the floor of the House at that time.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, quite a hassle.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if that had been sold back to Houston, Tex., or does the gentleman have that information?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not have that information, but I will tell the gentleman that if he will direct a letter to the General Services Administration, they will surely tell him the facts with respect thereto.

Mr. GROSS. I have been trying to keep up with that information, but at times I have not had very much luck.

I really rose to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if there is anything—any money—for installations in the Panama Canal Zone or in Panama?

Mr. RIVERS. I think there is.

Mr. GROSS. And, if there is any money in this bill for Wheelus Air Base in Libya?

Mr. RIVERS. There is nothing for Libya—I know there is nothing for Libya. There is something in Panama, and I would be glad to get that information for the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take Panama. Is there any saving language contained in the bill with respect to that situation? The gentleman is well aware of the fact that we are trying to give away the Panama Canal to the Panamanians, and if we are going to give the station at Coco Solo—the Navy station on the east side of the Panama Canal—if they are going to give away further real estate and further naval property, why would we want to go in and improve the property pending disposition of this treaty? Also, is there any saving language in this bill with respect to these situations?

Mr. RIVERS. I do not think there is any saving clause in this bill. But I do not know why we should not entertain one, if the gentleman has a proposal to that effect. I am sure our chief counsel who sits now with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] would have no opposition as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I would have no opposition to such a saving clause.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I hope the gentleman would agree with me that we have no business going in and spending a considerable amount of money, if we are going to give away these properties.

Mr. RIVERS. However, in the meantime, we must provide for our military people assigned to this area.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman from South Carolina, but I think we ought to have some understanding as to the tenure involved.

Mr. RIVERS. I would not object to that—some saving clause.

I will say this to the gentleman from Iowa: Seldom do we ever disagree, seldom do we ever disagree.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of this very important committee, two questions and, perhaps, the answer to the first one was given in his opening remarks which I missed.

Is it true that this bill is $257 million under the budget request?

Mr. RIVERS. I think—plus the $60 million——

Mr. JONAS. Let us put it another way: Was the total budget request $2.635 billion, but you cut it down——

Mr. RIVERS. Roughly $321 million.

Mr. JONAS. Two hundred and fifty-seven million dollars; is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS. We cut the budget request, roughly, 12 percent.

Mr. JONAS. I am trying to get some figures in the RECORD and not necessarily for my own use right now.

Was the total budget request $2.635 billion, and is the total amount authorized by this bill $2.378 billion?

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I can say right now, that we denied or deferred $321 million.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts to give you the exact figure.

Mr. BATES. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is correct, that the budget figure was $2.6 billion, and the amount contained in this bill is $2.3 billion. The original request by the various departments was $3.5 billion.

Mr. RIVERS. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. JONAS. That is satisfactory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. JONAS. Would the gentleman from South Carolina take 1 additional minute?

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for 1 more minute?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I read over the weekend that some of our military leaders now are saying that we were going to have to withdraw in the South Pacific back to a line closer to the United States. I do not have the exact details in my mind, but is the gentleman aware of that proposal? Has any discussion been had with the members of the gentleman's committee about the prospects of withdrawing our troops and our bases and consolidating them in the Marianas?

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

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

Mr. BATES. I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I understand there was an article with respect to that matter in the U.S. News & World Report, but I also understand further that the Department of Defense has denied it.

Mr. JONAS. I just wondered if there was any substance to the report I read.

Mr. RIVERS. We have no knowledge of it.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure if there was any substance to it the committee would have heard about it.

Mr. RIVERS. I would hope so.

Mr. JONAS. I would certainly hope so also.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 59 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 11722, the military construction authorization bill. This year the bill includes almost 1,800 items, for a total worth of about two and one-third billion dollars. It is the largest military construction bill we have had in many, many years.

The committee has worked diligently and, as the distinguished chairman has already indicated, we have cut about 12 percent from this bill on items that we do not feel will detract from our national security. We held 29 sessions in 6 weeks in order to secure very detailed information. While this was a difficult, exacting, and time-consuming task, I do believe our effort was well worth the while.

In going over the material, not only did we study it with the most careful scrutiny in order to be sure the items would appropriately serve the interest of our national defense, but we were also able to learn many things we had not known before.

One thing is clear: The Department of Defense has not kept the Committee on Armed Services completely in its confidence on all of its plans. Much of it, as the chairman has indicated, we read in newspapers and periodicals.

However, there is hardly a program for which construction is not needed sooner or later. And in the bill that we now have before us, at this point, the Committee on Armed Services finds out specifically what the Department's plans are. But sometimes it is very, very late.

Let me give you some examples.

The Committee on Armed Services has a very special subcommittee on antisubmarine warfare. That is because antisubmarine warfare is one of the most crucial problems that our Nation faces.

It also has another subcommittee which annually reviews all of the research and development of the Department of Defense, including its laboratories.

Yet neither of these committees even heard of a new underseas warfare laboratory that the Navy wanted to start on the Pacific coast until the Navy came in to our committee this year with a request for funds to construct the laboratory at Los Alamitos. And we have had several meetings of subcommittees, but never once before this particular construction bill was presented to us had any of the members of the committees had any information whatsoever on this new project.

As a consequence, we had to send a special subcommittee under the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PORTER HARDY] to California to examine this project.

Not too long ago I was driving down Independence Avenue and I saw a new building being erected. I asked what the building was. At that particular point I could not receive any information, but I pursued the matter further and I was advised that it was the new Forrestal Building. I said, "Do you mean it is a building named after the first Secretary of Defense, the late James Forrestal?" They said "Yes." I said "Is this a building for the Armed Forces?" And I was told yes, it was. But the Committee on Armed Services was not even advised about it.

It did go through the Congress but through the Committee on Public Works and in a lump sum, so that nobody really knew that the Forrestal Building was, in fact, to be built.

Let me give you one other example. In 1958 the Congress passed the Department of Defense Reorganization Act, including the so-called McCormack amendment. It has been the contention of the House Committee on Armed Services that the powers granted under this act to effect any consolidation of existing functions should be preceded by an act of the Congress. The later established Defense Supply Agency was the kind of agency that the McCormack amendment was addressed to, as the committee understood the amendment. We wanted to know what was going on. If new agencies were to be established or if there was to be a consolidation of existing agencies, we expected the Department of Defense would come before the Congress and certainly before our committee to advise us as to its intention. But never did we hear of what was going on until it became a fact.

Over the past years there have been other Department of Defense operations which have been put together without first bringing them to the Congress for our information and for our approval. Thus today there is a Defense Communication Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency, among others.

The tendency to centralize and put all of their eggs in one basket is to me very disquieting and the results can even be questionable. Although we have spent millions and millions of dollars to develop the facilities for our Defense Communication Agency, we still find that we cannot handle our communications adequately.

Look at the trouble we recently had in respect to getting a vital message to the U.S.S. *Liberty*. The basic communication to that ship was routed not through regular channels but by mistake into Greece, and there was a delay. An information copy was directed to the ship, but did it go to the ship? Not at all. It went to the Pacific—while the U.S.S. *Liberty* was in the Mediterranean.

So we are concerned about the centralization of many of these agencies.

We wonder what would happen if there was a real emergency so that our communications network would really have to be used in a really extended situation.

This year in the military construction

hearings we learned for the first time that there are now two new defense agencies, the National Agency Check Center and a Defense Central Index of Investigation. Never before did our committee know about these two agencies until they came before us on this bill and told us that the agencies were already established but that they needed a new building. If we had not had the military construction bill, I doubt if we ever would have heard of them.

We should have the opportunity to examine the pros and cons at any time that the administration decides to set up a new agency. Without this examination we have lost the checks and balances built into our Constitution.

Last year we found out about the new Defense Language Institute when the Department wanted funds to build new facilities at Biggs Air Force Base. The Armed Services Committee refused to go along with the proposal to move everything down to Biggs and deleted the item until the matter could be thoroughly studied. Now this year we find that there are more funds being sought to establish language facilities at Fort Bragg. Thus, it is only through the military construction bill that we often find out what is going on.

And they cannot build any building unless we are requested to enable them to do so, unless they do it through the General Services Administration, and we have now reached an agreement that any time the occupancy of any building shall exceed 50 percent by the Department of Defense, it shall in fact clear through our committee.

But it is not just that these new agencies have been formed without congressional knowledge or approval. One by one the functions of the Army, Navy and Air Force can be drawn off and put into some new Defense agency until there is merely a shell of the old organizations. Yet the Constitution clearly gave Congress the powers—

> To raise and support Armies; to provide and maintain a Navy.

It appears that our Founding Fathers were most wise when, in addition to the above powers, they also buttressed the power of Congress—

> To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever . . . over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.

By maintaining its control over the construction of all new buildings, the Congress has been able to keep informed of Defense policy.

For many years now the Atomic Energy Commission has had the statutory duty to keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "fully and currently informed" with respect to all aspects of the atomic programs. Just this year the House has sought to write into substantive law the requirement that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall keep the space committees "fully and currently informed." I would like to suggest that the Armed Services Committees should seriously consider adding this kind of language to their statutory powers so that we can learn about Defense policies firsthand rather than after the fact, when it might well be too late.

One of the things that our annual review of the construction budget permits us to do is to keep a rein on the ability of the Armed Forces to construct without undue frills. Thus it is that the committee can, by examining costs per square foot, come to some consideration as to the relative amount of gold plating that has gone into or might go into a particular building. Likewise, by examining the costs to landscape and grade, the committee has been able to determine in many instances that particular structures are being built with too much folderol, and had the services reexamine them.

Another type of item which has been included in the construction program for this year has been sewage treatment plants. During the review by the committee it was found that sometimes these plants were built in conjunction with local plants or were built to accommodate, in part, local needs besides the needs of the military. Thanks to the efforts of the committee, we have been sure that where local needs are being taken care of, the local governments are paying their share of the facilities. In fact, at one particular base we felt that the Armed Forces were helping to build a sewage treatment plant even though it had no particular need of it at this time. The cost was exorbitant and the committee eliminated the item.

This leads me to comment upon the method by which the Department of Defense arrived at its proposal for the military construction bill.

Listen to this, because I think it gives a new insight into how the Department of Defense is presently operated. The Department received from various departments proposals totaling over $3.5 billion. It took these proposals originally and cut them from $3.5 billion to $1.5 billion for submission to the President. At the White House an additional $1.1 billion was added to the bill. Why? Because of a military requirement that the President deemed necessary? Not at all. It was only because the construction industry needed some assistance. They had fallen upon hard times. They wanted to pick up the economy, so the President added $1.1 billion to this bill—to this military bill—not to help the military, but to shore up the economy.

The items which were thus added were not necessarily of the highest priority. Hence it was that when the committee decided to review some items or to delay some others, they went through those items rated with the lowest priority by the services, and we cut them approximately $330 million from this bill, or 12 percent of what was submitted to us. The items which were retained were those which, while not originally of the highest priority, nevertheless would have been included in next year's bill.

I have criticized the Secretary of Defense for his part in allowing the Defense construction bill to be used for purposes other than those which are strictly military. I had assumed that the Secretary of Defense had as his primary obligation the defense of this country.

In 1966, after the Congress had authorized certain construction, the Secretary of Defense refused to spend the money until early this year. This involves some 8,500 units of family housing for our military. When the Secretary of Defense came before our committee originally, he said of all the items in the bill, these 8,500 units for our military housing were the most important. Yet he cut it down, and slowed it up for a period of 2 years. This year he has started to build these houses. At that time, he authorized the expenditure of funds previously granted by the Congress. Why? In order to assist the construction industry. The press release that came out indicated the Secretary of Defense had now permitted the release of this money for three reasons: First. He said it was a need. It has been a need for 2 years. Second. He said it would help the morale. It would have helped the morale of the Armed Forces a lot more if they did not have to wait 2 years. Third. He said it was also to help the construction industry. It seems to me he ought to be in another department than in the Defense Department if it is upon this basis he is going to exercise judgment.

In order to be sure that our Armed Forces do receive adequate recognition for their efforts, there have been two areas in which the Armed Services Committee has been especially outspoken: first, in connection with adequate housing for our military personnel, and, second, in connection with adequate hospital facilities for them.

The construction which had been included in the bill in 1966 and which the Secretary of Defense authorized only at the beginning of this year was primarily for housing. Hence it was that even though the needs of our military personnel had been recognized for some time, it was not until early this year that the necessary housing, as already funded by the Congress, had construction started. In addition, in this year's military construction bill, there were additional sums approved for housing—indeed, this year we have approved $809,000,000 for family housing expenditures, including 12,500 new family housing units, $267,000,000. The Armed Services Committee has been urging the Department of Defense to approve adequate housing for its military personnel for a number of years now. We hope that when this is authorized and appropriated by the Congress, that the Secretary of Defense will not again decide to defer this program until sometime when it will do the construction industry a lot more good than it will at this particular moment.

Let me proceed further with respect to the hospital situation. For many years now, the Armed Services Committee has been emphasizing the necessity of providing adequate medical facilities for the servicemen and their families. In particular, I have been pointing to the Chelsea Hospital in Massachusetts as being old enough to be in a museum itself. This year we made a special effort to study the hospital situation. We even set aside one special hearing to be devoted only

to the problem of hospitals. While we have been told that the armed services cannot design one central core for a standard hospital of a set size, with the special needs of that hospital taken care of in addition to the wings, this is what we have been told. This year, I am glad to report, there are many new hospital projects which have been put into the program. Now, perhaps we can begin to look toward the time when the serviceman and his family will receive adequate hospital treatment without being turned away in emergencies.

One of the most important provisions of this bill is the title which would establish by statute the naval districts. During recent years, there has been much consolidation of naval districts by departmental unilateral order. I do not think that this has been the wisest way to proceed. It was the latest move to have the 1st and 3d Naval Districts combine in New York City that has caused the most consternation. If there should be such a move, it would be the larger, Boston office which would be required to move to join with the smaller New York office. To my mind, there is no reason for any such kind of amalgamation. The duties in New England are very real and very large. The duties in New York cover a very much smaller seacoast and a very much smaller naval activity. It is time that the Congress attacked the problem head on by writing the naval districts into statutory law. Then when the Department of Defense wants to change those districts it must come back to the Congress and present its case. If the case is well considered and will provide a benefit to the country as a whole, the change will be adopted by the Congress. On the other hand, if the proposed change is as lacking in sense as the proposed move of the Boston headquarters into New York, then it will be rejected. It is time that the Congress took one more step toward reacquiring its constitutional prerogative.

After we completed the hearings on this bill, I read in the newspapers that the Department of Defense intended to cut its programs by approximately 15 percent. I asked the chairman of the committee whether he was advised of this new development. He advised me he was not. I then suggested to him that we write a letter to the Secretary of Defense asking if there was any substance to this rumor of cutting the military appropriations by 15 percent. The chairman wrote that letter, he made that inquiry of the Secretary of Defense, and we received yesterday a reply, to which the chairman of the committee has previously referred. I want to read this letter. It is signed by Robert S. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, and it is addressed to the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN, with reference to your letter of July 19, 1967, this is to assure you that with the exception of the several additions made by the Committee, the appropriation estimates now before the Congress support all the new projects proposed for authorization in the 1968 program that are contained in H.R. 9356.

Let us back up a little bit. What does he say? "I want to assure you that with the exception of the additions which were added by the Congress, we will perhaps proceed." In other words, there is the fount of knowledge. Regardless of what new developments there may be, regardless of what position the Congress assumes, and regardless of our constitutional obligation to provide and maintain the armed services, he says this, and the name of the Secretary of Defense or his title never appear in the Constitution of the United States.

He is a creature of the Congress. Yet he said in this letter that the things he recommended were one thing but there would be exceptions so far as the items we thought were necessary.

I heard those same kinds of comments some 10 or 15 years ago, when this Congress believed it was important and imperative for the defense of this Nation to build nuclear submarines. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy at that time said there was no need for nuclear submarines, that they were too expensive. Where is the man who would stand in this place today and say that our Polaris submarines are not the strongest arm of our national defense?

The Secretary of Defense in his letter of July 28 said he could not approve the items which we have listed. What does he say with respect to his own items? Let me read further. He said:

Depending on appropriations actually granted by Congress and subject to our regular and continuing review of the requirements for individual projects as they come up for execution, we propose to go forward with the 1968 construction program in the normal manner.

What does that mean, "in the normal manner"?

To me, Mr. Chairman, this was not a fitting response to a committee which is diligently trying to do its work.

We wanted to know: does the Secretary of Defense now intend to cut these bills presently before us? If he does, I believe we are entitled to that information.

Is it necessary for us to go once again to our prime source, the newspapers of this country?

This morning I picked up the Washington Post. For the second time I find out from the newspapers, in a headline, that "Economies May Slow Missile Replacement."

It is said that the Air Force has passed the word—not to the Congress, but has passed the word that there is an "economy drive now underway."

What is this economy drive for the national defense? Certainly we have not heard it. We listened for 6 weeks to representatives of the Department of Defense, but not once were we advised that this bill should be cut. They said that all these items were vitally needed for national defense.

Now the newspaper advises us that the Air Force says there is an—

Economy drive now underway, the Minuteman I strategic missiles will not be replaced as fast as planned with the improved Minuteman II.

As originally planned, that is.

Only 2 weeks ago the American Security Council wrote a paper in which it criticized the gap being closed by the Russians in reference to our superiority in missiles. Although we are now pretty far ahead of the Russians, in no time at all, in terms of missiles and megatonnage, they will surpass us.

The Secretary of Defense said we should not be concerned about megatonnage because, after all, the important thing is whether we can hit the target and have enough missiles to do this. When he was before us he said we were not only having the Minuteman II, but further than that we wanted to pursue the Minuteman III. Now the newspaper article says we are not going to get the Minuteman III, and we are not even going to get the Minuteman II on schedule. We will get the Minuteman I.

Well, there is a direct relationship between the number of missiles that can hit a target and the megatonnage involved, as the Secretary of Defense indicated, but if we are going to be short on megatonnage, as he indicated, and now, as indicated in this article, we are going to cut down on the missile systems which are more accurate than the ones we presently have, the net effect is clear. We will be superior in neither megatonnage nor missiles.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take further time of the committee. We have gone through this bill carefully. I believe that the items now in the bill are important and are necessary. We have examined every single line, every single item that is in the bill. We believe that it is necessary, and after 6 weeks of study, Mr. Chairman, I recommend this bill to the House.

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

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my endorsement to the authorization bill before us. I have examined this bill carefully and find it is a well-balanced bill which provides for the immediate essential needs of the services. I am particularly pleased with the resumption of normal programing by the Department of Defense. The extremely limited program last year requires a larger construction program this year if we are to continue to modernize and rehabilitate obsolete facilities in a timely fashion. I am pleased that the Department of Defense revised its original plans and increased its program by $1.2 billion to correct the reduction of the previous year. I only hope there is no deferral by the Defense Department of any portion of this program as was the case in December 1965. With construction costs rising at 3 to 5 percent per year any such deferral would indeed prove costly.

Each of the services has included in its portion of the bill a request for deficiency authorization for projects previously authorized of approximately $9 million. These deficiencies developed from several causes; in some cases actual construction costs have exceeded the estimates, while in other cases the refinement of designs and estimates has indicated a

need for larger amounts. In the great majority of these cases the deficiency was not due to the deferral of projects by the Department of Defense in December 1965. I expect that the deficiencies that will be generated by that deferral action will have to be addressed in a future construction authorization bill.

Gentlemen, the military construction bill is but a very small percentage of our military budget. It has, however, received a very long and thorough review by the House Armed Services Committee. I, therefore, hope you will join me in supporting the bill recommended by the committee.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, authorizations in the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, a large portion of which lies in my congressional district, total $11.093 million. This represents a cut of nearly $14 million in the original budget request submitted by the Department of the Air Force in January.

Chairman RIVERS has given assurances that all the projects deferred for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, including a $7.084 million item for a laboratory addition to the foreign technology division, a $3.140 million item for an energy conversion laboratory, and a $2.740 million item for an aerospace medical research laboratory, will be given favorable consideration by the Armed Services Committee if requested again next year by the Department of the Air Force.

The distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee has also repeated to me many times in both public and private conversations his fundamental view that Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is one of the most significant and vital military installations in the United States. In this, of course, I concur, but I would like to take a moment to spell out for my colleagues why the chairman and I believe this to be true.

I am sure my colleagues would expect me to feel that this large military complex located in the Seventh Ohio District, which I have the honor to represent, is vital simply because it is in my district. Each of us tends to feel that the military installations in his own bailiwick are important. But in Wright-Patterson we have something unique. Not only do we have the advanced training school for the "brains" of the Air Force, the Air Force Institute of Technology, but we have a research complex which goes into many areas of pure and applied research. It is this accumulation of knowledge and brainpower which will keep our Nation ahead of any potential adversary. The study and accumulation of knowledge being done at Wright-Patterson will assure the superiority of American equipment, firepower, manpower, method, and materiel in generations to come.

Such research, of course, may be deferred briefly in the interest of economy, but it cannot be deferred indefinitely unless we are to obviously and grievously risk the future security of our Nation. I am reassured by the chairman's assurances about the future mission of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, but I am more reassured by the items which are included in the authorization this year for the avionics science laboratory and the flight dynamics research laboratory.

It is my strong feeling that to unnecessarily defer investment in the additional research and technology which have been proposed for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base would be a grievous error and I shall be personally watchful that such projects as are recommended by the Air Force for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are restored to the authorization of the Defense Department at the earliest practical moment. I trust that the chairman and the members of the Armed Services Committee will join me at that time and share my concern for undue deferment of such facilities in the vital area of research and technological development.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate and compliment my distinguished, able, and great chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for the splendid, explanatory remarks which he has made on this bill, and for his excellent analysis of its various provisions.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend and compliment my distinguished and able colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], for the fine speech that he has made and for his penetrating discussion of the bill.

I shall not talk in extenso with respect to this measure at this time, because I feel that after these two fine speeches which the Members have heard by my distinguished chairman and by my esteemed colleague [Mr. BATES], anything I might say might well be construed as carrying coals to Newcastle.

But I am very strongly in favor of this bill. A great deal of hard, intelligent work has been put into it, and it represents the best efforts of a great committee.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to give it its unanimous support. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] and to echo the words of praise for the leadership which we have received in making this bill possible for presentation to the House.

Both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] on the Republican side and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], our own distinguished and beloved chairman, have made excellent statements in support of this bill. Of course, I support in toto and wholeheartedly this legislation which the committee has worked so hard upon.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present the fiscal year 1968 Air Force construction request in support of our research and development program.

The construction request we are presenting today directly and substantially supports the Air Force research and development effort previously discussed with the committee. The effectiveness of this effort and our flexibility to exploit technological advances and military technology are keenly dependent upon the availability and adequacy of a modern, high quality research and development physical plant.

R. & D. technical facilities provide the technological base with which to insure that our scientific/engineering homework is complete before we make large-scale production investments in our weapons arsenal. They provide us the capability to respond to the uncertainties and technological breakthroughs in R. & D. They provide the "technical building blocks" that we need for research, exploratory development, advanced development, engineering development, operational systems development and systems testing and evaluation.

The investment in research and development facilities of past years has contributed significantly to the world position we enjoy today. Just as surely, our technical capabilities in the seventies will be closely linked to the foresight we use today in providing the necessary R. & D. support.

It is indeed gratifying to look back and see that the work of our dedicated scientific and engineering people, carried out in laboratories and test facilities provided in years gone by, has been responsible to a large degree for the present military and space achievements.

We cannot stand still to admire yesterday's achievements. Rather, we must recognize that dedicated efforts of today are essential if we are to maintain our national status in the years to come. The Soviets are hard at work, investing huge sums of money in research and development. The Soviet objectives behind this heavy investment is obvious. We too must work hard and make investments now to counter those Soviet objectives and insure our freedom and way of life in the future.

We must always guard against the temptation to defer the technology programs and to reduce the R. & D. effort in favor of forces in being. The consequences of deferred technology are deferred capabilities, missed opportunities, national deficiencies and ultimately, the inability to compete technologically or militarily. Our actions today can avoid the costly crash programs of tomorrow.

This past year we have reviewed a great number of interrelated individual efforts—including R. & D. construction requirements. We have geared our

R. & D. effort to changing military requirements, new technological and scientific discoveries, and the tremendous military and economic advantages to be gained. Our R. & D. construction request is an integral part of this effort and the objective has been to make the most effective use of our resources—men, money, time, and facilities—devoted to research and development.

In looking ahead, the Congress must continue to exploit the advantage of dynamic, forward-looking research and development. Continued progress requires timely and adequate resource support. The provision of carefully selected new R. & D. facilities is inherent to our resource and development effort. We must provide our dedicated scientists and engineers with the facility resources required to attain the gains of advancing tchnology. Specialized R. & D. facilities are required to meet the unique state-of-the-art requirements of many of our R. & D. programs. Our R. & D. physical plant must keep pace with our efforts in exploring new frontiers of knowledge and new avenues of technology. We must provide for large ground aerospace test facilities so that our future weapon systems will have a place to be adequately and economically tested before incurring the risks and expense of flight.

We are ahead in R. & D. We must stay ahead. To this end we have included in our fiscal year 1968 military construction program those facilities required to carry out our research and development effort. Some of the facilities in this year's program are as follows:

At Brooks AFB, Tex., we are proposing an environmental oral physiology laboratory. This facility is to conduct in-house studies and interdisciplinary research on the causes and factors which influence the cause of dental and maxillofacial disease. The objective is to develop techniques of maxillofacial surgery and the other specialties of dentistry. It should be noted that locating this facility at Brooks AFB provides the Air Force the opportunity to exploit the panoply of knowledge which emanates from other activities at the school of aerospace medicine.

At the Bishop Site of Edwards AFB, Calif., we are proposing a high-altitude test facility consisting of an austere, granite-stabilized 3,000- by 150-foot test strip and a 40- by 40-foot prefab building. This facility will allow performance evaluation of rotary wing, V/STOL, and other special purpose aircraft at a 10,000-foot altitude in order to substantiate the high altitude take-off, hover, and landing characteristics of the aircraft. We are also providing aircraft test facilities for C–5A aircraft.

At Eglin AFB, Fla., we are proposing an armament engineering and evaluation facility. This provides a three-story building for those nonnuclear munitions R.D.T. & E. functions for which the Air Force is solely responsible. We are also proposing a two-story building for an electromagnetic warfare engineering facility for electronic countermeasures work. An armament test preparation facility will provide experimental facilities needed for an in-house capability to study the chemstry and physics of explosive and to fabricate high explosive assemblies and prototype warheads.

At Holloman AFB, N. Mex., we are providing test track power alterations. This is required to provide trackside instrumentation camera coverage for an expanding track workload.

At L. G. Hanscon Field, Mass., we are proposing an optical physics lab. This provides a capability in low energy, molecular and optical physics, and application of the results to military problems.

At Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, we are proposing the second increment for the Avionics Lab. This second increment is required to support in-house research missions on navigation and guidance, advance weapons, reconnaissance, communications, electronic warfare, surveillance, electronic techniques, and bionics.

At the Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tenn., we are providing for a modification to the supersonic wind tunnel. This system will permit rapid injection and retraction of the test section for the purpose of making necessary model modifications without tunnel shutdown. This will increase test time capability by 30 percent. We are also proposing alterations to the hyperballistic armament test cell to increase velocities from 15,000 feet per second to 25,000 feet per second.

Additions are being made to the space launch complexes at the Eastern Test Range, the Western Test Ranges, and also the Satellite Control Facilities.

Gentlemen, this briefly reviews some facilities required to directly support our R. & D. program. As you can see, this is a modest request. We have been diligent in our effort to include only those facilities required to support the Air Force R. & D. effort.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this legislation.

The Nation has called on the military services to honor our commitments at many places around the world. They are carrying their responsibilities at home and abroad with distinction and valor. The people who bear these burdens, the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen, mature and young, men and women, are well trained and well equipped to perform their many and varied duties. Where do they achieve this status? A large part of it at our camps, stations, and bases. The buildings and structures at these installations, and of course, dedicated military people, permit us to maintain this well trained and well equipped status.

Many of our military installations have not been maintained up-to-date in keeping with the rapid advances of science and technology since the end of World War II. They may be deficient in troop housing, utilities, shops, piers, parking apron, and other facility categories which are necessary for the proper operation and administration of the installations. Many facilities antedate World War II; many were built during the war. Most of these are worn out and need replacement; some may be structurally sound and may be effectively and economically rehabilitated. Whatever the case may be, we owe it to our uniformed people to provide them the wherewithal to perform their difficult tasks adequately.

Our distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the eminent chairman of our Armed Services Committee, has clearly pointed a way in which this body may exercise its responsibilities; that is, to support his recommendation for enactment of the Department of Defense military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, H.R. 11722. His objective presentation and intelligent analysis of this bill leave few questions unanswered and form the bases of knowledgeable endorsement by all of us.

The learned views of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking minority member of our Armed Services Committee, have been expressed in his usual candid, unbiased manner. His important support is indicative of the nonpolitical nature of this bill.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that this bill would authorize a sizable amount for military construction. This fact is emphasized by comparing it to the unusually small amount authorized for this purpose last year. The insufficiencies in this respect in prior years and the unsettled conditions in the world today have contributed to the accumulation in each of the military departments of a considerable amount of unsatisfied facility requirements.

I sincerely believe that no military construction authorization bill of recent years has been scrutinized more closely nor has been analyzed more carefully than the one we are now considering. Problem areas were studied in detail to the extent that several subcommittees made on-site investigations. They reported their conclusions to the full Armed Services Committee before decisions were reached. The Navy program contained several such problem areas. I should like to speak to the Navy program in general and to these problem areas in particular.

Title II of the bill would authorize construction at Navy and Marine Corps installations in the amount of $474.2 million. By analyzing the Navy program it becomes evident that it has been thoughtfully planned, that it is well balanced. First things have been placed first. Most of the construction is for stations in the United States; less than one-tenth being for overseas activities. About one-third of the program, or $157.4 million, is allocated for construction of living facilities. These consist of bachelor quarters for officers and enlisted, messhalls, a few enlisted men's clubs and other recreational facilities, chapels and other community type facilities for use mostly during off-duty hours. Some of these facilities will be new, to satisfy numerical deficiencies; others will be for rehabilitation of existing structures to modernize them at relatively low cost. This appears to be a proper proportion of the program to devote to the well-being of the most important element of our defense, highly motivated people.

The second largest segment of the program, about one-fourth, or $119.1 million, will be used for operational and

training facilities. This also is a seemly proportion of the program, since such facilities are essential for carrying out the missions of the stations. Examples of facilities in this category are piers, airfield runways, and undersea weapons training building.

Other portions of the program are as essential and as urgently needed as those I have just mentioned. They are, however, of lesser importance to the direct purpose of the installations. Two of them will provide for maintenance facilities and utilities. Each composes approximately one-eighth of the program, for $63.3 and $60.4 million, respectively. Alteration of drydocks, and combat vehicle maintenance shops are typical examples of facilities in the maintenance category which are covered in the Navy program. Line items for water main and electric power system are examples of utilities which must be provided to make the buildings usable. Another prime and important example is sewerage improvements. With respect to this type of utility, the bill we are considering would authorize the construction of 27 such line items for $19.2 million at various naval and Marine Corps installations throughout the country. This is the first increment of a continuing Navy program to eliminate the dumping of sewage from their installations into the adjacent rivers and harbors. This pollution abatement program is proceeding in accordance with recommendations of the Congress and Executive order. Although this type of facility will not improve fleet readiness per se, it will definitely be beneficial to the health and welfare of the surrounding communities. This program merits your approval.

The other facility categories comprise the remaining one-sixth of the Navy program for $74.1 million. These are the support facilities so vital to development of improved weapons systems and to the proper operation of the Navy and Marine Corps installations. They include facilities for research and development, supply, medical care, administration, and land acquisition. A research and development line item in the original Navy program submitted to the Congress would have provided for construction of the Underseas Warfare Laboratory on the grounds of the Naval Air Station at Los Alamitos, Calif. This would have replaced the present inadequate laboratory at Pasadena. Your Armed Services Committee recognizes that it is extremely urgent to coordinate and expand our resources and to proceed with the work in this highly important research field. However, there are several serious problems relating to the Navy proposal. Your committee considered it prudent to defer hearings on it until the problems could be resolved. Similarly, your committee has deferred approval of the project for construction of a naval hopital at Roosevelt Roads, P.R., because of unresolved problems.

On the other hand, your committee has approved a major line item for land acquisition for $19.8 million at the Naval Weapons Station, Concord, Calif. As you know, this station supports very importantly, the operations of all of our services in Southeast Asia. Many questions have been raised on the desirability of this proposal which would include acquisition of their own of Port Chicago and the dislocation of its some 2,800 inhabitants. The committee decision was reached only after serious and prolonged study. This involved lengthy debate on the merits, disadvantages, and possible alternatives on the Navy proposal; onsite investigation by a subcommittee and its report to the fall committee. I sincerely believe that the committee decision was right because it involves the safety of hundreds of people.

Although I have touched sparingly on this bill and have mentioned a few details on only the Navy portion of it, I can assure you that your Armed Services Committee has gone into it thoroughly. It is a complex bill which has been given the careful, sober consideration of each committee member. Each project in it is urgently required to permit the shore installations of the Navy and Marine Corps to provide effective support of their operating forces.

Gentlemen, I recommend your approval of H.R. 11722.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this observation about this bill.

The Committee on Armed Services has devoted a great deal of time to this military construction bill. During the deliberations of our committee and during my tenure of service on the committee, there never has been as much attention and as much real study and work devoted to the consideration of military construction legislation as this bill has received. The chairman and all the members of the committee have worked tirelessly on this bill. It has done an outstanding job and I am in complete support of this measure.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MACHEN].

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

The bill we are debating today—the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968—is one of the single most important legislative packages we will consider in the first session of the 90th Congress. This bill is directed at maintaining facilities for the operation and the personnel of our military services.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RIVERS, who I commend today, we on the Armed Services Committee have given painstaking consideration to every facet of this legislation.

This $2.3 billion authorization bill we reported out is not a rubberstamp on the Defense Department's request to us. The Defense Department presented us with the largest single bill for military construction calling for line item authorization ever brought before our committee. We went into this huge request with tenacity and objectivity, and we reduced the departmental request by more than $322 million. There may be room for even more reductions without an adverse effect on our national objectives. Even with the reductions we made, this legislative package contains $809 million in authority for military family housing and homeowners' assistance, and $1,569.8 million in authority for construction of new operational facilities to support our Active and Reserve Forces.

Mr. Chairman, there are several aspects of this authorization bill of particular interest to me. First, it authorizes $33.1 million to begin a phased program of pollution abatement at military installations. We intend to eliminate inadequate sewage and industrial waste disposal at military installations. We believe that in asking the private sector of our country to control and prevent pollution we must also keep our own house in order. Secondly, this bill contains authorization for a total of $9,254,000 for military construction projects in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md. Specifically, the legislation recommends authorization for $925,000 in troop housing and utilities, and $975,000 for 50 units of military family housing at the Naval Communications Station, Cheltenham, and $5,850,000 for 300 units of military family housing at Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, both in Prince Georges County; and $1,208,000 for utilities and ground improvements at the Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, and $296,000 for training facilities at the Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Indian Head, both in Charles County. Thirdly, the overall authorization bill contains the specific language of a bill I introduced last June to prohibit the Navy from disposing of the U.S. Naval Academy dairy farm in Gambrills, Md. Introduction of my bill followed the recommendation of a special subcommittee I headed in the second session of the 89th Congress after the Secretary of the Navy announced plans to close the dairy farm. I am very pleased and gratified that Chairman RIVERS and the whole committee saw fit to include my bill in the overall authorization. Inasmuch as we proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that it would cost the taxpayers unnecessarily to close the dairy farm, and inasmuch as we had the bipartisan support of elected officials and private citizens in Anne Arundel County to maintain the farm, enactment of this legislation will protect the dairy farm from future attempts at disposal, and will guarantee that the Naval Academy midshipmen will continue to receive the highest quality milk and milk products at the lowest cost to the taxpayers.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation as we reported it out of committee. I also wish to express my deep respect for the excellent leadership which our committee chairman has provided members of his committee in considering this vital legislation. This bill we are considering is a tribute to his fine craftsmanship and knowledge of military matters.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, your Committee on Armed Services has been meeting over the past 6 weeks for hearings on the Defense military construction authorization bill for the fiscal year 1968. During the period the committee examined the construction requirements of the Department of Defense in great detail. This was a weighty and difficult task when one considers the sheer bulk of the Defense Department's fiscal year 1968 request which totaled $2,635,238,000 for new authorizations including $814,000,000 for all housing expenditures and $1,821,238,000 for construction. This year's Defense Department request was approximately 2½ times the magnitude of last year's request, and represents the largest single military construction request the Armed Services Committee has considered during the last 5 years.

As a member of your Committee on Armed Services I fully agree with the remarks made by our able chairman in his presentation of the military construction authorization bill. It has my personal support and I strongly recommend its indorsement. The committee chairman has presented a clear and concise summation of the details of this bill. He has singled out problem areas with which the committee was concerned and has indicated proposed solutions. I believe the proposals as outlined are indicative of the inherent responsibilities and prerogatives of the Congress.

I wish to express my personal appreciation to the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, for his recent visit with me to Fort Stewart, Ga.

The occasion, last Friday, was the unveiling of a new name for the helicopter training complex at Fort Stewart at Hinesville and Hunter Army Airfield at Savannah, Ga., which has been designated the U.S. Army Flight Training Center. The complex is under the command of the very able Brig. Gen. Frank Meszar. I predict it will become one of the great Army training centers of our Nation.

Chairman RIVERS made this trip to Georgia in keeping with his constant willingness to take a firsthand look at America's military installations, whenever possible.

Mr. Chairman, the committee notes with an extreme sense of satisfaction that the fiscal year 1968 Department of Defense authorization request reflects a return to the more realistic programing levels essential for replacing its aging facilities and improving the standards of living accommodations for military personnel. The bill also provides for those projects which must be started in fiscal year 1968 to meet essential operational schedules, to support new missions, or which are deemed essential for the health and safety of personnel, and improvements to seriously deficient facilities.

After extensive hearings by the full committee and review of each individual line item requested by the services, the committee was successful in effecting total reductions of $316,395,000 in the bill. The reductions represent some 12 percent of the total requested and represent projects which the committee felt were not of immediate or critical urgency and which would impose no hardship on the services if deferred. The Committee on Armed Services is convinced that the deferred requirements will certainly not impair the operational effectiveness of the armed services nor will they in any way jeopardize our national security.

The bill we now seek to bring before the House would authorize construction at 447 military bases throughout the world and includes 1,450 line items. This might be contrasted with the 280 military bases and 650 line items provided for in the bill for last year. New authority granted in this bill totals, $2,378,843,000 as compared with $996,519,000 in the annual authorizing legislation last year. Of the total in this bill, $1,569,843,000 is for construction in support of active and reserve component forces, $809,000,000 for family housing expenditures including 12,500 new family housing units at an estimated cost of $267,000,000. The committee has also approved $28,240,000 for deficiency authorization against projects authorized in prior years.

I should like now to speak in support of the specific titles.

TITLE I—ARMY

Title I proposes new authorization for the Army in the amount of $379,830,000. Of this amount, $271,327,000 is for projects inside the United States, $105,630,000 is for projects outside the United States, and $2,873,000 is for classified projects.

The Army is continuing in its efforts to improve and replace its obsolescent facilities on an orderly basis, in annual increments of construction. This program represents approximately 2 percent of its total inventory and is a step in the right direction.

The bill provides for construction at 58 Army military bases, including 54 inside the United States and four which are outside the United States.

Title I includes another significant provision which is related to U.S. participation in the sharing of costs with foreign governments for construction of military facilities and installations for collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area. In the past this authority was contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; however, since these requirements relate to support of our U.S. forces rather than the support of foreign aid operations, this authority will be included in the annual military construction bill.

The most critical and largest category of facilities in title I is troop housing and community facilities. For this category, we have approved $74.2 million including authorization for 12,981 enlisted men's spaces at nine installations in the United States and 130 enlisted men's barracks spaces overseas as well as 703 spaces for bachelor officers at two installations in the United States. A dependent school addition at Kwajalein, and an enlisted men's service club with a branch library at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

The next important category is operational and training facilities for which we have approved $173.3 million. This provides for air defense facilities, improved general academic and specialized instructional buildings at the armor, artillery, and special forces schools, and ranges and specialized unit training facilities as well as $60 million for NATO infrastructure.

The sum of $39.9 million is proposed for maintenance, production, and supply facilities to provide essential facilities for the production, stockage, maintenance, and repair of military hardware including field and depot maintenance shops and production, assembly, and maintenance facilities for rockets, guided missiles, and various types of conventional ammunition.

In the research and development category we have approved $21.5 million, the bulk of which is devoted to new laboratory facilities in the fields of infrared devices, nuclear defense, mobility, limited war techniques and ballistic instrumentation. A significant amount, $12.3 million, has been included for range facilities to support the development and test of Nike X.

For hospitals and medical facilities, the sum of $40.4 million include authorization for the construction of three new hospitals, a major addition to an existing hospital and five smaller medical facilities.

We have approved $4.4 million for improvements or additions to command and administrative facilities at five U.S. bases.

The sum of $25.8 million has been approved for utilities with a significant amount $5.2 million directed toward the pollution abatement program. Additional sums are included for augmentation of electrical power generating and distribution systems, improvements to water supply and treatment installations, and road improvements at two installations.

The remaining Army category would authorize the acquisition of mineral interests, on a training site, at Fort Gordon, Ga., at a cost of $260,000.

TITLE II—NAVY

The Navy would be authorized military construction in title II in the total amount of $474,202,000. This amount includes $430,097,000 for projects inside the United States, $37,321,000 for projects outside the United States, and $6,784,000 for classified projects.

The bill proposed for authorization this year presented a program by naval districts and areas instead of presentation by system commands and bureaus as was done last year.

Past Navy programs have emphasized operational facilities to improve fleet readiness and the major portion of the budgets were used to modernize its shore facilities in keeping with the modernization of ships, aircraft and weapons systems. As a result, less than 15 percent of those budgets were for improving living conditions for sailors and marines. Many of these dedicated officers and enlisted men serve protracted tours of duty at sea and at advanced bases separated from families and friends. To mitigate these hardships, we have approved $156 million for barracks, bachelor officers quarters, messhalls, and a few recreation facilities, to support new or expanded missions or corrections of other deficiencies. This amount represents approximately 33 per-

cent of the total program and is a start toward bringing the development of installations into proper perspective.

We have approved $55.6 million for Navy operational facilities. Major items contemplate improvement of operational and support facilities for carriers, fleet air squadrons, communications, and ammunition outloading facilities.

Training facilities: $57.7 million.

Approved projects in this category would expand electronic instruction, training of pilots, submarine crews, hospital corpsmen and recruits, and would augment academic facilities at the Naval Academy and the Navy Post Graduate School.

Maintenance, production, and supply facilities: $70.8 million.

The Navy has continuing requirements ashore to support its fleet of surface ships and submarines and this bill would authorize the modernization of various shore-based Marine maintenance and supply facilities. The bulk of the authorization would provide improved field and depot maintenance facilities, with other large segments devoted to production and maintenance of weapons and warehousing, and storage of POL, explosives, and general items of equipment and supply.

Research and development: $10.4 million.

The Navy approval includes substantial amounts for laboratory facilities for underwater research, including submarine warfare and aircraft testing and explosives development.

Hospital and medical facilities: $10.8 million.

Authorization approved in this category would provide for the replacement of a hospital at Adak, Alaska, and miscellaneous clinic improvements at nine bases.

Administrative facilities: $26.6 million.

Major significant Navy projects include three engineering buildings at U.S. shipyards and miscellaneous facilities including data processing facilities at 11 Navy bases.

Utilities: $64.3 million.

We have granted $19.2 million in this category toward implementation of a program for water pollution abatement by improving waste disposal facilities at 26 locations. The remainder provides for electrical power sources, transmission lines, expansion and improvement of station roadways, and improvement of steamplants and steam transmission lines.

Real estate: $23 million.

The bulk of this approval, $19.8 million, provides for the acquisition of privately owned land, including the town of Port Chicago, to provide an area cleared of human habitation within a radius of approximately 2 miles from the piers. The advantages and disadvantages of the Navy proposal were debated at length during the hearings and an onsite investigation of its merits was made by a subcommittee. With the catastrophe of July 1944 in mind, the committee considers it in the best interests of all concerned that the Navy be authorized to acquire the land within the zone of the greatest danger in event of an explosion during loading operations. The remainder of $3.2 million is for other minor acquisitions including $2.5 million for fee purchase of additional land for an explosion safety area at Patrick AFB where an advanced model of the fleet ballistic missile, the Poseidon, is being tested.

TITLE III—AIR FORCE

Title III proposes new authorizations for the Air Force in the amount of $433,511,000. Of this amount $316,699,000 is for projects inside the United States, $28,816,000 for projects outside the United States, and $87,996,000 for classified projects.

This year the program provides for construction at 130 major installations. Of these, 109 are located within the 50 States, territories, and possessions. Sixteen are in the Atlantic, European/Middle East area and five are in the Pacific area.

The Air Force real property facilities, like those of all other services, consist of many buildings and facilities that have been kept in use long beyond their expected life span. The increasing obsolescence of real property continues to be a matter of concern. This year we have a well-balanced program accommodating the requirements of expanded tactical operations, new transport aircraft, new tactical fighters and research and development facilities leading to the continuation of U.S. leadership in areospace. The "things for people" are contained in this program in significant quantities to provide improvement in living and working conditions for Air Force personnel, military, and civilian. This program represents a forward step after the very austere program of last year.

I will now provide some details of the content of title III:

The bill would provide construction to support the Air Defense Command which is responsible for the aerospace defense of the United States. Projects in this category amount to $15,920,000 and consist primarily of air traffic control facilities, headquarters, and command support facilities, and various base operating activities of the Air Defense Command, and some cleanup work in the NORAD Combat Operations Center.

The sum of $30,122,000 is included for facilities in the Air Force Logistic Command whose mission is to provide an efficient system of procurement, production, surveillance, maintenance, and supply for the U.S. Air Force; provide general overall logistical support for all activities and agencies of the U.S. Air Force and train specialized units for accomplishment of specified logistics functions in overseas areas and theaters. A large portion of the projects in this program are at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base which is the headquarters of the Air Force Logistic Command, but which also support the large research and development effort at this base.

We have approved $52,818,000 for facilities in support of the Air Force Systems Command which is responsible for the primary research and development effort within the Air Force to advance aerospace systems and to acquire qualitatively superior Air Force systems and materials needed to accomplish the Air Force mission. Major projects in this command are a laboratory at Brooks AFB, aircraft test facilities at Edwards AFB, armament engineering facilities at Eglin AFB, and a number of facilities at both the eastern and western test ranges.

The amount of $59,980,000 has been included for facilities in the Air Training Command to provide flying training, air crew training, basic and advanced technical training and basic military training. Included in this program are accommodations for basic military trainees at Lackland AFB. This is a major program to replace the substandard facilities currently used by the basic military trainees at the Air Force Basic Training Center.

The bill also provides $934,000 for the Air University at Maxwell AFB; $14,938,000 for various locations within the Alaskan Air Command, and $10,741,000 is authorized in this bill for Headquarters Command at Bolling, and includes site development for a new Defense office building to be located on the Anacostia-Bolling grounds.

For the Military Airlift Command the bill authorizes $33,771,000. The mission of this command is to provide a military airlift system for all airlift tasks in emergency operations. This command also supervises their operations, the air weather service, the air audio visual service, the air rescue service, and aeromedical evacuation system. A major project in the approved program is a new command headquarters building to be located at Scott AFB, Ill. The bill provides facilities to locate the C–5 transport training unit at Altus AFB, Okla. This unit was formerly scheduled to be located at Charleston AFB, S.C.

We have approved $39,595,000 for the Strategic Air Command which is one of the foremost deterrents of major worldwide aggression. It maintains intensive and inclusive capability for worldwide aerial bombardment against enemies of the United States. Projects include all types of facilities at various SAC bases.

The bill also includes $48,230,000 for Tactical Air Command. This provides facilities in support of those aerospace forces providing tactical air operations which independently or in coordination with ground or naval forces, gain or maintain air superiority, prevent movement of enemy forces, seek out and destroy those forces. Tactical Air Command has achieved prominence in the Southeast Asia conflict. Facility improvements to accommodate new fighter aircraft receive due attention in this program.

The bill authorizes $5,323,000 for the Air Force Academy including the balance of the projects needed for the cadet wing expansion authorized by the Congress.

Also included is $1,867,000 for aircraft control and warning systems projects in the continental United States.

For projects outside the United States, the majority of which are for U.S. Air Forces Europe, the bill includes $28,816,000 and the classified section of the bill will provide $87,996,000.

TITLE IV

We have approved $169 million for Defense agencies in title IV. Of this amount

$19 million is provided for the construction of new and rehabilitation of existing facilities at 13 installations, three of which are outside the United States. These projects are for support of the Defense Supply Agency, the Defense Communications Agency, the Defense Atomic Support Agency, and the National Security Agency. The remaining $150 million provides authorization to the Secretary of Defense for emergency construction to provide for unforeseen construction requirements determined by the Secretary to be vital to the security of the United States.

TITLE V

The authorization provided in title V of this bill for construction in support of Southeast Asia activities amounts to $75 million, including $33,156,000 for the Department of the Army, $17,964,000 for the Department of Navy, and $23,880,000 for the Department of the Air Force. These items represent follow-on elements of the military construction program authorized in the fiscal year 1967 supplemental legislation for southeast Asia.

TITLE VI

This title contains $787 million in authorization for all costs related to military family housing, including $267 million for construction of new family housing units and $520 million for housing support costs. The committee has reviewed all aspects of this new construction program and fully supports the policies and findings of the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee has authorized all 12,500 new units requested by the Department of Defense.

Other authorizations such as for leasing, rental guarantee are being continued for fiscal year 1968.

TITLE VII

Authorizes the Secretary of Defense to assist military homeowners by acquiring their properties, or by reimbursement for losses on sales of such properties, which are situated at or near a military installation ordered, after November 1, 1964, to be closed in whole or in part. The bill authorizes $22,000,000 for this purpose.

TITLE IX

Title IX contains authorization to support the facilities requirements of the Reserve Components during fiscal year 1968 in the amount of $38.3 million, including $10 million for the Army National Guard, $10 million for the Army Reserve, $4.5 million for the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $9.8 million for the Air National Guard, and $4 million for the Air Force Reserve.

In accordance with the procedures established in fiscal year 1963, the Congress will be furnished advance notification of projects to be constructed under each lump-sum authorization.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr RANDALL. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I rise in support of H.R. 11722.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take much time. I will point out this bill is a little different or I should say somewhat unique from other military construction authorization bills.

The membership of this House should know that in this bill we are dealing with over 1,700 line items, which means separate and distinct building projects in the United States and around the world.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can assure my colleagues in the House that your committee has carefully gone over these projects item by item, page by page. There was careful consideration and close scrutiny given each and every one of those items. There has been a lot of time devoted to a study of these items, day after day. Many hours were put in while the House was in session during afternoon as well as forenoons. Each and every one of these line items has stood the test, or they would not be placed before you for the consideration of the membership of the House today.

Through the leadership of our chairman, and the diligent work of the committee, we believe this to be a good authorization bill, and worthy of support by every Member of the House.

I would like now to call the attention of the House to a new item appearing in the military construction authorization bill for the first time. This item is for the U.S. share of the costs of multilateral programs for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This NATO infrastructure authority in title I of the bill was not inserted by the committee but was in the bill when it was presented to Congress.

The reason for the inclusion of NATO infrastructure authority in the military construction authorization bill is very simple. The projects undertaken are in every respect military construction projects and involve acquisition and construction of facilities to be used by the United States and allied forces in the NATO area. They relate to the support of our own forces. In the past this authority was contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; however, those requirements did not constitute foreign aid in any real sense but rather were support for our own military forces. Thus the committee concurred with the Defense Department that this authority should be included in the annual military construction bill.

The inclusion of this kind of authority in a military construction bill is not without precedent. The weapons procurement bill signed by the President June 5, 1967, contains the following language:

> Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support: (1) Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, (2) local forces in Laos and Thailand; and for related costs during the fiscal year 1968 on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine.

This language in that bill appeared for the same reason as the authority for NATO infrastructure in this bill; that is because it is directly related to the support of our own military forces in those areas.

As originally proposed by the Defense Department, the bill contained general language authorizing the carrying out of multilateral arrangements with any foreign government for sharing costs for acquiring and constructing military facilities and installations for collective defense. The committee considered this language to be much too broad and much too general and modified it to read as follows:

> Various locations: for the U.S. share of the cost of multilateral programs for acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area, $60 million provided that within 30 days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish the committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the U.S. share of such multilateral programs.

This modification does three things:

First. It places the authority in the Secretary of the Army who is, in fact, the executive agent for this construction;

Second. It limits the construction authority to NATO, thereby excluding any construction for SEATO, CENTO, or any other like organizations;

Third. It limits the specific amount to $60 million for fiscal year 1968.

The insertion of the $60 million does not add to the total of the military budget as this was the amount contemplated for expenditure by the Department of Defense.

The committee has examined this item very carefully and has concluded that it belongs properly in the military construction bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the commencement of my remarks I made the observation that this was a unique military construction bill. I pointed out above that it was unique as far as provision for inclusion of NATO infrastructure authority. Also the bill is quite unique in another particular, to which I shall now address some comment.

Congress over the past several years has expressed its mandate in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, starting way back in the 84th Congress and adding amendments in the 87th and the 89th Congress. In the 87th and the 88th Congress it was my privilege to serve upon the Natural Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, which held hearings from coast to coast on the subject of water pollution. During those hearings we discovered, again and again, that among the worst offenders were some of the military establishments in the areas where the hearings were held. The feeling was expressed almost regularly, and quite repeatedly, that these Government installations were not setting good examples for municipalities or the various industries to follow. In other words, if the Federal Government did not take the lead, why should industry spend its money, or municipalities concern themselves with the problem of pollution abatement?

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that it is so good to see included in this

military construction authorization bill this year a number of projects for sewage waste treatment plants, as well as additions and modifications to existing plants. The various services requested a large number of treatment plants, and in discussions during the hearings some members of the committee took the view that our first obligation was to provide housing for troops, warehouses, storage facilities, yards and docks, runways, and other projects that could be regarded as the sinews of the military, rather than spending a lot of money on what had heretofore been regarded as frills or at the best, conveniences rather than necessities.

It was for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that the review of these pollution abatement projects was very extensive. We made a start, but only a small start, for our various military installations scattered throughout this country, to set an example for nearby municipalities and industry. We approved 5.2 million in treatment plants for the Army, 19.2 million for the Navy, and 8.7 million for the Air Force, at a number of locations. There you have a total of 32 million for pollution abatement contained in a military construction authorization bill which has always traditionally been a bill relating only to military operational requirements. Thus it is that your Armed Services Committee has started a substantial program and a necessary program, if the military departments are to cooperate with the Federal, State, and local pollution authorities, and if the Federal Government is to be a leader for municipalities and industry to emulate.

The Members of this House may be assured that each of these pollution projects have been carefully examined, that each is designed in the most economical fashion to fit the load conditions and capability of receiving streams. In many instances, these projects are actually joint efforts with local communities. Not only is this bill unique in that the military has for one of the first time begun to take care of its own sewage, but has offered cooperation with local subdivisions, even to the extent of becoming part of a joint effort with local communities, in several instances.

Your committee has examined every item in this bill very carefully, and concluded that both the ordinary construction projects and these two unique departures properly belong in the military construction bill. I urge the support of this bill as presented.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for granting me this time to express the views with which I am rather sure he will disagree.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against this bill in the committee, and I shall vote against it in the House today. I have learned not to expect anyone whatsoever to be swayed by my reasoning, and in fact, so little swayed has anyone ever been by my reasoning that I frequently question it myself.

Nevertheless there are certain things about this legislation which impel me to vote against it, and there may be a few Members who would like to know why.

This is the seventh military construction bill which has come to the floor since I have been in Congress, and it is larger by $450 million than any military construction bill which has been brought to the floor in the past 7 years. It is $450 million bigger than the bill for 1966; it is $1,322,000,000 bigger than last year's bill; it is $788 million bigger than the bill for 1965; it is $745 million bigger than the bill for 1964; it is $860 million bigger than the bill for 1963. There are those who would argue that it has to be bigger because we have scrimped so with our military construction in recent years. The bill for 1963, which it is $860 million larger than, was itself twice as big as the military construction bill in 1962. In 1962 the House approved a bill for military construction for $761 million. This bill is not $761 million; it is $2,378,843,000. I have not filed minority views on this bill because I think the committee report speaks for itself. I call your attention to the language on the bottom of page 5 of the committee report, which says:

> The committee explored the reasons why this bill was of such great magnitude. They learned that late in 1966 and early 1967 $1,200 million was added to the legislative request as was originally contained in the Department of Defense plans for military construction for this fiscal year. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics stated that the Department of Defense had been following the economic situation very closely and had concluded after a review of key indices that the inflationary trends of a year ago have abated to a point where the construction economy can both absorb and benefit from an increase in construction placements.

In January of this year $1,200,000,000 was added to this bill by the Defense Department because "the inflationary trends of a year ago have abated to a point where the construction economy can both absorb and benefit from an increase in construction places." They did not say that they added $1,200,000,000 where the services wanted $1,200,000,000 added, and they did not. They added $1,200,000,000 where it would provide the most jobs. I have no objection to the Federal Government helping to provide jobs in areas of serious unemployment, but is there anyone in this Chamber who believes that the inflationary trends in this country have abated to a point where the military construction bill should be used, not simply to serve the interests of national defense, but as a job-creating vehicle?

The committee did cut $322 million worth of items from the Defense Department's request. Some of these were cut from the $1,200,000,000 which was added on; some of these were cut from items which the military had considered necessary and which had been approved from the very beginning.

I do not doubt that many of the projects included in this bill are essential. I do not doubt that all of them are desirable. I do doubt, however, very, very strongly that inflation has disappeared as a problem from the American economic scene. I doubt the wisdom of Congress in passing a bill of this size as a means of combating deflation.

I would like to think that this huge authorization would be spent wisely, but I have no such confidence.

Since it has become known that I voted against this bill in committee I have received complaints of tremendously wasteful military expenditures all over the United States of America, involving all three services, and in particular involving the Defense Construction Supply Center. Money sometimes comes too easily to the military. It comes so easily to the military that the Defense Construction Supply Center does not even bother to check the list prices contained in the catalogs of the manufacturers from which they purchase.

I am informed that on February 7 of this year the Defense Construction Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio, purchased some gears which were listed in the manufacturers' catalog by a part number at a price of $3.43 each. The Defense Supply Center did not pay $3.43 each; they paid $194.30 each, and an item which should have cost $30.87 cost $1,748.70.

I am informed that on April 27 of this year the same Defense Construction Supply Center bought some more gears of a different size. They were listed in the manufacturers' catalog at $10.75 each; they bought 40 of them, and they should have paid $430, although the manufacturers' catalog also said that quantity discounts were available. They didn't get a quantity discount, and they did not pay $10.75 each. They paid $62.50 each for the same items, and instead of paying $430 or less, they paid $2,500.

On May 3 of this year this same Defense Construction Supply Center paid $511 for some shafts listed in the manufacturers' catalog at $10, and $342.90 for some clamps which should have cost $39.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on and on with such items. I will simply say that I believe that this bill is approximately twice as big as it ought to be, and I believe further that as long as Congress rolls over and plays dead whenever the military asks for anything, there will never be any end to purchasing agents spending the taxpayers' money who do not even bother to check the catalog prices of the companies from whom they are purchasing, nor, I regret to say, will there be any end to companies which delight in gouging the Federal Government and the American taxpayer.

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

Mr. PIKE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. Let me compliment the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the committee some of the weaknesses that he has discovered in procurements made at the military construction supply center at Columbus, Ga.

Mr. PIKE. Columbus, Ohio.

Mr. HARDY. Excuse me. I am glad to have the record straight.

I would like to compliment the gentleman also on the diligence that he has always exhibited as the ranking Democrat

on our Committee for Special Investigations. Without his help, we would not have been able to accomplish nearly so much as we have in some of the investigations which the subcommittee has conducted. The gentleman is aware of the fact that this subject matter he has brought up is particularly within our area, and I would like to suggest to him that in view of the fact that he has gathered some very pertinent information—and, incidentally, I might say if there are enough of these items, there might be sufficient even to recoup the amount that is proposed to be expended by that installation in this bill—but if the gentleman will provide the information which he has to the subcommittee, I can assure him that he will have the complete cooperation of our staff and, for that matter, of myself and the rest of the committee.

We have worked very well together, all of us, and I would think we might be able to accomplish a great deal in pursuing this particular subject.

Mr. PIKE. I thank the gentleman, but I remind him that the last time I asked the committee which he heads so ably to investigate a very major procurement the gentleman had to tell me that we did not have time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the military construction authorization bill for fiscal 1968. When I was on the Armed Services Committee, I was privileged to observe the dedication and wisdom of the members of that committee, including the chairman, and I am very pleased to see no diminution of those qualities since I left the committee and see it now from the outside.

I also wish to commend the distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee for their decision to delete from this authorization more than $5 million which would have financed a wasteful duplication of existing naval training facilities.

I refer to the funds the Navy requested for the construction of unnecessary facilities, including barracks and messhall, for a WAVE recruit camp the Navy wanted to relocate from Bainbridge, Md., where it now is, to Orlando, Fla.

The Armed Services Committee wisely deferred these funds to allow the Navy to reconsider its decision to move the WAVES from Bainbridge.

The truth is that the WAVE training center at Bainbridge, Md., is perfectly adequate for the Navy's needs and the decision to move it was without justification.

The Navy has been successfully training WAVE recruits at Bainbridge since 1951, and the service has yet to give a convincing explanation of how these ladies would be better trained at Orlando. About 2,000 WAVES are trained at the Maryland center each year by a permanent staff of 177 officers and enlisted women.

Moreover, the Navy has just spent $1.2 million to build a new WAVE barracks at Bainbridge, and another $2 million for renovation of military housing at the base. In view of this recent $3.2 million expenditure for Bainbridge and its WAVE center, the House should vote to preserve our investment there.

The Navy estimates it will cost $3.4 million to move the WAVES and certain other facilities from Bainbridge to Orlando. Among these facilities is the nuclear power school, which the Navy wants to move to Florida despite the fact that constant contact between personnel at the school and at the New London, Conn., submarine base is essential. If this transfer is funded, this Congress will find, deeply buried in some future Navy request for funds, a large increase in travel money to pay for transportation between Florida and Connecticut.

I urge the Members of this House to approve the action of its committee this year, and I also urge similar action next year to delete funds for unnecessary transfers of facilities from Bainbridge, Md.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. WALDIE. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not express as completely and as sincerely as I can my extreme gratitude for the very generous and very courteous treatment given to me by the Armed Services Committee and particularly its chairman, and also by the chairman of the special subcommittee that visited my district, Congressman PRICE, and the members of that subcommittee. I have just been overwhelmed in terms of the courtesy and kindness shown me, even though the recommendation of the subcommittee and of the committee is one with which I disagree.

I have expressed my disagreement to the chairman of the committee and to the committee. The reason they recommended contrary to my view is not because the committee members did not deeply and seriously and fully consider the proposal that was before them, and my arguments against them. I believe that their reason for refusing my proposal was due to my lack of eloquence initially, and perhaps due to one factor that is not nearly as easily defined. That is the fact that subsequent to the committee hearings, there were two items of evidence that, had I had them in my possession at the time of the committee hearings and at the time the subcommittee visited, and had those gentlemen had these facts before them at that time, it is likely or at least probable they would have come up with a different conclusion.

I am speaking about the conclusion where the committee supports the Navy's request for $19.8 million for purposes of condemning a community of 3,100 population in my congressional district of Port Chicago. The reason the Navy has requested this community be condemned and the community be moved out is because the Navy, in operating that ammunition depot, has three piers at which they load and offload ammunition on and from ships. Within a 2-mile zone of those piers, because of Defense Department regulations, because they handle a minimum of 9 million pounds each, they must clear all habitable buildings within that 2-mile area.

Unhappily, that is not the only defect, and there is a much more serious defect causing hazard to the people I represent, and I am calling that to the attention of the committee. That inadequacy involves the fact that the three piers that are located in my congressional district are not slightly, but markedly, defective in their failure to comply with Department of Defense regulations that set up distances that must be maintained to handle quantities of ammunition in that great amount. They are not only defective in the manner in which the Navy is seeking to have them corrected, in that they have habitable dwellings within the 2-mile zone, but they are defective in that the piers themselves are 400 to 500 feet short of minimum length to prevent simultaneous detonation of two ships containing 4.5 million pounds of ammunition. Because they are so defective in that length, both ships have to be considered as detonating simultaneously if one of them explodes. It is because of that 9 million pound factor that the 2-mile zone has to be cleared.

That is a sufficiently serious defect that great concern on my part and the people I represent has been expressed about that.

There is an even more serious defect. The same Department of Defense regulations require that piers that load 9 million pounds of ammunition be separated by 3,745 feet from each other. The purpose of that is to prevent an explosion at one pier communicating to a pile of ammunition stacked on a pier adjoining, awaiting loading on a ship.

They are in fact only 2,100 feet separate, so there is a failure of 1,675 feet short of meeting minimum safety regulations for the Navy in terms of the separation of these piers.

The jeopardy that deficiency exposes my county to is precisely stated according to Navy regulations. These are not my regulations and not my computations, but according to Navy regulations there is a possibility or a probability of a 9-million-pound explosion at one pier because of the inadequate length of each pier, which otherwise could be held to a 4½-million-pound explosion, at least 50 percent of the time, and a likelihood that the 9-million-pound explosion will communicate to the second pier because of the fact that the piers are separated only 50 percent of the required minimum distance, and that will communicate to a third pier, exposing the people in my county to an explosion of 9 million pounds three successive times.

In 1944 we had an explosion at this pier; 3½ million pounds of ammunition exploded. On the basis of that explosion these quantity-distance safety regulations were derived.

With that explosion of 3½ million pounds, 322 men were killed on the piers, all naval personnel working ships or loading ammunition; 33 people were injured in this community which the Navy proposal seeks to eliminate. No people were killed in that community.

By permitting those defective piers to

remain, the hazard being permitted to continue is primarily to the Government's own people, to people we have employed, to the naval people working on those piers and the six ships that will be serviced at those piers.

I have been arguing—I have not made my point sufficiently clear for the committee to adopt it, but I have been arguing, first, for the expenditure of the money not directed at the removing of Port Chicago. That will remove only a small portion of the hazard. The money should be spent to correct the defective piers and to eliminate the hazard for people working at the piers, for the ships at the piers.

Even more importantly, for the population of 150,000 immediately adjacent to those piers, but beyond the confines of the 2-mile hazard zone, the removal of Port Chicago does nothing to decrease the hazard to those people. That hazard is more than it was in 1944.

In 1944, with the 3½-million-pound explosion, in this area of 150,000 people there were only 40,000 people. The population has increased to 150,000 since 1944, and considerable injuries were found within that body of 40,000 people at that time.

I made a proposal that the money should be expended to remove those piers from the present location 1 mile further north out into midstream, at a location called Roe Island.

The Navy maintained, during the committee hearings, that this was an absurd proposal, that it had no merit whatsoever, and that it should be discounted by the committee.

I have found, subsequent to the committee hearings, through a circumstance which is completely unexplainable by me—perhaps it is because I am new around here—that the Navy itself, in 1965, had made a proposal, signed by Secretary of the Navy Nitze, which had gone through every level of the chain of command up to the Secretary of the Navy, proposing precisely the recommendation that two of these piers be located on Roe Island at a cost of $30 million.

The Secretary of the Navy said at that time:

The fulfillment of this item—

Meaning those piers being moved to Roe Island—

would relieve the Navy of unfavorable publicity and liability in the future. It will fulfill the moral obligation to the community of Port Chicago and accordingly remove the imminent danger to the development and growth of the privately-held lands adjacent to the station without impeding the mobilization capability of this major West Coast ammunition loading facility.

There was one other argument made by the Navy before the committee, which was persuasive to them, relative to costs. The cost was $20 million to remove a portion of the habitable dwellings within the 2-mile zone. There will remain, however, within the 2-mile zone, factories employing people, on the contention, they advocated to the committee, that the exposure to these factories was not sufficiently great so that they would recommend that the factories be cleared from the 2-mile zone, despite the fact that the regulations required it.

Subsequent to those committee hearings I received a piece of evidence which came to my attention, and about which I had no information prior thereto. The Navy itself had a report as to what would happen to the major factory in that district, that they procured on June 1, and they had it in their possession during the time of the committee hearings when they were representing that there would be no undue hazard to the people working in those plants.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional one-half minute to the gentleman from California for the purpose of asking the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for one-half additional minute.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from California state that the Navy denied us information which could have assisted the committee in arriving at another decision for Port Chicago and for the provision of Port Chicago and the docks located there?

Mr. WALDIE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I did. The information to which I refer is information that first came to my attention through auditing a hearing which was held in the other body. I then asked the Navy that they permit me to see the change order to which reference was made. I was denied that permission. Finally, it was granted to me, but only in the company of a Navy officer. I was not able to copy that information on my copying machine. I was required to take it in longhand.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I take this time during which I first wish to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for the eminently fair manner in which this bill and the hearings thereon were conducted, as is true on all bills that are considered in his committee.

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

But I asked for this particular time to speak in conjunction with the problem which was raised by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE].

Mr. Chairman, one of the ways in which the proper transport situation could be assisted, would be to make adequate utilization of a facility that already exists in my district, the naval ammunition depot at Bangor. This facility is surrounded by hills, mountains and the deep channel of the Puget Sound. Yet only a very small percentage of the West Coast ammunition is stored and shipped from this ammunition depot. Moving some of this usage from Port Chicago north to the naval ammunition depot at Bangor in the State of Washington, would serve two purposes. No. 1, it might eliminate the need for one of those dangerous piers at Port Chicago mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. WALDIE]; and, No. 2, it would disperse the ammunition shipping facilities.

At the present time should something happen that would put Port Chicago out of business, 70 percent of the capability of transporting ammunition from the West Coast would be down the drain. That would not happen if adequate utilization were made of the Navy ammunition depot at Bangor. That would be one thing I would commend to the Navy to look into today and I would like to determine their reason for refusing to utilize it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time on this side of the aisle, there is only one disturbing fact that has been brought to my attention and that is that in our eagerness to protect the people of Port Chicago—and having sent the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] out there as the chairman of a special subcommittee—I am disturbed that the Navy would withhold information from us and the necessary data upon which we could arrive at a conclusion for the protection of the inhabitants of this area, and at the same time serve the requirements of the military.

With this in mind, in conference I am persuaded that we may have to arrive at a different conclusion, but to protect these people and save lives—that is the important thing. And that is my reply to the statement.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, part of the housing contemplated by this bill will occur in my district at the Johnsville Naval Air Development Center in an area near to existing civilian residences which are single-family units. Warminster Township, in which this housing is to be located, has had a very unfortunate experience with Federal housing built during World War II which was substandard in construction. There has been, therefore, some resistance in the community to the proposed Navy housing.

I have worked with the Armed Services Committee, with the Navy, and with the township in an attempt to solve the difficulties which this housing will cause in the township and also to meet the need of Navy personnel for good housing facilities in the area. I should like to point out that J. G. Devlin, captain, CEC, U.S. Navy, Assistant Commander for Family Housing, met with the local township officials on the site and considered in some detail the problems which the housing would create and the efforts which the Government would take to resolve those problems. Because his report of that meeting clarifies the matter considerably, I should like to hereby enclose it for the RECORD. I base my view of this item on the assurances set forth in Captain Devlin's report, which is as follows:

JULY 18, 1967.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

Subject: Meeting between Navy representatives and Warminster Township Supervisors.

1. On July 17, 1967 a meeting was held at the Warminster Municipal Building between the Board Supervisors of Warminster Township and the Navy. The Navy was principally

represented by Captain Stevens, Commanding Officer, East Central Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command; Captain Witmer, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pa.; Captain Devlin, Assistant Commander Navy Family Housing, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Headquarters; and Mr. Pinciotti was the principal spokesman for the Town Supervisors.

2. In connection with project for the construction of 300 houses at the NADC Johnsville, Mr. Pinciotti said that there were four problems that were of concern to the Township:

(1) The design of the housing.

(2) The use of land fill for disposal of trash and garbage.

(3) Funds to develop off site utilities to serve the new housing project.

(4) Utility Rates.

1. In regard to the design of the housing, Mr. Pinciotti brought out two main areas of concern: one was the use of row or townhouses and the other was the local building codes. It was pointed out by Captain Devlin that the Navy is just about to select an architect to develop this project. As now envisioned, the project will have both the townhouses and duplexes. An effort will be made to use the duplexes to make an acceptable transition from existing local housing and the Navy project. In addition, we will investigate the feasibility of constructing additional duplex units. However, we are limited by the amount of land available at a safe distance from the runways, and economic considerations. Regardless of the design mix of this project, I am certain the housing will be esthetically pleasing. The first review of the architect's plans will be at the 15% level, at which point overall picture of the architect's concept is apparent. We will be glad to allow the Town Supervisors to review the plans and will discuss with them any objections. With regard to local building codes, it is true that the Federal Government building and Federal land is not subject to local codes. However, as a matter of practice, the Federal Government normally meets and usually exceeds local codes.

2. With regard to the use of land fill for disposal of trash, the Navy strongly backs President Johnson's anti pollution program and will go to great lengths to avoid causing nuisance problems in the disposal of waste. Well run land fill is an acceptable sanitary method of disposal and the Navy was not aware of any objections to this present practice. However, the present land fill will be exhausted in another year and other methods of disposal will have to be developed. In this connection, the Navy is working with local officials on this problem. As for the disposal of trash and garbage from the proposed housing project, the Navy would be willing to contract on a bid basis with a local trash and garbage collection company for disposal in the same manner as it is handled in the local housing areas of the Township.

3. The Navy realizes that the Township has a difficult problem in funding the extension of utilities, water and sewerage, to accommodate the proposed housing. The Navy has a responsibility and is willing to fund its fair share of any utilities required to service the proposed housing. As a matter of practice, the Navy prefers to be serviced by the local utilities. On an economic basis, however, the Navy cannot afford to invest more for utility services than it would cost to develop its own. So that the problem can be discussed specifically, the Navy will make an engineering study of the utility system for the housing project. They will then discuss the whole problem with the Township engineers. It is felt that an agreement can be reached which will be equitable to all concerned.

4. The question of utility rates should lend itself to an equitable solution. Since the Navy would receive its water at one point, it feels it qualifies as a bulk user. The rates to be charged should be in accordance with the schedule of rates as established by the Township.

5. Though many extraneous matters were discussed the above discuss the main problems. From the viewpoint of the Navy representatives, we were cordially received by the Township Supervisors and felt that there was a spirit of cooperation aimed at obtaining solutions. We realize that the proposed housing is of concern to the Township, but if it is approached with the understanding of the problems of both sides then equitable solutions can be developed. The meeting indicated that this attitude does exist on both sides and that together the existing problems can be solved.

J. G. DEVLIN,
Captain, CEC, U.S. Navy, Assistant Commander for Family Housing.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, few if any Members of this Congress would argue against the need for developing a strong undersea warfare program. Our experience during World War II often tragically made clear the vital importance of undersea and submarine warfare. The Battle of the North Atlantic proved the effectiveness of a well-trained, efficiently operated, smoothly coordinated submarine effort.

Today the United States and its allies are faced with a substantially greater danger from undersea warfare programs. This threat emanates from the Soviet Union. It is estimated that the Soviet Navy includes about 400 submarines, of which approximately 50 are nuclear powered.

Every indication suggests the Soviet undersea warfare capability will improve, and that the nuclear-powered Soviet submarine fleet of the future will be capable of undertaking long-range operations and operating quietly at great depths, armed with a variety of weapons for both land and bombardment and attacks upon shipping, including longer range subsurface-launched ballistic missiles.

What has our response to this undersea warfare threat been?

Our nuclear fleet of submarines is well known but does not meet the overall demands and strategic requirements necessary to undersea warfare. In a word, our antisubmarine warfare program has not been adequate.

On June 12, I attempted to point out the deficiencies in the present program. At that time, I suggested evidence which indicates:

First. Our present program for the construction of nuclear submarines may not be sufficient in light of the Soviet threat.

Second. Present surface ship programs have deficiencies in meeting the real requirements of antisubmarine warfare.

Third. There has been a reluctance to expedite the development of shipbased aircraft antisubmarine warfare systems.

Fourth. The antisubmarine warfare program in the past has been inadequately coordinated.

Fifth. There is serious doubt as to the adequacy of current antisubmarine warfare programs for research, development, testing and evaluation.

However, most recently with the appointment of Admiral Martel as Director of antisubmarine warfare programs much progress in this area of our national defense has been made.

One of the most important realizations by the Department of the Navy, in its attempt to upgrade our antisubmarine warfare effort, has been that if there is any one single shortcoming which threatens our undersea warfare capability and, therefore, our superiority at sea, it is the fact that we are operating with antiquated facilities which are both costly and ineffective.

It was in recognition of this fact that the Navy Department adopted the proposal of the President's Marine Resources Advisory Committee that a single center responsible for conducting technical and research activities be created on both the east and west coasts.

After extensive study the Department of the Navy decided to establish the Undersea Warfare Laboratory at the Los Alamitos Naval Air Station in Los Alamitos, Calif. A number of excellent reasons suggested Los Alamitos, and I will review these reasons shortly.

After determining the site, the Navy invested over a quarter million dollars in specifications and plans, including relocating at Los Alamitos the Naval Ordnance Test Station and its personnel presently located at Pasadena.

Let me make clear that the Department of the Navy has considered alternative sites for the Laboratory, but after extensive study has determined that Los Alamitos is the best site available. This was reestablished even after the House Armed Services Committee requested the Department of the Navy to once again review alternative sites. This review was made, but has not altered the Navy's original position that Los Alamitos is the best site available for the Undersea Warfare Laboratory.

The Navy considers the Laboratory a priority item. The Department would like to begin developing the site as soon as possible. This was made clear in testimony before the Armed Services Committee. I believe the members of the Armed Services Committee understand the importance of the facility, for it is referred to as an "admittedly important facility" in the report accompanying H.R. 11722.

Yet, despite the agreement on the priority of the authorization for the Undersea Warfare Laboratory, especially in light of its importance in our national defense posture, the Armed Services Committee has seen fit to delete the Navy's requested authorization for the program.

Despite expert testimony from the Department of the Navy that extensive study went into determining the need for the Laboratory, and the excellence of the site location at Los Alamitos, the Armed Services Committee now advises Congress that consideration of this program can be delayed because the committee "believes a number of related factors have not yet been fully developed." Page 28, committee report.

Would the committee have us believe that the Navy, after extensive planning, and two site investigations, has left additional questions undeveloped? I seriously doubt this.

Then why has the House committee chosen not to include this project in its bill? Two main reasons have been given. Let me elaborate on them briefly and concurrently try to raise a few points in connection with each.

The first reason given for the House committee's refusal to authorize the construction of this facility at Los Alamitos was that all possible sites were not fully investigated. I have explored this question with the Navy Department and the Department of Defense. They advise me that this site was selected after 3 years of studies, on-site inspections, and detailed cost-effectiveness studies of alternative areas.

At the request of the House committee, the Department reopened its review of alternative sites in February. I was informed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics that this review did not materially alter the Department's position that Los Alamitos was the best available location because:

First. It is centrally located, and could therefore serve as a control point for coordinating research, development, and testing functions being carried out at adjoining facilities.

Second. It could, if authorized this session, be completed by 1970, at least 1 year sooner than any other site evaluated including the most frequently mentioned alternative site, Pasadena, Calif.

Third. It could be constructed at a relatively low cost, due to the fact that the land would require minimal preparation and is wholly Government owned.

Fourth. There is plenty of available Government land. It is estimated that 35 to 50 acres will be needed. There are over 100 acres of land available for this purpose at Los Alamitos.

Objections were also raised to this project in the House committee because of a reported lack of coordination in the planning of this facility between the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation and the Director of antisubmarine warfare programs. I have discussed this with both of these individuals or parties authorized to speak for them. They have assured me that the necessary coordination has been effected and that, though questions still remain to be answered, there are no important barriers to the development of the relationships necessary to insure the effective execution of the missions assigned to this facility.

There are a number of specific reasons why the Department of the Navy finds Los Alamitos a particularly well qualified location for the Undersea Warfare Laboratory.

First, its close proximity to the ocean and specifically the Los Angeles and Long Beach harbors, which, in combination, comprise the fourth largest marine complex in the United States.

Second, Los Alamitos has distinct advantages in the matter of air transportation—both for flights to and from the ranges and for flights by visitors from other areas. It would be a simple matter, for instance, for the warfare center personnel to fly by plane or helicopter to other installations—or for other military personnel to fly directly to Los Alamitos.

Third, Los Alamitos has excellent access to ground transportation. It is in the immediate proximity of three major freeways, the San Diego, San Gabriel, and Garden Grove. Vehicular transportation is important in several ways and particularly in relation to access to test ranges and other test facilities.

Los Alamitos is 179 miles from the China Lake Naval Ordnance Test Center, 15 miles from Long Beach NOTS, 37 miles from Morris Dam, and only 3 from the Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station.

The problem of transportation also is important in relation to the location of residences of existing personnel and availability of housing and services at any new location.

It is generally agreed that the residential areas of employees should be in close proximity to the location of employment. This would not be the case in the event of a relocation of the NOTS facility from Pasadena to Los Alamitos, but no employee would be more than an hour's drive away and more than 25 percent of the present civilian employees of the lab would actually be within 30 minutes driving time.

Proximity to institutions of higher learning is an important factor in site location for they provide a source of scientific information and engineering services and an opportunity for professional growth for station personnel. Los Alamitos is conveniently located close to a number of excellent institutions of higher learning. This proximity to major colleges and universities represents the location's fourth advantage.

The educational institutions in close proximity include:

First. The University of Southern California with its famed Allen Hancock Foundation Marine Biology Institute which has been long dedicated to oceanological research in coastal areas.

The University of Southern California, in cooperation with seven other colleges and universities, including the University of California at Irvine, is presently constructing a marine science center on a 275-acre site embracing two harbors at Fisherman's Cove on Santa Catalina Island.

The Hancock Foundation's Marine Biology Institute is to be relocated here and will contain the core research and teaching facilities.

Second. California State College at Long Beach, where it is proposed to establish a Marine Institute of Science and Technology, called MIST, which would be operated by the State colleges and provide services and facilities to private industries.

The proximity to Los Alamitos of Long Beach State College, California State College at Fullerton, and the University of California at Irvin are important for surveys have shown that approximately 15 percent of the NOTS Pasadena scientific and engineering personnel at any given time attend college or university courses and of these approximately eighty percent are enrolled in a State college or university.

Third. The Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the University of California Institute of Marine Resources at La Jolla and the Navy's Electronics Laboratory at Point Loma.

Scripps Institute currently is involved in work on more than 100 active contracts and grants, including mapping the ocean bottom, long-range sonar research for the Navy and visibility research for the Department of Defense. It also worked in cooperation with the Navy on the experiments with Sea Lab II, an operation in which teams of divers spent 45 days on the bottom in 200 feet of water.

Fourth. The California Institute of Technology Kerskhoff Marine Laboratory at Corona Del Mar, where practically all of the biological and marine research of that institution is conducted.

Fifth. Los Alamitos will be conveniently located near a great reservoir of research and development talent represented by major local aerospace firms, some directly engaged in programs relating to undersea technology.

Northrop's Nortronics Division and North American's Autonetics Division, both close to Los Alamitos, are already heavily committed to programs vital to our undersea warfare posture. Nortronics, at both its Palos Verdes and Anaheim facilities, is doing major research and development work on the Navy's deep submergence systems program. Autonetics at both its Anaheim plant and its new ocean systems operations division at Long Beach Harbor is engaged in a variety of programs involving propulsion, acoustic and magnetic sensors, exploration navigation systems and devices and a work boat—Mark III and IV, known as the Beaver—designed to perform meaningful tasks on the ocean bottom.

In addition, Hughes' Ground Systems Division which has contributed much to Navy radar, is working on improving sonar devices and underwater visibility.

Besides the major aerospace firms, there are a number of other companies in close proximity to Los Alamitos with strong support capabilities.

A number of other questions have been raised concerning problems of inconvenience to personnel in moving the Naval Ordnance Test Station, now located in Pasadena, to the Los Alamitos Naval Station. These questions have centered around the following issues:

First. The availability of housing in Orange County, particularly the areas immediately adjacent to the naval station.

Second. The quality and availability of educational facilities.

Third. The fear that there would be a loss of experienced personnel resulting from inconvenience connected with moving.

In regard to the first question concerning the availability of housing in the area, the following facts should be brought to the House's attention.

First. Current market statistics clearly point out that the average resale home cost in southwest Orange County is $21,226, as compared to $27,300 in Pasadena. Moderate cost housing is more available in southwest Orange County than Pasadena, the alternative site being given the most serious consideration.

Second. Southwest Orange County has an abundance of new and resale mod-

erately priced housing under $22,000. This housing is of good quality and primarily in the modern category. Pasadena, on the other hand, has a relative lack of moderately priced housing. In addition, much of Pasadena's existing units are considered old.

Third. Home financing in southwest Orange County is predominantly FHA and VA. This financing provides better terms on a nondiscriminatory basis. The Pasadena area is dependent primarily on conventional financing.

This summary points up the fact that modern housing is available in southwest Orange County at all price ranges. The promise that these conditions will continue to exist into the immediate future is superior, especially when compared with the situation in Pasadena.

In regard to the availability and quality of education in the Los Alamitos area, the following facts must be taken into account:

First. Any objective study of the quality of elementary and secondary education in California will rank Orange County schools in the top strata.

Second. Consistently, the voters of the various school districts in Orange County have supported necessary bonds and overrides for expansion and quality programs. This contrasts sharply with the Pasadena situation where five bond issues in the past 5 years have failed.

Third. Many of the local districts surrounding the Los Alamitos Naval Base have been singled out by State and National organizations for their educational innovations and the high quality of their programing.

The Anaheim school districts—Los Alamitos is included within Anaheim's high school district—are the recognized pioneers in educational television.

The Fountain Valley school district's innovative and imaginative curriculum planning was recently lauded in an article in the National School Administrator's Journal.

Although Orange County's rate of high school dropouts is one of the lowest in California, the U.S. Office of Education considers the county's program of recouping school dropouts the most effective in the country.

Fourth. The availability of public institutions of higher learning is unexcelled. Within a very reasonable range from the Naval Station are two campuses of the California State Colleges—Cal State Fullerton and Cal State Long Beach—campuses of the University of California—U. Cal Irvine—and innumerable community colleges—Fullerton, Santa Ana, Golden West, Orange Coast, Long Beach City, and Cerritos, to name a few. In addition, there are a number of private institutions of higher learning within the area.

Finally, the questions relating to the loss of critical personnel, and the disruption of operations because of relocation of facilities is not borne out by the facts of recent experiences of two major firms who have moved into Orange County. North American Aviation and Atlantic Research, Inc. have both relocated major facilities from other regions within the Los Angeles basin into Orange County. In both instances, it required the relocation of large numbers of critical employees. From both of these programs, as well as others, the following general conclusions were drawn:

First. In all cases, almost all the critical employees stayed with the companies and have either moved into Orange County or are commuting.

Second. Commuting, even to the point of 30 to 40 minutes each way per day, has not worked any special hardships on employees who remained in the area of the companies' previous locations. A half hour, or more, commuting time to and from work is a usual and common practice for many thousands of people in the Los Angeles area.

Third. Housing, recreation, quality education, and other facilities were readily available, and no hardships in any of these areas were reported.

Fourth. There was no disruption or loss of efficiency in the operations of the above mentioned firms during the period when employees were being relocated.

At every point, it is abundantly evident that experience and existing facilities and programs in southwest Orange County should more than adequately answer the questions relative to the impact on personnel who would be affected by a transfer of the present NOTS facility in Pasadena to Los Alamitos. In every instance, the evidence that the impact would be minimal and even beneficial is positive and abundant.

There should be no doubt, and I am certain that the Members of the Armed Services Committee would agree, of the importance and priority of developing the Undersea Warfare Laboratory. Soviet emphasis in this area requires that our national effort in antisubmarine warfare be immediate and of the highest quality.

The Department of the Navy, understanding its responsibilities in this area, has carefully constructed and presented a program which will be of significant meaning in the total undersea warfare effort. After careful consideration and extensive study, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Defense, is asking Congress that it immediately authorize the construction of the Undersea Warfare Laboratory at the Los Alamitos Naval Air Base.

Knowing the importance of the program to our national defense, and knowing the careful and meticulous attention the Navy has put into the preparation of their proposal, this session of the 90th Congress has the obligation to both authorize and appropriate the necessary $8,495,000 to get this vital program underway. We should not tolerate any further delay.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is much more complex than any military construction authorization bill of recent years. It authorizes about $2.3 billion, and involves more than the usual run of problems and controversial features.

I am deeply interested in the entire bill, but I would be less than candid, if I did not express special approval of the provisions of the bill which establish by law the various naval districts of the country.

This feature, if finally approved by the Congress, will retain the great naval district at Boston as well as the other great naval districts of the country.

The original Navy program included a project for construction start on a center to conduct research in undersea warfare with which the committee was in general agreement, but felt that additional information was required concerning its possible impact upon existing laboratories, and the limited availability of experienced scientists and engineers.

The committee moved to mitigate possible catastrophe by explosion at loading piers at Port Chicago, Calif., where great hazards to human life, as well as property, need to be eliminated.

Title I includes very substantial items at 54 Army installations in the United States including provision for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and several classified installations.

Necessary modernization and replacement projects are covered and important projects are contained for our activities in Southeast Asia, and numerous projects to replace troop housing facilities and essential conveniences for armed services personnel. In fact, the bill makes many vital provisions for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps across the board.

We have reduced budget and Defense Department requests by some 12 percent or more in our search for practical economy in the interest of the taxpayers that will also permit undiminished efficiency and strength in our defense components.

Our action in this regard was based on official information available to us from the various departments and from other sources, and the cuts made by the committee represent our best judgment at this time.

Let me observe, however, that if the changing scene and future developments should clearly show that further economies and reductions are possible without impairing the required potential of our defense agencies, this committee would be the first to approve additional economies when we are convinced they are reasonable and will not impair our overall military strength.

I strongly favor practical economy in this Government at every possible point, including defense and the armed services, because it is my conviction that this Congress has a clear mandate from the American people to keep all our expenditures in line and within reasonable budgetary requirements at all times.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to repeat what has been so well said here by previous speakers, who have made such interesting, informative presentations. It is my view that all the services have been considerately treated and provided with valuable, essential support for their plans, operations, and requirements.

Most of the other projects in the bill now before you are more mundane. They are, nonetheless, just as urgent and valid as the naval weapons station project. A block of the proposed projects would provide living facilities, in keeping with modern requirements, for Navy and Marine Corps officers and enlisted men

and women. In the main, these include new and rehabilitated bachelor quarters, messhalls, and a limited number of community facilities such as enlisted men's clubs, chapels, and athletic fields. The scope of these personnel support types of facilities approach one-third of the Navy program measured in dollars.

Another block of facilities of noteworthy merit consists of 27 line items for $19.2 million. These are for construction of sewerage improvements at various Navy and Marine Corps installations in the United States. This is an action to safeguard an invaluable resource of the country. It will reduce the sewage pollution of the streams, rivers, and harbors adjacent to the military installations. It is the first of a number of increments in the Navy plans. Can anyone deny that this plan has virtue? It should be implemented as soon as possible.

The remaining portions of the Navy program are comprised of facility categories with which most Members of this body are generally familiar. A number of the facilities are for support of ships and aircraft, such as piers and airfield pavement. Some are for training of Navy men and marines in the multitude of skills they require—for shipboard operation, for operation of aircraft, weapons, electronic equipment. Others are for maintenance functions, supply, administration, care of the sick and wounded—in fact, the entire gamut of facility categories, including utilities, to make the various structures operable.

The bill contains many items, more than 1,700 of them, for our great Army and great Air Force, which like our great Navy, stand as powerful components of our mighty striking force and defense system.

The committee has given careful attention, both as to the conventional and nuclear aspects, of their construction needs.

For fear of being reptitious, I will not treat of these items at this time, but I want to stress the needs we have attempted to serve, and pay highest tribute to the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps for their invaluable contributions to the Nation and the cause of peace.

Even as we work for total readiness at home and abroad, let us never cease to strive for a just, lasting peace with freedom, justice, and security for our own Nation and the world. I hope and pray that Hanoi and Russia will soon listen to our pleas and prayers for peace and agree to a conference to arrange fair terms and conditions so that the whole world can again enjoy reconciliation and just peace and amity and understanding between all nations and all peoples.

I am convinced that this bill is sound. I recommend your favorable action on it. Let us strive urgently for a just peace.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representative of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND

(First Army)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $3,869,000.

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,304,000.

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $976,000.

Fort Hamilton, New York: Operational facilities, $127,000.

A. P. Hill Military Reservation, Virginia: Training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,893,000.

Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $581,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Training facilities and utilities, $1,545,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, and utilities, $1,034,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Hospital facilities, $1,907,000.

Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, $141,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Troop housing and utilities, $3,759,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $17,800,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Hospital facilities and utilities, $312,000.

Fort Gordon, Georgia: Training facilities, supply facilities, utilities, and real estate, $4,364,000.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Hospital facilities, $10,365,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Training facilities and troop housing, $2,118,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Training facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $792,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $3,075,000.

Fort Polk, Louisiana: Training facilities, and supply facilities, $1,148,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Training facilities and community facilities, $3,636,000.

Fort Wolters, Texas: Utilities, $379,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Carson, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $20,929,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $4,462,000.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Administrative facilities, $392,000.

Fort Riley, Kansas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $22,122,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Training facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,575,000.

(Sixth Army)

Fort Irwin, California: Operational facilities, $217,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Maintenance facilities, $2,523,000.

Fort Ord, California: Hospital facilities, and troop housing, $27,329,000.

(Military District of Washington)

Fort Myer, Virginia: Troop housing, and utilities, $1,680,000.

(CONUS Various)

CONUS Various Locations: Community facilities, $1,053,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $2,184,000.

Aeronautical Maintenance Center, Texas: Utilities, $419,000.

Anniston Army Depot, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,937,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Michigan: Research, development and test facilities, $1,819,000.

Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $552,000.

Lexington Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky: Maintenance facilities, $160,000.

New Cumberland Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Utilities, $330,000.

Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas: Production facilities, $1,713,000.

Pueblo Army Depot, Colorado: Maintenance, and supply facilities, $855,000.

Red River Army Depot, Texas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and administrative facilities, $376,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama: Training facilities, research, development and test facilities, and administrative facilities, $646,000.

Sacramento Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $93,000.

Savanna Army Depot, Illinois: Operational facilities, and utilities, $102,000.

Sharpe Army Depot, California: Supply facilities, $199,000.

Tobyhanna Army Depot, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $268,000.

Tooele Army Depot, Utah: Supply facilities, $680,000.

Watertown Arsenal, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, $3,471,000.

White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico: Research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $4,781,000.

Fort Wingate Army Depot, New Mexico: Utilities, $166,000.

Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $176,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Chicago Defense Area, Illinois: Operational facilities, $365,000.

Detroit Defense Area, Michigan: Operational facilities, $130,000.

New York Defense Area, New York: Troop housing, $327,000.

CONUS Various Locations: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $65,779,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Two Rock Ranch Station, California: Supply facilities, $174,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Virginia: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $542,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

CONUS Various Locations: Operational facilities, $1,147,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Utilities, $216,000.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,495,000.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE

Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Colorado: Hospital facilities, $9,555,000.

Madigan General Hospital, Washington: Medical facilities, $185,000.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Army Map Service, Maryland: Utilities, $156,000.

MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND TERMINAL SERVICE

Bayonne Naval Supply Center, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $582,000.

Sunny Point, North Carolina: Utilities, $70,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, ALASKA

Fort Greely, Alaska: Operational facilities, $852,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, HAWAII

Fort De Russy, Hawaii: Troop housing and utilities, $7,132,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Training facilities, $286,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

UNITED STATES ARMY, PACIFIC

Camp Zama, Japan: Supply facilities, $193,000.

Korea: Hospital facilities, $2,810,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY FORCES, SOUTHERN COMMAND

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Utilities $7,985,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

Kwajalein Atoll: Research, development, and test facilities, housing and community facilities, $12,255,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY SECURITY AGENCY

Various locations: Operational facilities, housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,556,000.

UNITED STATES ARMY, EUROPE

Gerrmany: Supply facilities, $7,195,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $6,815,000.

Various locations: For the United States share of the cost of multilateral programs for the acquisition or construction of military facilities and installations, including international military headquarters, for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area, $60,000,000: *Provided*, That, within thirty days after the end of each quarter, the Secretary of the Army shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services and on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a description of obligations incurred as the United States share of such multilateral programs.

UNITED STATES ARMY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMAND

Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,821,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisitions, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the amount of $2,873,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction in any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Third Army)" with respect to Fort McClellan, Alabama, strike out "$1,352,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,554,000;"

(b) Public Law 87-554, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$102,370,000" and "$150,879,000" and inserting in place thereof "$102,572,000" and "$151,081,000" respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "ARMY COMPONENT COMMANDS (Pacific Command Area)" with respect to Schofield Barracks, Hawaii, strike out "$913,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,006,000."

(b) Public Law 88-174, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$155,826,000" and "$200,695,000" and inserting in place thereof "$155,919,000" and "$200,788,000" respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Military District of Washington, District of Columbia)" with respect to Fort Myer, Virginia, strike out "$4,052,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,330,000."

(2) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Sheridan, Illinois, strike out $5,544,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,350,000."

(3) Under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND (United States Army Missile Command)" with respect to Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, strike out "$2,389,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,563,000."

(4) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Signal Corps)" with respect to Army Pictorial Center, New York, strike out "$1,120,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,185,000."

(5) Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Medical Service)" with respect to Letterman General Hospital, California, strike out "$14,305,000" and insert in place thereof "$15,424,000".

(b) Public Law 88-390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$252,994,000" and "$304,055,000" and inserting "$255,436,000" and "$306,497,000", respectively.

SEC. 107. (a) Public Law 89-188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND, less Army Materiel Command (Fifth Army)" with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$16,084,000" and insert in place thereof "$16,536,000".

(b) Public Law 89-188 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602, "$253,722,000" and "$310,583,000" and inserting "$254,174,000" and "$311,035,000", repectively.

SEC. 108. (a) Public Law 89-568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101, as follows:

(1) Under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES CONTINENTAL ARMY COMMAND (First Army)" with respect to United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, strike out "$2,451,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,705,000."

(2) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and under the subheading "UNITED STATES ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND" with respect to Kwajalein Atoll, strike out "$31,333,000" and insert in place thereof "$36,907,000."

(b) Public Law 89-568 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 602 "$57,219,000," "$36,141,000," and "$126,360,000" and inserting "$57,473,000," "$41,715,000" and "$132,188,000."

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

FIRST NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Utilities, $575,000.

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Massachusetts: Utilities, $496,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, Rhode Island: Troop housing, $2,613,000.

Naval Station, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $4,368,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Newport, Rhode Island: Supply facilities, $82,000.

Naval Destroyer School, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $1,486,000.

Naval Schools Command, Newport, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $2,848,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Newport, Rhode Island: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,697,000.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,823,000.

THIRD NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $2,129,000.

Naval Submarine School, New London, Connecticut: Training facilities, $1,607,000.

Naval Submarine Medical Center, New London, Connecticut: Medical facilities, $1,590,000.

FOURTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,766,000.

Naval Air Test Facility, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $839,000.

Naval Air Development Center, Johnsville, Pennsylvania: Research, development, and test facilities, $1,684,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $296,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,526,000.

Naval Station, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,859,000.

Navy Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Technical Services Facility, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $586,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Scientific and Technical Intelligence Center, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $1,374,000.

Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia: Operational facilities, and utilities, $874,000.

Naval Security Station, District of Columbia: Administrative facilities, $2,271,000.

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Training facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,578,000.

Naval Hospital, Annapolis, Maryland: Hospital and medical facilities, $134,000.

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $5,000,000.

National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland: Utilities, $630,000.

Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Troop housing, and utilities, $925,000.

Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Maryland: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,208,000.

Naval School, Explosive Ordnance Disposal, Indian Head, Maryland: Training facilities, $296,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $9,850000.

FIFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Hospital, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; Troop housing, $267,000.

Naval Facility, Cape Hatteras, North Carolina: Troop housing $92,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,349,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $2,866,000.

Fleet Anti-War Warfare Training Center, Dam Neck, Virginia: Training facilities, and troop housing, $2,378,000.

Naval Radio Station, Driver, Virginia: Troop housing, $86,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Virginia: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,072,000.

Naval Amphibious School, Little Creek, Virginia: Training facilities, $693,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $4,723,000.

Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Atlantic Fleet, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $2,508,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Utilities, $424,000.

Naval Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,062,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,714,000.

Naval Supply Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Operational facilities, $43,000.

Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia: Troop housing, $808,000.

Fleet Training Center, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $65,000.

Naval Schools Command, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,787,000.

Nuclear Weapons Training Center, Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,557,000.

Navy Preventive Medicine Unit, Norfolk, Virginia: Medical facilities, $339,000.

Naval Radio Station, Northwest, Virginia: Troop housing and community facilities, $320,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $9,831,000.

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Virginia: Troop housing, $1,084,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Yorktown, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,051,000.

SIXTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational and training facilities, and troop housing, $3,590,000.

Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $5,179,000.

Naval Hospital, Jacksonville, Florida: Troop housing, $302,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $5,651,000.

Naval Station, Key West, Florida: Operational facilities, $300,000.

Naval Air Station, Key West, Florida: Supply facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $1,511,000.

Naval Hospital, Key West, Florida: Troop housing, $243,000.

Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilites, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $14,464,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Unit, Patrick Air Force Base, Florida: Operational facilities, and real estate, $7,188,000.

Navy Mine Defense Laboratory, Panama City, Florida: Troop housing, $441,000.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,608,000.

Naval Aviation Medical Center, Pensacola, Florida: Troop housing, $338,000.

Naval Communications Training Center, Pensacola, Florida: Training facilities, and troop housing, $1,864,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pensacola, Florida: Utilities, $3,001,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Saufley Field, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,317,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida: Troop housing, $1,020,000.

Naval Air Station, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,530,000.

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,098,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $955,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $3,063,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,048,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $17,172,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennesseee: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,246,000.

EIGHTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Chase Field, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $12,784,000.

Naval Air Station, Corpus Christi, Texas: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $3,603,000.

Naval Hospital, Corpus Christi, Texas: Troop housing, $344,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Kingsville, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $3,894,000.

NINTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Community facilities, $122,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Troop housing, $6,869,000.

Naval Hospital Corps School, Great Lakes, Illinois: Training facilities, $1,561,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Utilities, $306,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Crane, Indiana: Maintenance facilities, $225,000.

ELEVENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Observatory, Flagstaff, Arizona: Research, development, and test facilities, $704,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona: Operational facilities, medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,849,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $3,041,000.

Naval Aerospace Recovery Facility, El Centro, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $460,000.

Naval Air Facility, El Centro, California: Troop housing, $427,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and hospital and medical facilities, $3,723,000.

Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $626,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Community facilities, $800,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Facility, Long Beach, California: Training facilities, $434,000.

Naval Dental Clinic, Long Beach, California: Medical facilities, $821,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Research, development, and test facilities; and, on San Nicolas Island, troop housing, $703,000.

Naval Ship Missile Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, California: Administrative facilities, $1,591,000.

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Troop housing, $2,638,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Santa Ana, California: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,145,000.

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, $222,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $8,380,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,590,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $7,692,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Ream Field, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,309,000.

Naval Submarine Support Facility, San Diego, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,720,000.

Fleet Anti-Air Warfare Training Center, San Diego, California: Administrative facilities, $475,000.

Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare School, San Diego, California: Training facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,128,000.

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $12,491,000.

Naval Hospital, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $986,000.

TWELFTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,216,000.

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Maintenance facilities, $280,000.

Naval Weapons Station, Concord, California: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $20,079,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $172,000.

Naval Schools Command, Mare Island, California: Troop housing, $2,738,000.

Naval Air Station, Moffett Field, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $119,000.

Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California: Training facilities, $1,794,000.

Naval Hospital, Oakland, California: Troop housing, $1,436,000.

Naval Medical Research Unit, Oakland, California: Research, development, and test facilities, $412,000.

Naval Shipyard, San Francisco Bay, California: Troop housing at Hunters Point; and maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities at Mare Island, $9,174,000.

Naval Station, Treasure Island, California: Utilities and ground improvements, $850,000.

Naval Schools Command, Treasure Island, California: Training facilities, and troop housing, $5,825,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $598,000.

THIRTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Coos Head, Oregon: Utilities and ground improvements, $65,000.

Naval Shipyard, Bremerton, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,923,000.

Naval Hospital, Bremerton, Washington: Troop housing, $83,000.

Naval Radio Station, Jim Creek, Oso, Washington: Community facilities, $130,000.

Naval Communication Station, Puget Sound, Washington: Operational facilities, $713,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Seattle, Washington: Utilities and ground improvements, $252,000.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,866,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Communication Station, Honolulu, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $370,000.

Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,237,000.

Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Administrative facilities, $735,000.

Naval Station, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $1,395,000.

Naval Submarine Base, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,042,000.

Naval Supply Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $62,000.

Fleet Submarine Training Facility, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $944,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii: Utilities and ground improvements, $5,431,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,183,000.

Fleet Operations Control Center, Kunia, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, and utilities, $1,728,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $1,170,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $494,000.

Naval Radio Station, Lualualei, Oahu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, utilities and ground improvements, $6,793,000.

Pacific Fleet Tactical Range, Barking Sands, Kauai, Hawaii: Operation facilities, and maintenance facilities, $678,000.

SEVENTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $7,000,000.

Naval Arctic Research Laboratory, Barrow, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, $1,563,000.

Naval Radio Station, Buskin Lake, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $686,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $55,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $3,278,000.

MARINE CORPS GROUND FORCES FACILITIES

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,294,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $12,507,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, and utilities, $892,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, South Carolina: Training facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $2,149,000.

Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,230,000.

Marine Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $6,704,000.

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $11,290,000.

Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, California: Troop housing, $912,000.

Camp H. M. Smith, Aiea, Oahu, Hawaii: Troop housing, $1,549,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

TENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Facility, Antigua, West Indies: Utilities, $87,000.

Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $3,918,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Troop housing, $1,600,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,468,000.

Naval Radio Station, Sabana Seca, Puerto Rico: Troop housing and community facilities, $513,000.

FOURTEENTH NAVAL DISTRICT

Naval Station, Midway Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, $1,669,000.

ATLANTIC AREA

Naval Station, Bermuda: Operational facilities, $1,253,000.

EUROPEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, Londonderry, Northern Ireland: Medical facilities, $116,000.

Naval Radio Station, Guardamar del Segura, Spain: Community facilities, $58,000.

Naval Station, Rota, Spain: Community facilities, $288,000.

Naval Communication Station, Nea Makri, Greece: Maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $133,000.

PACIFIC OCEAN AREA

Naval Communication Station, North West Cape, Australia: Supply facilities, $426,000.

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, and community facilities, $467,000.

Naval Communication Station, Finegayan, Guam, Mariana Islands: Troop housing, $142,000.

Naval Facility, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, $2,000,000.

Naval Station, Guam, Mariana Islands: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $3,947,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Guam, Mariana Islands: Supply facilities, $2,590,000.

Navy Public Works Center, Guam, Mariana Islands: Utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $8,452,000.

Naval Radio Station, Totsuka, Japan: Utilities, $97,000.

Naval Ordnance Facility, Yokosuka, Japan: Maintenance facilities, $336,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $6,169,000.

Fleet Activities, Ryukyus, Okinawa: Community facilities, $80,000.

Naval Air Station, Cubi Point, Republic of the Philippines: Medical facilities, $105,000.

Naval Communication Station, San Miguel, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $501,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines: Community facilities, $179,000.

VARIOUS LOCATIONS

Various Locations: Operational facilities, $65,000.

Various Naval Communication Activities: Utilities, $662,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,784,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security considerations, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $10,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyards, Mare Island, California, by striking out "$850,000" and inserting in place thereof "$908,000".

(b) Public Law 88–174, as amended, is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$116,031,000" and "$202,930,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$116,089,000" and "$202,988,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 88–390 is amended in title II, section 201, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire, by striking out "$4,760,000" and inserting in place thereof "$5,240,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390 is amended in section 602, clause (2), by striking out "$160,237,000" and "$225,639,000" and inserting respectively in place thereof "$160,717,000" and "$226,119,000".

SEC. 206. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE

THE UNITED STATES" in section 201, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "BUREAU OF SHIPS FACILITIES (Naval Shipyards)" with respect to Naval Shipyard, Long Beach, California, and Naval Shipyard, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "$2,931,000" and "$3,591,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$3,857,000" and "$4,650,000", respectively.

(2) Under the subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Station, Key West, Florida, and Naval Station, Treasure Island, California, strike out "$1,293,000" and "$1,856,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$1,462,000" and "$2,234,000", respectively.

(3) Under the subheading "MARINE CORPS FACILITIES" with respect to Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, strike out "$7,126,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,402,000".

(4) Under the subheading "SERVICE SCHOOL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois, strike out "$11,457,000" and insert in place thereof "$12,732,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MEDICAL FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Dispensary and Dental Clinic, Pearl Harbor, Oahu, Hawaii, strike out "$2,800,000" and insert in place thereof, "$3,026,000".

(6) Under the heading "COMMUNICATION FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Autodin Facility, Albany, Georgia, and Naval Autodin Facility, Syracuse, New York, strike out "$313,000" and "$45,000", respectively, and insert in place thereof "$926,000" and "$135,000", respectively.

(7) Under the heading "OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH FACILITIES" with respect to Naval Research Laboratory, District of Columbia, strike out "$5,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,368,000".

(8) Under the heading "OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FLEET BASE FACILITIES" with respect to Headquarters Support Activity, Taipei, Republic of China, strike out "$199,000" and insert in place thereof "$370,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 602 "$228,770,000", "$34,436,000", and "$314,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "$236,590,000", "$34,607,000", and "$322,296,000", respectively.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth Minnesota: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $316,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, California: Utilities, $204,000.

Kingsley Field, Klamath Falls, Oregon: Administrative facilities and utilities, $290,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities and utilities, $1,598,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, New York: Maintenance facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $377,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $1,201,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Hospital facilities and utilities, $2,805,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Camarillo, California: Training facilities, $264,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $401,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Operational and training facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,105,000.

Peterson Field, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,264,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan: Utilities, $255,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, New York: Utilities, $166,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Utilities, $475,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Florida: Supply facilities and administrative facilities, $199,000.

AIR FORCE LOGISTICS COMMAND

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Maintenance facilities and community facilities, $730,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $1,628,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,146,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,440,000.

Newark Air Force Station, Newark, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $365,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,420,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $2,300,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $11,093,000.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $1,704,000.

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Research, development, and test facilities, medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,185,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and supply facilities, $4,023,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $7,750,000.

Eglin Auxiliary Airfield Numbered 9, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,636,000.

Grenier Field, Manchester, New Hampshire: Troop housing, $465,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,563,000.

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, New Mexico: Operational facilities and utilities, $181,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $1,648,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $1,040,000.

Eastern Test Range, Cocoa, Florida: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $4,787,000.

Western Test Range, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $15,699,000.

Satellite Tracking Facilities: Operational facilities, research, development, and test facilities, and utilities, $7,137,000.

AIR TRAINING COMMAND

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Training facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,523,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $1,665,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Operational and training facilities and administrative facilities, $3,071,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $23,457,000.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Texas: Operational and training facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $736,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Training facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $6,089,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $6,396,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $875,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $1,203,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational and training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,795,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $4,800,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma: Training facilities and utilities, $619,000.

Webb Air Force Base, Big Spring, Texas: Hospital facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,296,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Arizona: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,455,000.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $934,000.

ALASKAN AIR COMMAND

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $225,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $3,390,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $11,323,000.

HEADQUARTERS COMMAND

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, District of Columbia: Maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $10,741,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $3,655,000.

Charleston Air Force Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $7,892,000.

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Operational facilities and utilities, $866,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,543,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,967,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, $8,761,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,047,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Medical facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $2,566,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,483,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $356,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Utilities, $88,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $795,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,689,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Administrative facilities, $123,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Operational facilities, hospital facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,132,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Arizona: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $2,954,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $537,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid, City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $229,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $345,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Washington: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $389,000.

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,652,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $584,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $1,032,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $759,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great Falls, Montana: Operational facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,428,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Administrative facilities, and community facilities, $5,471,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing, $430,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,354,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $960,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,203,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $2,068,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $3,581,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $3,495,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $248,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $822,000.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $6,461,000.

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $6,311,000.

England Air Force Base, Alexandria, Louisiana: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and real estate, $4,410,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kansas: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $970,000.

George Air Force Base, Victorville, California: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $3,176,000.

Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $2,243,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Utilities, $51,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,526,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Florida: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,129,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, supply facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,395,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Operational facilities and administrative facilities, $470,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Community facilities and utilities, $669,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $4,201,000.

Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $5,023,000.

Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Training facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $613,000.

Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,582,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Training facilities, hospital facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $5,323,000.

AIRCRAFT CONTROL AND WARNING SYSTEM

Various Locations: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,801,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $818,000.

MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND

Wake Island Air Force Station, Wake Island: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $484,000.

Kindley Air Base, Bermuda: Operational facilities and community facilities, $1,096,000.

PACIFIC AIR FORCE

Okinawa: Supply facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,255,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities and troop housing and community facilities, $1,355,000.

STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Troop housing and utilities, $1,255,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $1,778,000.

Goose Air Base, Canada: Administrative facilities and utilities, $90,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

Germany: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $2,502,000.

United Kingdom: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,457,000.

Various Locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $4,615,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCES SOUTHERN COMMAND

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $1,625,000.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE SECURITY SERVICE

Various Locations: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $486,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $87,996,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions and responsibilities which have been occasioned by: (a) unforeseen security consideration, (b) new weapons developments, (c) new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or (d) improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next Military Construction Authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $10,000,000:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1968, except for those public work projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. (a) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended unded the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND", with respect to Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada, strike out "$2,433,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,504,000".

(b) Public Law 87–57, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$146,868,000" and "$474,461,000" and inserting in place thereof "$146,939,000" and "$474,532,000", respectively.

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE", with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$3,137,000" and insert in place thereof "$3,998,000".

(2) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska, strike out "$1,888,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,259,000".

(b) Public Law 88–390, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$165,327,000" and "$303,447,000" and inserting in place thereof "$166,559,000" and "$304,679,000", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND", with respect to McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington, strike out "$3,736,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,277,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$5,442,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,347,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$5,510,000" and insert in place thereof "$6,663,000".

(4) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Georgia, strike out "$1,782,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,017,000".

(5) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas, strike out "$651,000" and insert in place thereof "$732,000".

(6) Under the subheading "AIR UNIVERSITY" with respect to Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama, strike out "$770,000" and insert in place thereof "$970,000".

(7) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE" with respect to McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey, strike out "$2,094,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,440,000".

(8) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE" with respect to Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Illinois, strike out "$2,240,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,612,000".

(9) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana, strike out "$1,785,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,945,000".

(10) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan, strike out "$148,000" and insert in place thereof "$223,000".

(11) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio, strike out "$565,000" and insert in place thereof "$706,000".

(12) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida, strike out "$40,000" and insert in place thereof "$66,000".

(13) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$109,000" and insert in place thereof "$132,000".

(14) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Whiteman Air Force Base, Knob Noster, Missouri, strike out "$218,000" and insert in place thereof "$250,000".

(15) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan, strike out "$45,000" and insert in place thereof "$70,000".

(16) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Virginia, strike out "$3,696,000" and insert in place thereof "$4,063,000".

(17) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Pope Air Force Base, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, strike out "$2,560,000" and insert in place thereof "$2,801,000".

(18) Under the subheading "TACTICAL AIR COMMAND" with respect to Shaw Air Force Base, Sumter, South Carolina, strike out "$1,189,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,267,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$210,630,000" and "$334,376,000" and inserting in place thereof "$215,631,000" and "$339,377,000", respectively.

SEC. 307. (a) Public Law 89–568 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 301, as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND" with respect to Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida, strike out "$6,277,000" and insert in place thereof "$7,262,000".

(2) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois, strike out "$586,000" and insert in place thereof "$885,000".

(3) Under the subheading "AIR TRAINING COMMAND" with respect to Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Oklahoma, strike out $1,169,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,313,000".

(4) Under the subheading "ALASKAN AIR COMMAND" with respect to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska, strike out "$1,265,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,500,000".

(5) Under the subheading "MILITARY AIRLIFT COMMAND" with respect to Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, California, strike out "$7,706,000" and insert in place thereof "$8,560,000".

(6) Under the subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND" with respect to Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota, strike out "$440,000" and insert in place thereof "$498,000".

(b) Public Law 89–568 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 602 "$107,098,000" and "$198,014,000" and inserting in place thereof "$109,673,000" and "$200,589,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for defense agencies for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Administrative facilities and hospital and medical facilities, $1,732,000.

DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS AGENCY

National Military Command System Support Center, Pentagon, Washington, D.C.: Administrative facilities, $600,000.

DEFENSE SUPPLY AGENCY

Defense Contract Administration Services Region, Chicago, Illinois: Administrative facilities, $1,255,000.

Defense Depot, Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania: Supply facilities, $375,000.

Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $847,000.

Defense Supply Depot, Tracy, California: Supply facilities, $4,026,000.

Defense General Support Center, Richmond, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $198,000.

Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, Michigan: Administrative facilities, $305,000.

Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities and utilities, $2,429,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Fort George G. Meade, Maryland: Operational facilities, production facilities, and utilities, $3,416,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

DEFENSE ATOMIC SUPPORT AGENCY

Johnston Island: Community facilities, and ground improvements, $1,410,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Various Locations, Europe: Operational facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,407,000.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities which he determines to be vital to the security of the United States, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $150,000,000, of which $50,000,000 is restricted to construction and rehabilitation of highways in Southeast Asia, and provided, that the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 403. (a) Public Law 89–188, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 401 as follows:

(1) Under the subheading "DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY" with respect to Arlington Hall Station, Arlington, Virginia, strike out "$17,900,000" and insert in place thereof "$19,715,000".

(b) Public Law 89–188, as amended is amended, by striking out in clause (4) of section 602 "$100,051,000" and inserting in place thereof "$101,866,000".

TITLE V

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, which are necessary outside the United States in connection with military activities in Southeast Asia, or in support of such activities in the total amount as follows:

Department of the Army, $33,156,000

Department of the Navy, $17,964,000

Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000: *Provided,* That materials only are authorized in connection with dependent military housing facilities for the Vietnamese.

SEC. 502. The Secretary of Defense, in connection with construction projects undertaken in South Vietnam pursuant to section 501 above, shall furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives such reports as were heretofore furnished pursuant to section 401(c) of Public Law 89-367 (80 Stat. 36, 37).

MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

SEC. 601. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to construct, at the locations hereinafter named, family housing units and trailer court facilities in the numbers hereinafter listed, but no family housing construction shall be commenced at any such locations in the United States, until the Secretary shall have consulted with the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, as to the availability of adequate private housing at such locations. If agreement cannot be reached with respect to the availability of adequate private housing at any location, the Secretary of Defense shall immediately notify the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, in writing, of such difference of opinion, and no contract for construction at such location shall be entered into for a period of thirty days after such notification has been given. This authority shall include the authority to acquire land, and interests in land, by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

Family housing units for—

(a) The Department of the Army, two thousand eight hundred and fifty units, $53,954,000:

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama, two hundred units.

Presidio of San Francisco, California, two hundred units.

Fort Benning, Georgia, three hundred and sixty units.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, four hundred units.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, fifty units.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, four hundred units.

Fort Meade, Maryland, three hundred units.

Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, one hundred units.

Fort Jackson, South Carolina, two hundred units.

Fort Hood, Texas, one hundred and twenty units.

Fort Belvoir, Virginia, two hundred and fifty units.

Fort Stewart, Georgia, one hundred and twenty units.

Pacific Side, Canal Zone, one hundred and fifty units.

(b) The Department of the Navy, five thousand and seventy units, $102,040,000:

Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, four hundred and thirty units.

Naval Complex, Long Beach, California, five hundred units.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, three hundred units.

Naval Station, Washington, District of Columbia, one hundred and fifty-eight units.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida, one hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, one hundred units.

Naval Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia, forty-two units.

Naval Complex, Oahu, Hawaii, five hundred units.

David Taylor Model Basin Field Station, Bayview, Idaho, four units.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, thirty-two units.

Naval Communication Station, Cheltenham, Maryland, fifty units.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Maryland, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Boston, Massachusetts, two hundred units.

Naval Facility, Nantucket, Massachusetts, fourteen units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nevada, one hundred units.

Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Oklahoma, thirty units.

Naval Complex, Johnsville, Pennsylvania, three hundred units.

Naval Complex, South Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Newport, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, Rhode Island, two hundred units.

Naval Complex, Charleston, South Carolina, one hundred and fifty units.

Naval Complex, Norfolk, Virginia, one hundred units.

Naval Security Group Activity, Marietta, Washington, thirty units.

Naval Air Station, Whidbey Island, Washington, two hundred and fifty units.

Naval Communications Station, Sugar Grove, West Virginia, twenty units.

Naval Station, Guam, two hundred units.

Naval Communication Station, North West Cape, Australia, seventy units.

Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, two hundred units.

Naval Station, Keflavik, Iceland, one hundred and forty units.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Republic of the Philippines, one hundred units.

(c) The Department of the Air Force, four thousand five hundred and eighty units, $91,135,000:

Craig Air Force Base, Alabama, three hundred units.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, two hundred units.

Luke Air Force Range, Arizona, four units.

George Air Force Base, California, three hundred and seventy-two units.

Norton Air Force Base, California, two hundred units.

Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, one unit.

Bolling Air Force Base, District of Columbia, one hundred and fifty-eight units.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, one hundred and sixty units.

Hickam-Wheeler Air Force Bases, Hawaii, four hundred units.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Indiana, two hundred units.

McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, two hundred units.

Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, three hundred units.

L. G. Hanscom Field, Massachusetts, one hundred units.

Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska, two hundred units.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, three hundred units.

Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, three hundred units.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Texas, fourteen units.

Laredo Air Force Base, Texas, four hundred units.

Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, one hundred units.

Reese Air Force Base, Texas, one unit.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico, one hundred units.

Anderson Air Force Base, Guam, two hundred units.

Wake Island Air Force Station, twenty units.

Albrook-Howard Air Force Bases, Canal Zone, fifty units.

Bentwaters Air Base, United Kingdom, two hundred units.

Upper Heyford Air Base, United Kingdom, one hundred units.

SEC. 602. Authorization for the construction of family housing provided in this Act shall be subject, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, to the following limitations on cost, which shall include shades, screens, ranges, refrigerators, and all other installed equipment and fixtures:

(a) The average unit cost for each military department for all units of family housing constructed in the United States (other than Hawaii and Alaska) and Puerto Rico shall not exceed $19,500, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of site preparation and installation of utilities.

(b) No family housing unit in the areas listed in subsection (a) shall be constructed at a total cost exceeding $35,000, including the cost of the family unit and the proportionate costs of site preparation and installation of utilities: *Provided,* That as to any family housing unit for the commanding officer of any station or installation, and for any such unit for the incumbent of a command position senior to such commander, the limitations of this subjection (b) may be increased 20 per centum for general and flag officers.

(c) When family housing units are constructed in areas other than those listed in subsection (a), the average cost of all such units, in any project of fifty units or more, shall not exceed $32,000, and in no event shall the cost of any unit exceed $40,000. The cost limitations of this subsection shall be exclusive of land acquisition, site preparation, and installation of utilities.

SEC. 603. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorizations Acts on cost of construction of family housing, the limitations on such cost contained in section 602 of this Act shall apply to all prior authorizations for construction of family housing not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been executed by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 604. (a) Sections 4774(b) and 9774(b) of title 10, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased in the amounts provided for construction of quarters of the commanding officer of any station, airbase, or other installation, and for construction of quarters for the incumbent of any command position senior to such commander, based on the grade authorized for such positions:

"(1) For general officers, 20 per centum.

"(2) For colonels, 15 per centum.

"(3) For lieutenant colonels or majors, 10 per centum."

(b) Section 7574(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The maximum limitations prescribed by subsection (a) may be increased in the amounts provided for construction of quarters of the commanding officer of any station, airbase, or other installation, and for construction of quarters for the incumbent of any command position senior to such commander, based on the grade authorized for such positions:

"(1) For flag officers in the Navy and general officers in the Marine Corps, 20 per centum.

"(2) For captains in the Navy and colonels in the Marine Corps, 15 per centum.

"(3) For commanders and lieutenant commanders in the Navy and lieutenant colonels and majors in the Marine Corps, 10 per centum."

SEC. 605. Notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 609 of Public Law 87-57 or any other provision of law, on the maximum cost of rehabilitating a family housing unit, the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to repair and rehabilitate the damaged family housing unit at the Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois,

which is designated for occupancy by the Commandant, Ninth Naval District, at a cost not in excess of $40,000.

SEC. 606. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to accomplish alterations, additions, expansions, or extensions not otherwise authorized by law, to existing public quarters at a cost not to exceed—

(a) For the Department of the Army, $7,000,000.

(b) For the Department of the Navy, $5,000,000.

(c) For the Department of the Air Force, $5,000,000.

(d) For the Defense Agencies, $671,000.

SEC. 607. Section 507 of Public Law 88–174 (77 Stat. 307, 326), as amended by section 505 of Public Law 89–188 (79 Stat. 793, 814), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 507. For the purpose of providing military family housing in foreign countries, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements guaranteeing the builders or other sponsors of such housing a rental return equivalent to a specified portion of the annual rental income which the builders or other sponsors would receive from the tenants if the housing were fully occupied: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount guaranteed under such agreements entered into during the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 shall not exceed such amount as may be applicable to five thousand units: *Provided further,* That no such agreement shall guarantee the payment of more than 97 per centum of the anticipated rentals, nor shall any guarantee extend for a period of more than ten years, nor shall the average guaranteed rental on any project exceed $185 per unit per month, including the cost of maintenance and operation."

SEC. 608. Section 501(b) of Public Law 87–554 (76 Stat. 223, 237) is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following new clause: "and (3) notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of debt service, proceeds of the disposal of family housing of the Department of Defense, including related land and improvements, whether disposed of by the Department of Defense or any other Federal agency, but less those expenses payable pursuant to section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 485(b)), to remain available until expended."

SEC. 609. Section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1968 and 1969, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near military installations in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam, for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge, upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities, at or near such military installations. Such housing facilities may be leased on an individual basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of $175 per unit per month for each military department, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation."

SEC. 610. In addition to the leasing authority of section 515 of Public Law 84–161 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, and upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense that a valid military requirement exists, and under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Secretary of a military department is authorized to lease, at or near military installations in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Guam, housing facilities which are either (a) owned by the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or (b) which were built in consultation with the Department of Defense in order to meet military requirements and which were financed by mortgages insured by an agency of the United States. Such housing facilities, to be available for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents without rental charge, may be leased on an individual basis. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may not exceed an average of $175 per unit per month for each military department, including the cost of utilities and maintenance and operation: *Provided,* That not more than seven thousand five hundred units may be leased at any one time under authority of this section and said section 515, as amended.

SEC. 611. Subsection (g) of section 407 of Public Law 85–241 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1594j(g)) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "Any such housing so exempted in connection with depot-type installations, as to which the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, determines, subsequent to July 1, 1967, that indefinite retention may be necessary to satisfy unanticipated housing requirements resulting from future expanded activity at such installations, may be retained and utilized as necessary, notwithstanding that the foregoing criteria are no longer satisfied."

SEC. 612. The Secretary of Defense, or his designee, is authorized to acquire by transfer, without reimbursement, all rights and interests of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, in ten family housing units located on Auxiliary Field Numbered 6, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

SEC. 613. There is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, for military family housing as authorized by law for the following purposes:

(a) for construction and acquisition of family housing, including improvements to adequate quarters, improvements to inadequate quarters, minor construction, rental guarantee payments, construction and acquisition of trailer court facilities, and planning, an amount not to exceed $267,000,000 and

(b) for support of military family housing including operating expenses, leasing, maintenance of real property, payments of principal and interest on mortgage debts incurred, payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and mortgage insurance premiums authorized under section 222 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1715m), an amount not to exceed $520,000,000.

TITLE VII

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE

SEC. 701. In accordance with subsection 1013(i) of Public Law 89–754 (80 Stat. 1255, 1292) there is authorized to be appropriated for use by the Secretary of Defense for the purposes of section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, including acquisition of properties, an amount not to exceed $22,000,000, to be available on behalf of military personnel only.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or lands includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 802. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, and VII shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $271,327,000; outside the United States $105,630,000; section 102, $2,873,000; or a total of $379,830,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $430,097,000; outside the United States, $37,321,000; section 202, $6,784,000; or a total of $474,202,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $316,699,000; outside the United States, $28,816,000; section 302, $87,996,000; or a total of $433,511,000.

(4) for title IV: A total of $169,000,000.

(5) for title V: Southeast Asia support—Department of the Army, $33,156,000; Department of the Navy, $17,964,000; Department of the Air Force, $23,880,000.

(6) for title VI: Military family housing, $787,000,000.

(7) for title VII: Homeowners assistance, $22,000,000.

SEC. 803. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, III, and IV of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 804. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. Regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense implementing the provisions of this section shall provide the department or agency requiring such construction with the right to select either the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Department of the Navy, as its construction agent, providing that under the facts and circumstances that exist at the time of the selection of the construction agent, such selection will not result in any increased cost to the United States. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 805. (a) As of October 1, 1968, all authorizations for military public works (other than family housing) to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are con-

tained in titles I, II, III, and IV of the Act of September 12, 1966, Public Law 89–568 (80 Stat. 739), and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed except authorizations for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before October 1, 1968, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

(b) Effective fifteen months from the date of enactment of this Act, all authorizations for construction of family housing which are contained in this Act are repealed except authorizations for family housing projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions or manufactured structural component contracts in whole or in part before such date.

SEC. 806. None of the authority contained in titles I, II, III, IV and V of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $36 per square foot for cold storage warehousing;

(2) $9 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $2,900 per person for permanent barracks;

(4) $10,200 per person for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the limitations contained in prior Military Construction Authorization Acts on unit costs, the limitations on such costs contained in this section shall apply to all prior authorizations for such construction not heretofore repealed and for which construction contracts have not been awarded by the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 807. (a) The Naval Academy Dairy Farm is a self-supporting operation, an economic and morale-building asset to the Department of the Navy, and shall continue in its present status and function.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) or any other provision of law, the real property located in Gambrills, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, and comprising the Naval Academy Dairy Farm shall not be determined excess to the needs of the holding agency or transferred, reassigned, or otherwise disposed of by such agency, nor shall any action be taken by the Navy to close, dispose of or phase out the Naval Academy Dairy Farm unless specially authorized by an Act of Congress.

SEC. 808. Section 610 of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1967 (Public Law 89–568; 80 Stat. 756) is amended as follows:

(a) By inserting, after the words "under this Act" appearing in subsection (b), the following: "or hereafter authorized" and

(b) By striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a colon therefor and adding the following: *"Provided, however,* That this authorization may be averaged and applied to a single facility of two or more facilities, or among projects on an installation, when such application will result in more fallout shelter space, or is needed to meet minimum fallout protection standards in such facilities or projects."

SEC. 809. Titles I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Authorization Act, 1968."

TITLE IX

RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 901. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop additional facilities for the Reserve Forces, including the acquisition of land therefor, but the cost of such facilities shall not exceed—

(1) for Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $10,000,000.

(b) Army Reserve, $10,000,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $4,500,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $9,800,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,000,000.

SEC. 902. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 903. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Authorization Act, 1968."

TITLE X

NAVAL DISTRICTS AND THE RANK OF COMMANDANTS THEREOF

SEC. 1001. Part I of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) A new chapter 516 is inserted after chapter 515 reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 516.—NAVAL DISTRICTS

"Sec.

"5221. Naval districts.

"5222. Commandants of naval districts.

"§ 5221. Naval districts.

"There shall be included within the organization of the Department of the Navy, naval districts. These naval districts and their headquarters are as listed in the subjoined table:

"District No.	States and counties	Headquarters
1	Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (including Block Island)	Boston.
3	Connecticut, New York, northern part of New Jersey, including the counties of Monmouth, Middlesex, Somerset, Hunterdon, and all counties north thereof; also Nantucket Shoals Lightship.	New York.
4	Pennsylvania; southern part of New Jersey, including counties of Mercer, Burlington, Ocean, and all counties south thereof; Delaware, including Winter Quarter Shoal Light Vessel; Ohio.	Philadelphia.
5	Maryland less Anne Arundel, Prince Georges, Montgomery, St. Marys, Calvert, and Charles Counties; West Virginia; Virginia less Arlington, Fairfax, Stafford, King George, Prince William, and Westmoreland Counties and the city of Alexandria: also all waters of Chesapeake Bay including its arms and tributaries except waters within the Fourth Naval District and the counties comprising the Naval District Washington, D.C., west of a line extending from Smith Point to Point Lookout thence following the general contour of the shoreline of St. Marys, Calvert, and Anne Arundel Counties, as paired by straight lines from headland to headland across rivers and estuaries; Kentucky; and the counties of Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Gates, Perquimans, Chowan, Dare, Tyrrell, Washington, Hyde, Beaufort, Pamlico, Craven, Jones, Carteret, and Onslow in North Carolina.	Norfolk.
6	North Carolina less the counties of Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Gates, Perquimans, Chowan, Dare, Tyrrell, Washington, Hyde, Beaufort, Pamlico, Craven, Jones, Carteret, and Onslow; South Carolina; Georgia; Florida; Alabama; Tennessee; and Mississippi.	Charleston.
8	Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico	New Orleans.
9	Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, and Wyoming	Great Lakes.
10	Starting from a point in latitude 18°05' north, longitude 85°00' west, due north along the 85th meridian to a point due west of Cape San Antonio on the west coast of Cuba; thence due east to Cape San Antonio; thence along the north coast of Cuba to Cape Maysi; thence from Cape Maysi to Matthewtown, Great Inagua; thence along the south coast of Great Inagua, taking departure from the east coast of Great Inagua due east along the 21st parallel to longitude 70° west; thence to latitude 20° north, longitude 65° west thence to latitude 19° north, longitude 62° west; thence to latitude 17° north, longitude 60° west; thence to the northern tip of Barbados Island and along the east coast to the southern tip of Barbados; thence to a point at the seaward end of the British Guiana-Venezuela boundary on thence in a northwesterly direction along the northern sea boundary of Venezuela to the seaward end of the Venezuela-Colombia boundary; thence northeastward and northwestward along the sea boundary of Colombia to the northernmost point of the Colombian sea boundary; thence to the starting point. The inclusion within the above boundaries of islands, land masses or territorial waters of sovereign countries other than the United States does not extend the command functions and responsibilities of the commandant to those islands, land masses or territorial waters. The commandant's responsibilities extend only to United States territories, possessions, naval reservations, and naval activities located within the geographical limits hereby established, and then subject to the provisions of international treaties or agreements to which the United States is a party.	San Juan, P.R.
11	Arizona; Clark County, Nevada; southern part of California, including counties of Santa Barbara, Kern, and San Bernardino, and all counties south thereof	San Diego.
12	Utah, Nevada (except Clark County), northern part of California, including counties of San Luis Obispo, Kings, Tulare, Inyo and all counties north thereof	San Francisco.
13	Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana	Seattle.
14	The Hawaiian Islands and islands to the westward and southward including the Midway Islands, Kure, Wake, Johnston and Palmyra Islands, Kingman Reef and Kwajalein Atoll (Marshall Islands).	Pearl Harbor.
15	Panama Canal Zone	Balboa.
17	Alaska, including Aleutians	Kodiak.

"Naval District *Washington,* D.C.	States and counties	Headquarters
	The Potomac River up to the Frederick County line; the District of Columbia; the counties of Anne Arundel, Prince Georges, Montgomery, St. Marys, Calvert, and Charles in Maryland; the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Stafford, King George, Prince William and Westmoreland in Virginia; and the cities of Alexandria, Falls Church, and Fairfax, Virginia. The waters of the Naval District Washington, D.C., include the waters within the counties comprising the command west of a line extending from Smith Point to Point Lookout, thence following the general contour of the shoreline of St. Marys, Calvert, and Anne Arundel Counties, as faired by straight lines from headland to headland across rivers and estuaries.	Washington, D.C.

"§ 5222. Commandants of naval districts

"The Secretary of the Navy shall detail an officer of the Navy not below the grade of rear admiral as commandant of each of the naval districts listed in section 5221 of this title."

(2) The chapter analysis is amended by inserting the following item after item 515:

"516. Naval districts."

Mr. RIVERS (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer six technical committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. RIVERS: On page 5, line 20, strike out "Operational facilities," and on line 21, capitalize the initial "S" in the next word.

On page 7, line 2, strike out "research, development, and test facilities,".

On page 7, line 16, strike out "supply facilities,".

On page 30, line 18, strike out "Community" and insert in lieu thereof "Operational facilities, and community".

On page 43, lines 18 and 19, strike out "Operational facilities," and capitalize the initial "M" in the next word.

On page 61, after line 14, insert "Title VI".

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, these amendments represent errors in draftsmanship caused by pressure of time in getting the report and the bill into final form, also printers errors, and errors that would follow as a result of committee amendments whereas, for instance, a project for an installation may have been changed, but the utilities were not as a result removed.

As I say, Mr. Chairman, these amendments are purely technical in nature, and are proposed simply to round out the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHIAS OF MARYLAND

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland: On page 81, line 4, strike out "unless specially authorized by an Act of Congress" and insert in lieu thereof "until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a full report of the facts, including the justification for such proposed action, is submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives."

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my affection and my respect for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina, and for the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, are sufficiently deep that I can disagree with them in one particular without undermining either, and I must disagree very strongly with the language in section 807 in the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, I also have a high regard for cows, whether they are found at the Naval Academy dairy farm or elsewhere in Maryland, or at any other place in the country. But, Mr. Chairman, I have made it a matter of high principle to treat all cows with a fine degree of impartiality.

I strongly dissent from the proposition that 600 cows at Gambrills, Md., should be beatified by this bill and be hereafter considered as sacred cows. This bill exempts these 600 sacred cows from the rule of reason. It would exempt these 600 sacred cows from the laws of economics, and it would exempt these 600 sacred cows from the disciplines of the free enterprise system.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in treating all cows alike.

Section 807 as presented to the House would perpetuate a situation which is an insult to the free enterprise farmers of America and which violates the principle of prohibiting Government competition with the taxpayers who support it. If we today endorse the proposition that the Government can compete freely with the private sector, it will be difficult for us to attempt to discipline the executive branch when they choose to violate what has heretofore been considered a matter of faith.

Section 807 as presented to the House ignores a careful study made by the General Accounting Office which determined that it is more expensive to keep socialized cows at the Naval Academy than it would be to purchase milk and cream and ice cream from the cows who are in the business.

Section 807 is a roadblock to the modern economic use by the Navy or by some other branch of the Government of one of the most valuable tracts of land that the Federal Government owns today. I favor the retention of real estate that is owned by the Government for Government use which might result in 4,900 new employees in Anne Arundel County, Md., instead of the present 49, and it is not right from either the local or the national point of view to make this evolution more difficult.

Section 807 is unfair to the midshipmen at Annapolis. The Comptroller General has reported that it would be cheaper to buy milk for the Academy mess. If we are paying more than we ought to pay for milk under the present dairy farm system, the midshipmen could have more milk or more of something else under the normal free enterprise system of procurement in force at the Military Academy, at the Air Force Academy, and at every other military establishment around the world.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered does not do violence to this bill. It merely puts into effect the same language with regard to the department's establishment of a military installation which the Committee on Armed Services accepted last year and which was embodied in the last military construction bill. I believe that it is a fair amendment. It does not give the Executive any arbitrary authority to close anything. It simply puts both sides on notice as to what the intention of the other might be.

Section 807 of this bill would make the Naval Academy Dairy Farm at Gambrills, Md., a permanent installation. If this action is adopted, it would require a special act of Congress to authorize the Navy to close, phase out, or dispose of the dairy farm, to declare the property excess, or to reassign or dispose of this acreage.

This is just one small section in a very large bill. Similarly, the dairy farm is just one among many fine Maryland dairy farms, and just one among many Government-operated businesses. Yet I feel that we should discuss thoroughly the important issues which this small item has raised.

The first question here is simply whether we should completely tie the hands of the Department of the Navy, the Naval Academy, and the government and people of Anne Arundel County, by making this installation permanent. The second question here is whether it is appropriate to give this small facility a thicker congressional shield than that which protects far greater and more strategic installations such as Fort Detrick, Andrews Air Force Base, Fort Meade, and probably the Pentagon itself.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Naval Academy Dairy Farm should not be made a sacred cow. Accordingly, I have offered an amendment to section 807 to require that the dairy farm could be phased out, or its assets or property disposed of, after 30 days' notice and full justifications have been submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The language of this amendment is identical to the wording of section 611 of the Military Construction Authorization Act of 1965—Public Law 89–188—the act in which we finally reached a compromise between the desire of the Congress to review military base closings, and the preference of the executive branch for unfettered discretion in such matters.

This act does not presently apply to the dairy farm because its provisions for 30 days' notice cover only those bases which have a total of more than 250 military and civilian employees. In 1965, the total complement of the dairy farm was one naval officer and 45 full-time civilian employees.

Mr. Chairman, the Naval Academy Dairy Farm was established in 1911, at a time when adequate supplies of top quality, healthy milk and dairy products could not be guaranteed through commercial markets for the midshipmen's mess. Since 1911 the farm has grown, and has become one of the most progressive dairy operations in this area, one in which the officers and men of the Naval Academy, and many distinguished alumni of Annapolis, can justifiably take pride.

Since 1911, however, the commercial dairy industry of Maryland has also grown and improved, to the point where it now ranks among the first in the Nation, and is completely capable of providing the quantities and quality of milk which the midshipmen need.

To me, it seems to be time to reexamine the justification for the Naval Academy Dairy Farm, to see whether considerations of comparative cost support maintaining this Government business in competition with private enterprise. Accordingly, 2 years ago I asked the General Accounting Office to investigate the situation, assess all of the direct and indirect costs involved, and determine whether a saving to the taxpayers could be realized if the farm were closed.

In all candor, I must state that right now cost comparisons are conflicting and inconclusive. The GAO reported in March 1966 that potential savings of $83,803 per year could be realized if the farm were closed. The Navy Department initially accepted that finding, and made preliminary plans for phasing out the farm's operations. More recently, however, new conclusions about disposition of the assets, and a new audit by the Navy Department, have produced cost justifications for continuing and even modernizing the farm.

Section 807 of the pending bill is a response to this situation—a response which seems to be overenthusiastic and out of proportion. Rather than continuing the discussion over costs, section 807 would effectively end it, by taking the future disposition of the dairy farm out of the realm of executive action into the sphere of congressional prerogatives.

I might point out that the complete protection provided in this section far exceeds the requirements for executive notice to Congress which the President vetoed in 1965 as an invasion of his discretion. I am not suggesting that the President will, or should, veto this bill simply to keep his flexibility in determining the future of the dairy farm. I am suggesting that it is imprudent and unwise for us to freeze any single installation into law, especially when the facility involved is so small and, in the overall scheme of things, not the most vital to our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this question should remain open. I do not advocate arbitrary closing of the farm. I do believe, however, that the Navy should have the discretion to phase out its operations, with adequate notice to Congress, when and if the evidence clearly shows that purchase of milk for the midshipmen from commercial markets would be more economical.

Similarly, I do not advocate abandoning the dairy farm's real estate or removing the Federal presence from Anne Arundel County. The dairy farm has been a good neighbor, and its 876 acres at Gambrills represent not only valuable property, but open space which is increasingly important as the county grows more crowded. I do believe, however, that at some future time it may become appropriate to locate another Federal installation on that property, perhaps replacing the 45 dairy farm workers with, for example, 4,500 scientists and engineers. On the other hand, at some future time it may be desirable to use this land as the basis for a valuable recreational facility. I believe strongly that none of these options should be foreclosed.

Mr. Chairman, I can certainly understand the sentimental attachment to the dairy farm which is felt by many Annapolis alumni and by many long-time Anne Arundel County residents. But such sentiment should not be enshrined in law. My amedment to section 807 will not affect the present operations or the immediate future of the dairy farm. It will restore proper proportions to the question of the midshipmen's milk.

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

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the effect of the gentleman's amendment, Mr. Chairman, give the Secretary of Defense the right to close lock, stock, and barrel, this dairy at Annapolis after giving the Congress 30 days' notice?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. I believe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is very familiar with this language, because it is the identical language that appears in existing legislation on this subject. It would simply put the Naval Academy dairy farm in the same category as other installations around the country.

Mr. RIVERS. Does it give the right to close this after 30 day's notice to the Congress?

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. The amendment would provide as follows, and I will read the amendment:

* * * the Naval Academy Dairy Farm shall not be determined excess to the needs of the holding agency or transferred, reassigned, or otherwise disposed of by such agency, nor shall any action be taken by the Navy to close, dispose of or phase out (or any other words that the gentleman might want to use) the Naval Academy Dairy Farm until after the expiration of thirty days from the date upon which a full report of the facts, including the justification for such proposed action is submitted by the Secretary of Defense to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Is that not the language in the existing legislation as applicable to other installations?

Mr. Chairman, at this point I offer the report of the Comptroller General for inclusion in the RECORD.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1966.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Herewith is our report on the operation of a dairy farm by the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

The dairy was established in 1911 to provide the midshipmen with a source of pure milk following an outbreak of typhoid fever attributed to the unprocessed milk purchased for the midshipmen's mess. In the 54 years which have passed since the dairy was established, commercial dairy operations have improved to the point that there is no longer any reason to consider it necessary for the Naval Academy to operate a dairy to ensure the availability of a supply of pure milk and milk products. Further, its continued operation appears to be contrary to Government policies with respect to competition with private enterprise and retention of real property.

The records maintained by the dairy indicate that the cost to the Government for milk and milk products obtained from the Academy dairy was less than the prices charged other Government activities by commercial sources. We found, however that certain additional adjustments to the dairy farm costs were necessary in order to reflect the true cost to the Government. After these adjustments, annual savings of about $84,000 would be realized by the Government if the Academy dairy farm was sold and the Academy's milk needs were obtained from commercial sources.

Inasmuch as the continued operation of the dairy farm appears contrary to Government policy and in view of the economies which could be realized through discontinuing its operation, we proposed to the Navy that consideration be given to the disposal of the dairy farm.

The Navy has agreed that the dairy is no longer necessary and has advised us that a plan will be developed to phase out the dairy with the objective of minimizing the impact on the local farm community and providing the maximum return on the midshipmen's store investment. The Navy advised us also that the Department of Defense was preparing a directive which would provide specific guidelines for an evaluation of commercial activities operated by the military departments in order to arrive at a decision which would be in the best interests of the Government.

Concerning the Navy's comment on providing the maximum return on the midshipmen's store investment in the dairy farm, we were advised by a cognizant official that the Navy was considering whether the midshipmen's store should participate in the proceeds from the sale of the dairy farm. We were further advised by this official that a final decision on this matter had not been made by the Navy as of January 18, 1966.

It should be recognized that the computations in this report were based on the assumption that the proceeds from the sale of the dairy farm would accrue to the United States Government and that any other disposition of such proceeds would alter the comparative costs of the procurement of dairy products by the Academy and, thus, the savings to the Government. In the event that the Navy determines that any proceeds from the sale of the dairy should not be deposited with the Treasury, the proposed disposition of the proceeds should be submitted with appropriate explanation of the basis for the Navy's determination to the Comptroller General for a decision.

Since the Navy plans to phase out the dairy at the Naval Academy, we are making no recommendations at this time. We shall, however, continue to examine into the economic aspects of these commercial activities which are operated by the military departments.

This review was undertaken in response to a request from Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr. However, we are reporting our findings to the Congress because the matter relates to the general policy of the Government in conducting activities to produce supplies available from private enterprise.

Copies of this report are being sent today to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Agriculture.

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF A DAIRY FARM BY THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD., DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has examined into the operation of the Naval Academy dairy, an activity of the midshipmen's store of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland. Our review, conducted at the request of Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Our examination was directed, primarily, toward an evaluation of the Naval Academy's need to operate a dairy to fulfill its mission. In connection therewith, we considered (a) the purpose for which the dairy had been established and the need for its continued existence, (b) the relative costs to the Government for milk and milk products produced by the Academy dairy with those available from commercial sources, and (c) the operation of the Academy dairy in relation to the Government's policies with respect to retention of high value properties and competition with private enterprise.

Our review was performed at the United States Naval Academy dairy, Gambrills, Maryland; the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland; and the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Washington, D.C.

The principal officials of the Departments of Defense and the Navy responsible for administration of activities discussed in this report are listed in appendix I.

BACKGROUND

A dairy was established at the Naval Academy in 1911 as the result of certain health problems. A medical board determined that a serious outbreak of typhoid fever in 1910 and other illnesses prevalent among the midshipmen had been caused by the raw, unprocessed milk purchased for the midshipmen's mess. At that time, the pasteurization process was little known or used. To ensure that milk supplied to the midshipmen's mess was of the highest purity attainable, the midshipmen's store, an organization which operated such facilities as the cobblershop, tailorshop, and barbershop for the midshipmen, established a small dairy herd and the necessary facilities with the expenditure of $40,000 in 1911. The facilities were located on Naval Academy property which is now the location of Naval Academy quarters known as Perry Circle.

In 1913 the size of the brigade of midshipmen had grown, and it became necessary to increase the size of the herd and facilities to meet the demand for milk. The midshipmen's store was not in a position to fund such expansion. Consequently, the Naval Academy turned to the Congress for funds to buy land and buildings necessary for the increased herd.

The act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 904), appropriated $100,000 "For the purchase of the necessary land for the location of the Naval Academy dairy * * * and for the transfer to the new dairy site, and re-erection thereon, of buildings belonging to the present dairy, the repair and alteration of such buildings as may be found on the land to be purchased, and for all other necessary purposes connected with the establishment of a dairy on such land * * *." The act contained the provisions (1) "That the cost of said land shall not exceed $75,000" and (2) "That the amount appropriated * * * shall be treated as an advance to the midshipmen's store fund at the Naval Academy, to be ultimately repaid to the United States." The record indicates that the advance was repaid in full on January 20, 1925.

The act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 603), appropriated $100,000 as an additional advance to be returned to the United States and the act of March 28, 1918 (40 Stat. 488), appropriated $55,000 also as an advance to be returned.

The act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1278), repealed those portions of the act of August 29, 1916, and March 28, 1918, which required the ultimate return to the United States of advances aggregating $155,000 made to the midshipmen's store fund with the provisions (1) "That the dairy and farm, cattle and work animals, machinery and implements, buildings, and other stock, equipment, and supplies heretofore purchased from the funds so advanced shall become and remain the property of the United States" and (2) "That the dairy farm shall be continued and operated as an activity of the midshipmen's store."

The Comptroller General in a decision dated February 26, 1926 (5 Comp. Gen. 663, 664), stated that:

"From the provisions of the above acts, it appears that the only funds expended in the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the dairy farm were public funds, either appropriated by the Congress or accruing through profits from the sale of the dairy-farm products, etc., which profits must also be regarded as Government funds. The moneys expended in the establishment and development of the dairy farm having been exclusively Government funds it appears that the dairy farm was the property of the United States from the time of its establishment and that therefore the act of March 4, 1925, passed no title in the property to the United States, the title having been in the United States at the time of the passage of the act. It is also shown by these acts that the Naval Academy dairy farm is an instrumentality of the Government under the administrative control of the Secretary of the Navy, as an activity of the midshipmen's store."

The dairy is located in Gambrills, Anne Arundel County, Maryland, on 876 acres of land. This location is close to Friendship Airport, Annapolis, and Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. There are approximately 97 buildings and/or structures that were erected during the period 1914 to 1963, of which 19 are used as housing for permanent civilian employees of the dairy and their families. In addition, one large housing unit is occupied by a Lieutenant Commander, United States Navy, the sole military person assigned to the dairy. In 1964, there were 45 permanent civilian employees of the dairy.

The farm's dairy herd at December 31, 1964, consisted of 377 cows, 262 calves, and 4 bulls. Through the years the dairy has improved its facilities and now provides homogenized, pasteurized milk in half gallon cartons to the midshipmen's mess. It also provides to the midshipmen's mess, chocolate milk and cereal cream in half gallon cartons and heavy cream in six-gallon containers.

Milk production is regulated by the dairy management so as to provide the highest production when the brigade of midshipmen is in residence at the Academy and its lowest production when the brigade is not in residence. Production averages 1,400 to 1,500 gallons of milk a day during the winter months and drops to approximately 700 gallons a day in the summer months. During the summer months, the dairy separates the milk to produce heavy cream which it freezes for use in making ice cream for the midshipmen's mess when the brigade returns. The resulting skim milk is either fed to the calves or processed at the dairy's milk-drying plant to produce powdered milk. The powdered milk is sold, used as a feed supplement in feeding the regular herd, or bartered for other animal feed. In addition, a large portion of the feed for the dairy herd is grown on the dairy's land or on land it leases.

The Academy dairy is not designed to be a profit-making organization, consequently, prices charged for the milk and milk products produced at the dairy closely approximate the actual cost of the dairy operation.

FINDINGS

Academy dairy not needed for health or economic reasons

Our review disclosed that adequate supplies of milk and milk products are readily available from commercial sources to satisfy the needs of the Naval Academy. We found also that the continued operation of the Academy dairy farm would prevent the Government from realizing estimated annual savings of about $84,000. In our opinion, therefore, the dairy farm is no longer required for the purpose for which it was established and its continued operation appears to be contrary to the Government's policies with respect to competition with private enterprise and retention of real estate. The Navy has agreed and has informed us that it plans to close the dairy in a prompt and orderly fashion and with minimum impact on the local community.

Operation of the dairy no longer required to safeguard midshipmen's health

As stated in the background section of this report (see p. 2), the Naval Academy in 1911 established a dairy to provide the midshipmen with a source of pure, safe milk. At that time pasteurization was not a general practice and the midshipmen had suffered typhoid fever and other illnesses attributable to impure milk. In the 54 years which have passed since establishment of the dairy, the quality of commercially available milk has improved greatly. Almost all milk sold in fluid form is pasteurized, and it is no longer necessary for the Academy to operate its own dairy to ensure the availability of safe, pure milk and milk products.

Also, an adequate supply of pasteurized fluid milk—produced, processed, and distributed under regulations established to assure wholesomeness and purity—is readily available in the Upper Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, the marketing area in which the Naval Academy is located. The Federal market administrator has compiled data which shows that during calendar year 1964 receipts of milk by cooperative associations and pool plant operators in this area amounted to about 91.4 million gallons. These data disclosed that about 65.9 million gallons of this milk were processed and sold in fluid form during that year. There being no market for the remaining 25.5 million gallons of milk in fluid form, this quantity was considered to be surplus and was converted into manufactured dairy products. The 25.5 million gallons of surplus fluid milk were more than adequate to satisfy the Naval Academy's demand for fluid milk, which is the equivalent of about 415,000 gallons a year.

Furthermore, responsible officials in the Consumer and Marketing Service and Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, formally advised us that adequate supplies of milk were available in the Upper Chesapeake Bay area, and in other areas, to supply the Academy's needs.

Cost of milk available from commercial sources is comparable to the cost of milk produced by the Academy dairy

Although the records maintained by the dairy indicate that the cost to the Government for milk and milk products obtained from the Academy dairy was less than the prices charged other Government activities by commercial producers, we found that certain additional adjustments were necessary to reflect the true cost to the Government.

For example, adjustments were necesary for interest savings to the Government, for certain salaries and also for Federal payments to Anne Arundel County. As shown in the following schedule, after these adjustments are made to the dairy farm costs, an annual savings of about $84,000 would be obtained if the dairy farm were not in operation.

COMPARISON OF COMMERCIAL PRICES WITH COST TO PRODUCE MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS AT NAVAL ACADEMY DAIRY FARM DURING 1964

	Sales to Naval Academy (in gallons)	Commercial prices per gallon	Total sales at commercial dairy prices
Commercial prices: [1]			
Whole milk	242,262	$0.6276	$152,044
Chocolate milk	11,078	.708	7,843
Coffee and cereal cream	24,743	1.52	37,609
Heavy cream	9,846	3.60	35,446
			$232,942
Dairy farm:			
Cost of sales			171,174
Salaries and related costs			20,937
Insurance (fire, comprehensive)			11,298
Utilities			7,970
Maintenance and repair			2,989
Supplies and services			1,699
Loss on death of cattle			1,020
Other income			11,942
Total			[2] 205,145
Difference			27,797
Other elements:			
Interest savings on real property			68,100
Interest savings on net assets			26,000
Manager's salary and allowances			10,500
Payments to Anne Arundel County			7,000
Subtotal			111,600
Estimated annual savings			83,803

[1] Based on 1964 Defense Supply Agency contract for Washington area.
[2] Obtained from Naval Academy dairy financial statement, Jan. 1–Dec. 31, 1964.

A discussion on each of the additional adjustments which were included in our comparison follows.

Interest savings

The Government could realize at least $1.7 million if the dairy was sold at its current value. The Academy dairy occupies 876 acres of land situated about one mile from Maryland Highway Number 3, a four lane divided highway. Also, it is located about 5 miles from the head of the Severn River, and within short distances of Friendship Airport, Annapolis and Baltimore, Maryland, and Washington, D.C. The terrain of the dairy is described as having a gentle roll, and is well suited for residential or industrial purposes. In May 1965, Anne Arundel County officials informed us that, if used for residential or industrial purposes, the land would have a probable market value of at least $1,752,000, or the equivalent value of $2,000 an acre.

At rates currently paid for funds borrowed by the Government, reduction of the Federal debt by $1,752,000 would reduce interest costs by about $68,100 annually. We did not consider it practical to estimate the current market value of the remaining net assets (such as production and breeding herds, buildings, and machinery and equipment), which according to dairy records were valued at about $670,000 at December 31, 1964. However, assuming that the $670,000 value is a realizable amount, we estimate that the Government would reduce its annual interest costs by an additional $26,000 if the money received from the sale of the assets was used to pay the liabilities of the dairy farm and the remainder returned to the Treasury to reduce the Federal debt.

Salary and allowances

The dairy farm is managed by a naval officer, presently a Lieutenant Commander. We estimate that his pay and allowances, including maintenance of his residence, for calendar year 1964, during which time he held the rank of Lieutenant, amounted to approximately $10,500.

Payments to Anne Arundel County

Payments are made by the Federal Government under the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 236), to the Anne Arundel School District as financial assistance to the school district for providing education for children whose parents are employed by the dairy.

In January 1964, 31 of the children of dairy employees living on the dairy property were attending the Anne Arundel County schools. Navy officials estimated an annual Federal payment under this school-aid program of about $7,000.

Other items

Although we recognize that certain other costs may be appropriate for consideration in making cost comparisons, we did not consider them to be of sufficient significance to alter our conclusion as to the economy of purchasing milk and milk products from commercial sources. These costs include depreciation which, according to the dairy farm records, amounted to about $2,100 in 1964 and Federal income taxes which would be foregone under a Government operation. Both of these factors, if included, would make a commercial operation even more attractive.

We did not include an amount in our comparison for discontinued-service retirement of the 45 employees at the dairy farm since the employees are entitled only to Social Security retirement benefits.

In view of the above, it is apparent that it would be more economical for the Government to purchase the milk and milk products from commercial sources rather than to maintain and operate the dairy farm.

Government policy concerning competition with private enterprise

Government policy in effect during our review concerning competition with private enterprise was set forth in Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 dated September 21, 1959, which stated that generally the Federal Government would not carry on any activity to provide a product for its own use if such product could be procured from commercial sources. It also stated that the continuing use of a Government operation on the grounds that procurement from commercial sources would involve higher costs might be justified only if the costs were analyzed on a comparable basis and the differences were found to be substantial and disproportionately large. The Bulletin required also that, in making cost comparisons, the costs assigned to the Government operation must cover all direct and indirect costs of the Government.

Effective March 31, 1966, Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 will be superseded by Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–76. This Circular restates the Government's general policy of relying on the private enterprise system to supply its needs and—except under specified conditions generally relating to effective conduct of the Government's programs, none of which appear pertinent to the case involved—prohibits Government operation of a commercial or industrial activity unless the Government can provide or is providing a product or service at a lower cost. The Circular also contains guidelines for the analyses of comparative costs.

In making our cost comparisons as discussed in the preceding section of this report, we considered those direct and indirect costs that were incurred by the Academy dairy farm during calendar year 1964.

Our comparison disclosed that potential savings would accrue to the Government if the dairy farm was sold and the milk and milk products were purchased by the Naval Academy from commercial concerns. It is our opinion, therefore, that continued operation of the dairy farm would be contrary to Government policy concerning competition with private enterprise.

Government policy on retention of real property holdings

Government policy on the retention of real property holdings is set forth in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A–2, dated October 18, 1955, and generally states that unneeded real property holdings should not be retained by the Government. The Circular sets forth general guidelines to be applied by the heads of executive agencies when making the determination as to the necessity for retention of the real property. One of the general guidelines listed in the circular as it would pertain to the real property at the dairy farm follows.

"They are being used by the Government to produce goods or services which are available from private enterprise, except when it is demonstrated clearly in each instance that it is not in the public interest to obtain such requirements from private enterprise."

The implementing instruction issued by the Department of Defense is Directive 4165.20, dated August 29, 1958. The directive lists seven factors which should be considered when evaluating whether real property holdings should be retained.

The factor pertinent to the matter discussed in this report is that the product for which the property is utilized cannot be obtained from private enterprise. In determining whether the product can be obtained from private enterprise, the directive requires that the instructions as contained in the implementing DOD directive on Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 be utilized.

As shown on page 12 in the preceding section of this report, application of the instructions set forth in Bureau of the Budget Bulletin No. 60–2 should result in a decision to procure the milk and milk products from commercial concerns. Therefore, it appears that retention of the real property, valued at about $1,752,000, would be contrary to Government policy on this matter since the purpose for which it is currently being utilized would no longer exist and that retention of the property would prohibit the Government from obtaining a reduction in the annual interest cost which we estimate to be about $68,100. (See p. 9.)

Review by Navy of the dairy farm operation

During the past several years, the Navy has on various occasions reviewed the opera-

tions of the Naval Academy dairy with respect to the need for its continued operations, as well as the consideration of alternate uses for the land in the event of termination of dairy operations. On each occasion the Navy has decided that it was realizing sufficient benefits to justify continued operation of the dairy.

While the Navy may realize some economic benefits from the dairy, its continued operation by the Academy is not economical to the Government when all elements of cost are considered. As shown on page 8, continued operation of the dairy farm would prevent the Government from realizing estimated annual savings of about $84,000. In the sense that the Academy dairy does not offer its products on the open market, it is not in direct competition with private enterprise. As shown on page 7, however, the surplus fluid milk available in the area from commercial sources is more than enough to meet the Academy's needs.

The dairy is operated as a nonappropriated fund activity. The funds expended in the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the dairy, however, have been public funds, either appropriated by the Congress or accruing through profits from the sale of dairy products, which profits are also regarded as Government funds.

Agency comments and our conclusions

We brought our findings to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and proposed that prompt consideration be given to the disposal of the Naval Academy dairy—including land, buildings, dairy herd, machinery, and other assets. We also proposed that the Secretary of Defense advise the various military services that determinations as to the economic feasibility of retaining installations or facilities should not be based on the economic benefits to an individual service but should be based on whether continued operation of such installations or facilities is economical, considering the Government as a whole.

In a letter dated October 25, 1965, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management) commented on our proposals at the request of the Secretary of Defense. (See Appendix II.)

The Navy advised us that a plan would be developed to phase out the Naval Academy dairy with the objective of minimizing the impact on the local farm community and providing the maximum return on the midshipmen's store investment. The Navy advised us also that the Department of Defense was preparing a directive which would provide specific guidelines for an evaluation of commercial activities operated by the military departments so as to arrive at a decision which would be in the best interest of the Government.

Concerning the Navy's comment on providing the maximum return on the midshipmen's store investment in the dairy farm, we were advised by a cognizant official that the Navy was considering whether the midshipmen's store should participate in the proceeds from the sale of the dairy farm. We were further advised by this official that a final decision on this matter had not been made by the Navy as of January 18, 1966.

It should be recognized that the computations in this report were based on the assumption that the proceeds from the sale of the dairy farm would accrue to the United States Government and that any other disposition of such proceeds would alter the comparative costs of the procurement of dairy products by the Academy and, thus, the savings to the Government. Also, in the event that the Navy determines that any proceeds from the sale of the dairy should not be deposited with the Treasury, the proposed disposition of the proceeds should be submitted with appropriate explanation of the basis for the Navy's determination to the Comptroller General for a decision.

Since the Navy plans to phase out the dairy at the Naval Academy, we are making no recommendations at this time. We shall, however, continue to examine into the economic aspects of those commercial activities which are operated by the military departments.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

	Tenure of office	
	From	To
Secretary of Defense: Robert S. McNamara	January 1961	Present.
Deputy Secretary of Defense:		
Roswell L. Gilpatric	do	January 1964.
Cyrus R. Vance	January 1964	Present.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Secretary of the Navy:		
Fred Korth	January 1962	November 1963.
Paul H. Nitze	November 1963	Present.
Under Secretary of the Navy:		
Paul B. Fay, Jr	February 1961	January 1965.
Kenneth E. BeLieu	February 1965	June 1965.
Robert H. B. Baldwin	July 1965	Present.
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics):		
Kenneth E. BeLieu	February 1961	February 1965.
Graeme C. Bannerman	February 1965	Present.
Chief of Naval Operations:		
Adm. George W. Anderson	August 1961	July 1963.
Adm. David L. McDonald	August 1963	Present.
Chief, Bureau of Naval Personnel:		
Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III	February 1960	February 1964.
Rear Adm. A. S. Heyward, Jr	February 1964	March 1964.
Vice Adm. Benedict J. Semmes, Jr	April 1964	Present.
Superintendent, U.S. Naval Academy:		
Rear Adm. C. C. Kirkpatrick, Jr	August 1962	January 1964.
Rear Adm. C. S. Minter, Jr	January 1964	Present.

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., October 25, 1965.

Mr. J. K. FASICK,
Associate Director, Defense Accounting and Auditing Division, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FASICK: The Secretary of Defense has asked me to reply to your letter of 31 August 1965 which forwarded your draft report on operation of a dairy farm by the United States Naval Academy.

I am enclosing the Navy reply to the report.

Sincerely yours,
VICTOR M. LONGSTREET,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management).

Enclosure.

NAVY STATEMENT ON GAO DRAFT REPORT OF AUGUST 31, 1965, ON REVIEW OF OPERATION OF A DAIRY FARM BY THE U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY—OSD CASE NO. 2359

GAO FINDINGS

The General Accounting Office (GAO) has examined into the operation of the Naval Academy Dairy. They found that the milk and milk products required by the Naval Academy can be obtained from local commercial sources at comparable or lower costs than the cost to the Government of operating the Academy's dairy farm. They believe that disposal of the dairy, including the land it occupies, would make at least $1.9 million available to the Government which could be used to reduce governmental indebtedness with a reduction in interest cost of about $200,200 annually and that subsidies paid by the Government could have been reduced by as much as $135,000.

GAO RECOMMENDATIONS

The GAO recommended:

(1) That the Secretary of Defense give prompt consideration to disposal of the Naval Academy dairy farm, including the land, buildings, dairy herd, machinery, improvements and other assets.

(2) That the Secretary of Defense advise the various military services that determinations as to the economic feasibility of retaining installations or facilities should not be based on the economic benefits to an individual service, but should be based on whether continued operation of such installations or facilities is economical considering the Government as a whole.

NAVY STATEMENT

The Department of the Navy will develop a plan to phase out the U.S. Naval Academy Dairy with the objective of minimizing the impact on the local farming community, and providing the maximum return on the Midshipmen's Store investment. The Department of the Navy will proceed therewith upon approval of said plan.

DEFENSE STATEMENT

The Department of Defense is now preparing a new directive on operation of commercial or industrial activities within the Defense Department. This directive will provide for a systematic review of all commercial activities operated by the military departments, and will also give specific guidelines to the military services for uniform evaluation of the direct and related costs so as to arrive at a decision with reference to each case which will be in the best interest of the Government.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recog-

nizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

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

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

Mr. BATES. I believe it should be pointed out to the membership that the dairy farm at Annapolis under discussion at the moment is not the property of the U.S. Government. This is something that was paid for by the midshipmen. This is the midshipmen's dairy. So they are in business down there. A lot of times as we see the practices in the military, we do wish, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] said a little while ago, there was a little more business management in the operation and perhaps we would be better off.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I wanted to comment on a statement made by the gentleman from Maryland in connection with the Comptroller General's statement on the economics involved in this particular subject. The gentleman may not know that a special committee of the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], made a study of this matter. No report was issued. However, there were conferences with the Comptroller General and his auditors in connection with the matter.

Frankly, I think it was concluded that actually it was more economical to conduct the farm than to depend on outside sources for milk. I think if the facts were adequately developed, it would be found the original Comptroller General's decision was in error.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point so that I will not have to interrupt his statement?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, how much do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 4 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Maryland. Pardon me, if I could yield a quarter of a minute, Mr. Chairman, I would yield it to the gentleman from Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland and hope he will not take more than one quarter of a minute.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryand. Mr. Chairman, I will offer the decision of the Comptroller General so that the RECORD will be clear.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, to begin with, the Secretary of Defense does not own this farm. It was established in 1911 with the expenditure of $40,000 from the midshipmen's store fund. They borrowed the money from the Government, which they paid back. They borrowed other money which the Government decided to give them. They own this dairy.

I appointed a special subcommittee to inquire into the retention of the farm. This investigation disclosed the continuation would result in a savings rather than additional cost. It will affect the morale of the midshipmen by denying them cream, the best milk on earth, and ice cream any time they wish it. The most recent Navy audit disclosed that by producing its own milk for the midshipmen through the period July 1967–June 1970, would result in a savings of $199,-200. It is always good to say, "Get the Government out of business. Get the Government out of business." I am against socialism, too. But what about these boys that are being trained to give their lives for their country? Why do we not leave this dairy alone?

Do you know why? Because somebody says, "That is mighty valuable land down there. Would it not look good if it was subdivided?"

"Those are valuable cows down there. I would like to get them at an auction, because they are the best on earth."

Do not give away this dairy. Do not take it from these boys. They are asking you through me to stop this effort.

The Navy, after coming to this earth-shaking conclusion to close this dairy, have now changed their minds and they have so advised me. Pursuant to their request, I am putting a provision in the bill so they cannot change their minds. Would you not rather that they live by law than by the whims of some executive?

Furthermore, if we leave them alone, we would like to see this dairy modernized, and when we do, the milk will cost 6 cents less a gallon. We have plans for this dairy. Leave it alone. Do not let these people who would like to have it get it. Let us let them make a living somewhere else. These dairies have trouble getting help now, take it from me. Milk is going up every day, while at the Naval Academy it is going down every day.

I love the distinguished gentleman from Maryland. He is one of the most dedicated men in the House. But this is one of the few times on record where he is exactly 100 percent wrong.

I yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, since this question of the ownership of the land has been raised, I would like to read from the Comptroller General's report which sets it out in full:

> It is true that the original funds were advanced by the United States and there were some repayments from the midshipmen stores fund, but by the act of March 4, 1925, it was declared that the dairy and farm, cattle and work animals, machinery and implements, buildings and other . . . equipment purchased under the General Services funds shall become the property of the United States.

This, I think settles any question whether this is U.S. property insofar as the owned portion of this farm is concerned.

However, it is not generally known that almost half this acreage is rented land, rented from other people in that vicinity.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, we are familiar with that. It is true the Government did take over this property. It also took over property of the Naval Home in Philadelphia, and also the Soldiers' Home. Why? Because there was some money in the bank. They guaranteed that the Soldiers' Home and the dairy farm would continue. They have continued and, Mr. Chairman, I believe they should be continued today.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take my full time. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the subcommittee last year that looked into the question of closing of the dairy farm in Annapolis. First, let me make it clear that from our in-depth review of this matter, we found the milk produced on the dairy farm represents only twenty-two one-hundreths of 1 percent of the milk produced in the State of Maryland each year. The land involved, 876 acres, lies in the center of the complex between Washington and Baltimore and Annapolis. It is an area that, without exception, the elected officials of the county of Anne Arundel, Democrats and Republicans alike, were unanimous in wanting to keep—that is, the dairy farm—as open space because of the fantastic suburban growth all around.

In addition thereto, while the dairy is being operated it has only one officer there, and all of the other employees are paid from the 55 cents per gallon that is paid for this milk under the 1964 figures. Today the equivalent milk on the commercial market runs 70 cents a gallon.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it is 73.4 cents.

Mr. MACHEN. I just checked it 3 months ago, Mr. Chairman; I was not up to date.

Mr. RIVERS. Every day it is going up, and the cost of the dairy is going down every day.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I think after the subcommittee's report, and now with the adoption of it by the Armed Services Committee, I believe the Navy and the Defense Department also realized that they had made a mistake and reconsidered their action on their own, and the action taken by our subcommittee and committee is only to be certain they cannot arbitrarily act in the future against the will of most of the people in the area involved and against the best interests of the Academy. Certainly, there is a savings to the Academy and to the taxpayers.

I might add, the Navy has indicated that if the land had been sold, the proceeds would have gone into the midshipmen's store fund and would not have gone back to the Federal Government as the Comptroller General had stated.

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

Mr. MACHEN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RIVERS. First of all, Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee for handling the subcommittee which dealt with this matter. As a result, they took a new look at this, and it will save $200,000 a year. If the land is sold, it goes into the midship-

men's fund. This is owned by the midshipmen, and we are protecting them now. If we modernize this, it will save us 7 cents a gallon on milk. This is a worthwhile undertaking.

There is a morale factor, Mr. Chairman, which cannot be evaluated by anybody's pecuniary hallucinations, regardless of who it is. The morale of those boys is the most important thing on earth to us, so let us save this for the good of our boys and, incidentally, save a few hundred thousand dollars a year.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I do urge that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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 Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee a question in order to write proper legislative intent and history into the RECORD.

With reference to the item on page 8 of the bill (H.R. 11722), providing for troop housing and utilities at Fort DeRussey, Hawaii, am I correct in assuming that the type of construction, whether it be hotel type or motel type billeting, will be left solely to the discretion of the Army?

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman from Hawaii is correct in his assumption.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the distinguished chairman for his clarifying statement, which I am sure will settle the controversy which has been stirred up in my home State over this matter. I can now report back that this legislation makes no specifications as to what type of building or buildings should be constructed at Fort DeRussey.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, 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. 11722) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 828, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

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

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 394, nays 2, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

YEAS—394

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—2

Ottinger
Pike

NOT VOTING—36

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Bell
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burton, Utah
Conyers
Corman
Derwinski
Diggs
Flynt
Ford, William D.
Garmatz
Gibbons
Ichord
Jones, Mo.
Kornegay
Kupferman
Laird
Lipscomb
McClure
Morton
Murphy, N.Y.
Resnick
Rostenkowski
Sisk
Taylor
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McClure.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Kupferman.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Burke of Florida.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conyers.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

5 legislatives days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 11722.

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

There was no objection.

FOOD IRRADIATION PROGRAM

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee's Subcommittee on Research. Development, and Radiation, which has followed very closely the Government's program to develop methods of preserving food by ionizing radiation, I took more than a passing interest in the report issued recently under the aegis of the President's Science Advisory Committee entitled "The World Food Program." The section of the report dealing with the food irradiation program concludes with the following sentence:

> These and other problems indicate that radiation is not likely to have a significant application for food preservation in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, the basis for this statement completely escapes me. There is nothing in the report itself which provides a basis for such an assertion, and most certainly there is no information which has come to the attention of the Joint Committee which would support it. On the contrary, the information which the Joint Committee has developed in its numerous hearings on this program is in direct contradiction to what the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee has to say on the matter. Thus far the results of the collaborative AEC-Army program to develop this important technology have been highly encouraging. Potatoes, bacon, and flour preserved by ionizing radiation have already been approved by the Food and Drug Administration for unlimited human consumption, and a number of other food products are now before the FDA for approval.

If there is some unstated reason that would justify the report's allegation I would like to hear it, and I know the other members of the Joint Committee would also. For this reason the Joint Committee has written to Dr. Donald F. Hornig, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, asking that he furnish any information that he may have which would support the questioned pronouncement. The committee has also asked that he inform us whether either of the primary sources of information on this subject, the Army and the Atomic Energy Commission, was consulted in this connection prior to publication of the referenced statement. Nothing in the report would indicate that knowledgeable technical personnel from either of these Government agencies had an opportunity to provide specific information for the report or to review the questioned statement prior to its publication. When responses to our questions have been received, I anticipate I will have more to say on this subject.

While waiting for Dr. Hornig's response to our questions, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to note that the Joint Committee is not alone in questioning aloud the basis for this statement. I have here a copy of a letter which has been sent to Dr. Hornig by Mr. Anthony A. Bertsch, Assistant Administrator for Industrial Mobilization in the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce and Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on Radiation Preservation of Food. The letter speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, but I would call particular attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Bertsch's letter, wherein he calls for the issuance of a clarifying statement to set the record straight.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Bertsch's letter to Dr. Hornig at this point in the RECORD.

JULY 5, 1967.

Mr. DONALD F. HORNIG,
Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HORNIG: The Interdepartmental Committee on Radiation Preservation of Food, established in 1956, which includes representation of all major executive departments of the Federal Government has, since inception of the National Food Irradiation Program, directed its efforts toward stimulating industry interest and participation in the achievement of an early commercialization of this new process. Attention has also been directed to the potential role of irradiated foods in the solution to world food problems.

The statement on radiation (page 550) in the report by the World Food Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, just released, implies that food irradiation involves harmful effects and that it is not likely to have significant application as a means of food preservation in the foreseeable future. This evaluation appears to us to overlook many significant developments since the inception of the program and especially in recent years.

Intensive wholesomeness studies on some 21 radiation sterilized foods conducted by the Surgeon General of the U.S. Army, and other studies on low dose radiation applications conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission, have shown irradiated foods to be wholesome. In fact, in a statement before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, June 9, 1965, the Surgeon General concluded that ". . . it can be stated that foods irradiated up to absorbed doses of 5.6 megarads with a cobalt 60 source of gamma radiation or with electrons with energies up to 10 million electron volts have been found to be wholesome; i.e., safe, and nutritionally adequate."

One might say that in all of the history of food processing, no preservation method has ever received such intensive scrutiny, all of which has demonstrated the safety of the process.

One of the primary objectives of the Interdepartmental Committee has been that of attaining industry interest and participation. We believe great progress has been made by the United States National Food Irradiation Program, and by the more than fifty other nations that are actively engaged in food irradiation research and development. The conclusion of your Subcommittee that radiation is not likely to have a significant application for food preservation in the foreseeable future overlooks such developments and may very well impede future progress here and abroad.

The Marine Products Development Irradiator at Gloucester has been in operation for more than two years and has conducted many cooperative programs with industry to measure the practical effects of distributing irradiated marine products under commercial conditions. The Grain Products Irradiator in Savannah, Georgia, was dedicated last month. On July 3, 1967, the Hawaii Development Irradiator in Honolulu was dedicated. The Atomic Energy Commission, the Army, and the Department of Commerce have just selected a proposal for the establishment of an industry-built and operated pilot plant meat irradiator with only minimum Governmental support. The proposal was one of 10 (many of which involved participation of a number of business firms and groups). All of these developments, as well as the findings of many recent studies, indicate a favorable outlook for the commercialization of food irradiation within the "foreseeable" future.

As Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on Radiation Preservation of Food, I would like to suggest that your office issue a statement clarifying the report of the Panel on World Food Supply with reference to food irradiation. It seems to us imperative that the implication in the report that this process is unsafe be clarified, and that readers of the report have knowledge of the many favorable dovelopments which suggest that the process may well have significant applications within the foreseeable future. We believe that such a statement should incorporate the current evaluation of this program by the U.S. Army Natick Laboratories, the Division of Isotopes Development, Atomic Energy Commission, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and the Interdepartmental Committee on Radiation Preservation of Food. Such a clarification appears to be essential to achievement of the objectives of your Subcommittee. If we can assist your office in this connection, we will be happy to do so.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. BERTSCH,
Chairman.

SARGENT SHRIVER CITES NEED FOR OEO

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, some of the critics of our national strategy against poverty would have you believe this year represents Sargent Shriver's last stand before the Congress. They would like to shoot down the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mr. Shriver with it.

Mr. Shriver will be making courageous stands for what he believes in far into the future, of course, and I was pleased to see this same view reflected in a fascinating column by Mary Inger of the Star Publications of Cook County, Ill.

The Star columnist was on hand for Mr. Shriver's opening appearance before the House Committee on Education and Labor when he spoke strongly and persuasively of the need for a central, independent agency to coordinate and direct the war against poverty.

Because of my faith in Mr. Shriver's ability and my agreement with the need for such an agency, I want to bring the column to the attention of the House and include it at this point in the RECORD.

THE PAD: FACES OPENING GUNS IN FIGHT ON OEO

(By Mary Inger)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—What was needed was a miracle man. What we got was Sargent Shriver, a reasonable facsimile thereof. Yesterday June 12, he faced the opening guns in the war against the war on poverty in the very large House committee on education and labor now holding hearings on proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The public discussion of poverty has shifted considerably as a result of the two and a half-year-old program. Time was when a good many Republicans scoffed at what they termed President Kennedy's exaggerated claims about poverty in the United States. They don't do that anymore. They are now agreeing that the gap between the haves and have-nots can and should be narrowed and they propose that they can do it better than the Office of Economic Opportunity can do it.

At times yesterday the partisan political flak sent up by both Democrats and Republicans got so heavy that it was hard to see Shriver, but each time the smoke cleared away, there he was holding to his central argument that OEO has and can continue to release more creativity in communities across the country where there is need and will to act than any other agency of government has or any proposed substitute could.

For a Cook countian sitting in the audience there was particular fun and interest in listening to the partisan bullets whistling across the head of a man who wasn't there, Mayor Daley. Congressman Quie (R., Minn.) is the major spokesman in the committee for the Republican idea, called "Opportunity Crusade." His line of questioning re participation of the poor in Chicago drew immediate fire from Congressman Pucinski (D., Ill.) who accused the minority of having snooped around Chicago for more than two years trying to discredit the Chicago program and the Chicago mayor and having failed.

Pucinski's excessive partisanship was matched by that of Congressman Erlenborn (R., Ill.) who recited a long list of complaints about his inability to get reliable information from anybody at OEO about anything, but in the end he failed to direct Shriver to produce for the record the information that he asserted he had sought and failed to get.

Throughout it all, Shriver kept his cool, responding with warmth only once. In this case to what he took to be the insinuation of Republican Congressman Esch that he was there to protect his job. Shriver responded with incontestable truth that he could find employment with more money and less pain any day in the week. It's not equally clear somehow that all congressmen could do that.

Listening to Shriver yesterday, I thought about what man could have taken on this impossible task and have done it better and could think of no one. A more cautious man could have avoided some of the office's errors, no doubt, but such a man could probably not have gotten enough of the show on the road in two and a half years to bring Congress to the point where they are now . . . that of arguing about means, not goals.

The same dynamism that Shriver brought to the concept of the Peace corps he has brought to OEO. Looking at his troops that accompanied him yesterday to the Hill, I estimated their average age to be about 26. While we might, on occasion, as we deal with them wish for a little more maturity and a little less brashness, the central task is really one for the young non-case-hardened to bring off.

There are sober critics of the program who wish it well on both sides of the political aisle and the best thing that can happen is that as they strive to improve it, they will contribute to our public understanding of the magnitude, difficulty and complexity of this task to which we are only barely committed.

There are other critics, however, who while shedding crocodile tears for the poor would like nothing better than to abolish the entire effort. These people, too, are to be found on both sides of the aisle. Neither the reactionary Republican nor the Southern Bourbon has the slightest stomach for financing a deliberate social revolution no matter how clearly its time may have come. The old GOP-Dixie coalition is far from dead, as Republican House Leader Ford proclaimed just two days before it went into action to kill off rent supplements for poor people and reduce the Model Cities funds.

The poverty bill will be another testing ground. It remains yet to be seen just how "new" the much touted "new Republicanism" really is. By far the most important result from this Congress' action on the poverty program is what it will tell poor people about this society. The effects on the 1968 elections, while secondary, will be fascinating. As wag Russell Baker said recently: "All early political indicators suggest that the Republicans have an excellent chance of beating President Johnson next year if they resist the temptation to run a Republican against him."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The opinions expressed in the foregoing column are those of the writer, and do not necessarily coincide with those of this newspaper.)

BENNETT INTRODUCES HOUSE FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. BENNETT. 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. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Will Rogers once said, "Politics has got so expensive it takes a lot of money even to get beat with."

He could have added in 1967: "It takes a lot of money just to stay in office."

We have been recently educated, along with the rest of the country, on the high cost of being in public life when the other body considered the case of Senator DODD.

Fifteen years ago, the Nation was dismayed about the revelation of an unpublic fund for Senator Richard M. Nixon, who was the Republican vice-presidential nominee. A fund of over $18,000 from 76 contributors was described as "a private fund to be used to cover expenses of running Nixon's office that are not covered by Government allowances."

There should be no evil implication attached to the collection of funds from the general public for the financing of legitimate political expenses. But the public has a right to know who is contributing to their elected officials and in what amounts, just as in the case of campaign contributions. Otherwise the public cannot intelligently pass judgment on possible conflicts of interest.

The disclosure idea, it has been said, comes as close as anything to being the all-purpose cleanser of American politics. It attaches no moral overtones to the financial situation of a particular Member or candidate. Rather, it recognizes as the final arbiter in any controversy the public, who must have the knowledge of all such facts in order to express their opinions on the behavior of their elected representatives. As public office is a public trust, so must public disclosure be the responsibility of any public official.

In 1958, we were able to enact a "Code of Ethics for Government Service," which covers all Federal employees, including Members of Congress. But this code has no penalty clause or penalty procedures to make it wholly effective, although the Civil Service Commission has said it has been a very worthwhile instrument in the Federal service.

Now a code specifically for the House is being proposed; but to be very effective it will also have to have penalty provisions and procedures. The bill I am introducing today is a step in that direction. The proposed legislation is titled, "The House Financial Disclosure Act." It calls for financial disclosure by Representatives and by candidates for the House. The bill would require a complete account of income, of assets, of gifts, and of liabilities, as well as a description of all "slush" funds maintained by or for the Member or candidate. It includes a provision to extend the authority of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct so that it may examine the financial reports of Members. The courts would have jurisdiction to impose a $1,000 fine and 1 year in prison for those who fail to file the required data.

I feel the need for such a measure is today greater than ever before. Recent exposures of misconduct in the Congress and intimations of wrongdoing have seriously affected the public's regard for Congress. National polls reveal that some 60 percent of the country's citizens consider most Senators and Representatives to be as guilty of unethical behavior as was ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. Positive action is called for by the situation, action demonstrating a sincere concern by Congress for enforcement of standards of conduct. I am hopeful the House will react favorably to this proposal, and that it may be one of the first steps toward enacting a workable code of ethics for this body. A copy of the bill follows:

A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives and by candidates for such office and to give the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct appropriate jurisdiction

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "House Financial Disclosure Act."

SEC. 2. (a) Each person serving as a Member of the House at the beginning of a calendar year shall file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives on or before January 31 of that year a written report containing the

information required by this Act covering the preceding calendar year.

(b) Each candidate for the House of Representatives who is not a Member of the House shall file with the Clerk of the House at least fifteen days before the date on which is held the first election in which he is a candidate a written report containing the information required by this Act covering the preceding calendar year. Where an individual becomes a candidate after the beginning of such fifteen day period, he shall file such a report within twenty-four hours after becoming a candidate.

(c) The report required to be filed under subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be verified by the oath or affirmation of the person filing such report.

(d) All reports required under subsection (a) of this section shall be maintained by the Clerk of the House for the duration of the Member's consecutive terms in office as public records available for inspection at reasonable times by the public. All reports required under subsection (b) of this section shall be maintained for a period of one year by the Clerk of the House of Representatives as public records which shall be available for inspection at reasonable times by the public.

SEC. 3. (a) The report of the Member or candidate as required in this Act shall include a complete account of the Member's or candidate's gross income and that of his spouse and dependent children. For the purposes of this Act, gross income shall be defined as set forth in section 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 61). The report of income shall specifically include, though not to the exclusion of other items listed in section 61, the following information:

(1) The names and addresses of all persons and organizations from whom was received by the Member or candidate, or on his behalf with his knowledge and consent, any honorarium or compensation for services, including fees, commissions, salaries, and similar items, and the amount of such honorarium or compensation for services, or if not money, the substance of the honorarium or compensation and the appraised value thereof;

(2) Gross income derived from business enterprises including the amounts thereof; the nature of his interest in the business, and the names and addresses of each such business.

(3) An itemization of all gains derived from dealings in property, including the names and addresses of other parties involved and a brief description of the transaction which took place.

(4) The sources from which were derived income from interest and the amounts thereof;

(5) The sources from which rents were derived and the amounts thereof;

(6) The sources from which royalties were derived and the amounts thereof;

(7) The sources from which dividends were derived and the amounts thereof;

(8) The names and addresses of all persons and organizations from whom he received assistance in the discharge of indebtedness and the aggregate amount or appraised value thereof;

(9) Itemization of income or benefits derived from distribution of the Member's or candidate's share in any partnership or professional group, and the names and addresses of all persons and organizations from whose payments such distributions are made, provided, however, that no such names and addresses need be furnished when the distribution to the Member or candidate from any such person or organization in said year is less than $1,000.

(10) Itemization of income derived from an estate or trust in which the Member or candidate has an interest and the nature of that interest.

(b) The report shall list all gifts to the Member or candidate which in aggregate value exceed $100 in the year from a particular source. Included in the report shall be the name and address of the donor, the amount or value of his gifts, and a description thereof. The report shall also contain the name and address of a donor to the Member or candidate, his spouse and his dependent children when the amounts or values or such gifts given in the course of a calendar year from a particular source exceed $500, and shall describe each such gift and the value thereof.

(c) The report shall list assets held by the Member or candidate, by his spouse or dependent children, or by any of them jointly. The list shall include the value of each asset and a brief description thereof, but household furnishings and personal effects need not be reported.

(d) The report shall include the names and addresses of each person and organization to whom the Member or candidate, his wife or dependent children, or any of them jointly owe an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000, and include a statement of the total aggregate indebtedness of the Member or candidate and such family members.

(e) The report shall include a statement of any funds established by the Member or candidate, or on his behalf, to assist him in defraying expenses which may be incurred by reason of his being a Member or candidate. The report shall set forth the names and addresses of all persons contributing to the funds, the amount of each contribution, the amount of each expenditure from such funds, and the purpose of each such expenditure.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 2 of House Resolution 418, Ninetieth Congress, is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 2", and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The Committee shall have jurisdiction to review the report filed with it by a Member, under the House Financial Disclosure Act, and shall recommend to the House appropriate disciplinary action against any Member who it determines has failed to file any such report or knowingly and willfully filed a false report. Such violations shall be reported to the Attorney General. The Committee shall develop and prescribe the forms to be used in making such reports."

(b) Subsection (a) of this section is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, with full recognition of the right of such House to make changes therein at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 5. Any Member or candidate who willfully fails to file a report required by this Act, or who knowingly and willfully files a false report under this Act, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for a period of time not to exceed one year or both.

SEC. 6. For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Member" means a Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

(2) The term "candidate" means an individual who has taken the action necessary under the law of a State to qualify him to be a candidate either in a primary election held to nominate a candidate for election to the House of Representatives, or in a general or special election held to fill the office of Member of the House of Representatives.

(3) The term "election" means a general or special election held to select a Member and a primary election held to nominate candidates for the office of Member.

(4) The term "gift" shall refer to something of value voluntarily transferred from one party to another without compensation or monetary consideration.

(5) The term "fund" shall refer to a sum of money or other material resources available for the use of a Member or candidate or anyone acting on his behalf.

(6) The term "asset" shall refer to an item of value owned or in which exists a beneficial interest.

EAST-WEST TRADE AND WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. WHITENER. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution regarding East-West trade. The resolution would create a select committee to investigate: First, East-West trade and its impact on the productivity and capability of nations which directly or indirectly supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any Communist faction within any nation in Latin America with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance; second, the effectiveness of those U.S. laws, regulations, commitments, and policies governing trade with or aid to nations which directly or indirectly supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any Communist faction within any nation in Latin America with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance; and third, the extent of the participation of international organizations, groups, or funds which extend or guarantee credit, in aiding nations which supply North Vietnam, North Korea, the Middle East, Cuba, or any faction within any nation in Latin America with military, technical, economic, or financial assistance.

The select committee would be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom the Speaker will designate as chairman.

It would be incumbent upon the select committee to conduct hearings and make investigations bearing upon East-West trade and report back to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress. At that time the committee would make such recommendations to the House as it deemed necessary and proper.

In my judgment such a select committee can render a great public service by doing the type of study which is called for by the resolution. No such study has been made by a committee of the Congress since 1962. It is now time that a further inquiry be made.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of these remarks, the purpose of my resolution is simply to set up a select committee to investigate, to find out, to seek truth in the realm of East-West trade in context of the United States involvement in Vietnam and the U.S.S.R.'s declared policy of backing "wars of liberation." As it is only the truth that can make us free, it is only the truth that can keep us free and able to legislate responsibly in the field of East-West trade for the future security of the United States.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that

I sponsor the resolution and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

GIVE HIM HIS WALKING PAPERS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, when one gets too big for his shoes, it is time to give him his walking papers. That is what should be done with U.N. Secretary General U Thant.

He has now attempted to make himself the spokesman for the United Nations—a spokesman of not what the United Nations has enunciated but what he thinks the United Nations should enunciate.

Instead of being the impartial agent of the United Nations to implement its decisions, he now pretends to be the maker of those decisions, even when the United Nations has not spoken on the subject.

No human being can be denied the right to have his own opinions, but one who accepts the position of being an impartial agent has no right to make it appear that his opinions are those of the organization he represents.

Too frequently, U Thant has made it very plain that he has been taking sides in the disputes before the United Nations.

He has shown by word and by deed that he is pro-Russian Communist, that he is pro-Arab and that he is anti-American, that he is anti-Israel and now he shows that he is pro-Chinese Communist, pro-Vietcong, and antieverything that the free world stands for.

His ugly bias and prejudice is unbefitting any administrative officer of any agency of any government. It is much worse when it comes from the chief administrative officer of the United Nations.

He has now destroyed his influence and his conduct tends to impair and impede, if not actually destroy, the influence of the United Nations. His loss of objectivity is a reflection on the possibility of the loss of such objectivity on the part of the United Nations, difficult as it is to obtain in that body in any event. It is time that he is told to use his walking shoes to seek another job.

I direct my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

DISTORTED VIEW

U.N. Secretary General U Thant has not changed the nature of the struggle in Vietnam by his crude effort to transform it into a simple war for independence that Americans should understand because of 1776. But he has gravely impaired his own standing, as an agent of the United Nations, to seek a rational termination of the conflict.

Undoubtedly the desire of the Vietnamese for independence is a large element in the struggle. But this sentiment actuates the anti-Communist Vietnamese no less than the supporters of Ho Chi Minh. They too want to be free to manage their own affairs, and they are fighting to maintain this right against the aggressive conquest launched against them by Hanoi. When the Secretary General of the United Nations ignores this aspect of the war and tries to make it appear that Hanoi is merely resisting imperialism from the United States, he flagrantly distorts history and encourages the illusions on which aggression feeds.

Such a biased view of the conflict in Vietnam would be a misfortune coming from any eminent source. When it comes from the chief administrative officer of the United Nations, it is doubly unfortunate; for it undercuts the influence of the U.N. and deprives the international community of its natural leadership in an objective study of all possible approaches to peace.

LETTER FROM PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE

Mr. JACOBS. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, never have I been prouder of a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church than last Sunday when at the Georgetown University Chapel I heard read the following letter from Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington. It and the service at Georgetown that day were relevant to the suffering of God's children, and, therefore, to the best meaning of religion. The statement follows:

My dear people in Christ: Our President spoke for all of us when he said last Thursday evening, for all the world to hear that "we have endured a week such as no nation should live through: a time of violence and tragedy." Now that the violence, at long last, has subsided—permanently, we hope and pray—some of us may be sorely tempted to throw up our hands in utter despair and to settle, in a mood of bitter hatred and cynical frustration, for an uncertain and uneasy stalemate, a state of permanent martial law. This would be a fatal mistake, and one which would only compound the frightful tragedy of recent days.

We would be better advised to look for signs of progress and hope on the darkened horizon of urban America. For my own part, I see at least a glimmer of hope in the fact that so many Americans, instead of pinning the blame on someone else as a kind of sacrificial scapegoat, are now willing, perhaps for the first time, to examine their own conscience and to assume their own full share of responsibility for the disastrous events of the past few weeks.

Under no circumstances, can the violence and lawlessness which have paralyzed so many of our urban centers be excused or condoned. Every right-minded citizen must concur with the solemn judgment of four of the nation's most respected Negro leaders, namely, that "killing, arson and looting are criminal acts and should be dealt with as such." The President of the United States has already assured the nation that these crimes will most certainly be dealt with as high office can command that we cannot be satisfied with "the uneasy calm of martial law" but must look for "a public order built on steady progress in meeting the needs of our people."

We believe that God is calling each of us to respond to this urgent challenge in terms of our religious faith and to do so with complete honesty and with a firm resolve to amend our ways and to make reparation for our past failures and past sins of omission.

NEEDED—UNDERSTANDING AND COMPASSION

We are obliged, as followers of Christ, to be ambassadors of reconciliation. We must bring to our disorganized and demoralized urban centers a healing ministry, a ministry of understanding and compassion.

We need to probe beneath the violence and destruction of the recent riots and to try to understand their underlying causes. We must do everything within our power to remedy, without delay, the long-standing injustices and festering grievances which are the natural breeding ground of lawless rebellion.

We must come to realize that riots, however senseless they may be, are the frenzied cry of alienated people who are trying to tell us, out of a sense of enervating despair and utter hopelessness, that they want to be heard and want to participate as full-fledged American citizens in the economic, social and cultural life of our cities and our nation. Riots are a way—a completely irrational way, if you will, but for some people, unfortunately, the only way they can think of—to get their message to the rest of us who have long since achieved the rights and benefits and privileges which they are now determined, after many generations of neglect and delay, to achieve for themselves and their children.

We Christians, following the example of our Lord and Master who had compassion on the multitude and showed a special predilection for the poor and underprivileged, must listen humbly and attentively to this desperate call from the festering slums of America and must repentantly strive to see the hand of God's judgment in the shattering events of recent days.

We must be willing to acknowledge our own responsibility for perpetuating a system which sooner or later, as the recent riots have tragically demonstrated, was inevitably bound to erupt in violence.

We must honestly recognize and admit that we have not done many of the things that we should have been doing and have too often done things which we ought not to have been doing in the field of social justice.

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

Our efforts to eliminate segregated slum housing have been feeble. Our support of desperately needed programs of job training and job opportunities for unemployed Negroes in our ghettos has been far less than adequate. Our education system throughout the nation moves at a snail's pace in its faltering efforts to readjust to the rapidly changing situation in our crowded urban centers and to provide the kind of education needed in the inner city. Our programs of urban renewal have not been designed primarily to meet the needs of disadvantaged low income families. Too often, to the contrary, these families have been the victims rather than the beneficiaries of urban renewal. Our welfare programs have too often been paternalistic, demeaning, and inadequate and have weakened family life.

We have tolerated the commercial exploitation of ghetto residents by excessively high prices, inflated credit rates, and inferior products.

* * * * *

We have too often taken it for granted, all too paternalistically, that we, as outsiders, know what is best for people in the ghetto. We have not fully understood that they need and want—desperately want—to participate in the making of decisions which affect their lives; that they need and want to find a sense of dignity and human worth in responsibly working out their own destiny. We have too readily assumed that we have a "model" city, unmindful of the fact that for tens of thousands of our fellow citizens the nation's capital is a blighted ghetto.

INTERFAITH ACTION

I have already noted that I see some hope in the fact that so many Christians—and so many of our fellow citizens of other faiths—are approaching the current crisis in this spirit of honest self-examination and sincere repentence. This is a good beginning but we must now be prepared to pay the price of our religious convictions. As the President has pointed out, "This is not a time for angry reaction. It is a time for action, starting with legislative action to improve life in our cities."

In response to this challenge, we should immediately adopt certain priority measures designed to meet the immediate crisis and must do so, in the word of the President, "not because we are frightened by conflict, but because we are fired by conscience." At the national level, we need, at the very minimum, dramatic and far-reaching improvements in the anti-poverty program of the Federal government, whatever the cost of these improvements! We also need a far-reaching program of Federal public works to provide employment for the great mass of unemployed Negro youth and a vastly expanded health and welfare program, together with an adequate program of rent supplements.

LOCAL NEEDS

Here at the local level we need: An adequate system of local self government; an increased budget for our public schools; a Model Cities program; a substantial increase in the number of low and moderate income housing units either at the Bolling Air Force Base or at the National Training School site.

All of these legislative programs will cost money and may call for an increase of taxes. Let us not selfishly reject them for this reason and, above all, let us not use the costly war in Vietnam as a feeble excuse or rationalization for postponing action on them in the Congress. We are not faced with a choice between guns and butter—between the tragic war in Vietnam and a vast program of domestic social and economic reform. Whatever the cost of the war, we have no choice but to meet our responsibilities here at home. To refuse to do so and to rationalize our refusal in the name of the war, would be a tragic distortion of the meaning of true patriotism and might well result in a national disaster much worse than any defeat which we have ever suffered in a time of war.

Needless to add, the list of legislative reforms referred to above is not meant to be exhaustive, nor is it meant to suggest that legislation alone can be expected to solve the present crisis. On the contrary, private initiative is absolutely indispensable on many fronts. We therefore appeal to the business community, to organized labor, realtors, investors and every other influential group in the private economy to begin to look for new and imaginative methods of helping to solve the explosive problems of our blighted cities. In turn, we solemnly pledge the full support of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Washington in this common effort to make up for lost time and to develop "a public order built on steady progress in meeting the needs of our people."

Faithfully yours in Christ,

PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

STOKELY CARMICHAEL—J. EDGAR HOOVER RIGHT AGAIN

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. 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. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, that J. Edgar Hoover is right again is no surprise to most Americans. We have come to expect Mr. Hoover to be on top of every situation of concern to the FBI. For this I commend him. I refer to his comments on Stokely Carmichael, RAM, and riots, made last February before the House Appropriations Committee.

In February, long before summer riots began to spread across the land, and long before Carmichael exposed himself by going to Castro's Cuba and calling for a revolution in the United States, FBI Director Hoover told the Congress:

> Since assuming chairmanship of SNCC, Carmichael is generally considered the chief architect of Black Power.

Mr. Hoover said:

> In espousing his philosophy of Black Power, Carmichael has been in frequent contact with Max Stanford, field chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), a highly secret, all-Negro, Marxist-Leninist, Chinese-Communist-oriented organization which advocates guerrilla warfare to obtain its goals, and has afforded Stanford assistance and guidance.

Mr. Hoover indicated that RAM is dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalist system in the United States, by violence if necessary, and its replacement by a socialist system oriented toward the Chinese Communist interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. The FBI found that various leaders of the organization have participated in activities organized by the more militant civil rights leaders in order to expand its influence in racially tense areas.

Mr. Hoover has pointed out that some civil rights leaders, while themselves deploring violence, have called for civil disobedience by saying that an individual often has to break a particular law in order to obey a higher law—to which Mr. Hoover replies:

> Such a course of action is fraught with danger, for if everyone took it upon himself to break any law that he believed was morally unjust, it is readily apparent there would be complete chaos in this country. Respect for law and order cannot be a part-time thing. Under such conditions, there only tends to be a growing disregard of the law and its enforcement.

Mr. Hoover was right in February. His words prove true today. The chaos he warned us of is here. Many cities have witnessed insurrection. Many others fear they will be next on the growing list. Carmichael is attending a Communist revolutionary convention in Havana. Lawbreakers are too often excused as victims of a "social disease," while law enforcement agencies are accused of police brutality.

The Justice Department, in spite of the findings of Mr. Hoover and the FBI, seems to feel powerless. The Department has taken no firm action to enforce present law. It has questioned the need for new antiriot laws. It quibbles about words like "insurrection" and "civil disturbance," the words "request" and "recommend," while the fifth largest city of the greatest Nation on earth is set on fire.

Rap Brown is free to travel the country, preaching hate and violence. His presence in Washington is not questioned by the Justice Department. He calls for the destruction of the city the very night, in the same city, the President calls for prayer and understanding.

The American people are concerned. They are concerned about the warnings of their FBI Director. They are concerned about their lives and their property and the exercise of their rights and liberties.

The law must be enforced. The Stokely Carmichaels, Rap Browns, and others like them must be severely dealt with. The Justice Department must respond. It must enforce the laws available to the Federal Government now. It must respond to the grave crisis facing the Nation today without further delay.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HARVEY. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's short newspaper headline summed it up in three words—"Now, It's Milwaukee."

Mob law is rampant throughout the cities of our Nation. Practically all areas of our Nation have been struck by rioting and violent civil disorders.

Our Nation is in a crisis. That crisis centers in our cities.

In the days, weeks, months, and, yes, years ahead, we will take the necessary steps to end this mob rule and restore peace and order. We also must continue to weed out the roots of this madness.

I, for one, support legislation introduced by Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, House Concurrent Resolution 425, to investigate and study the "elements, causes, and extent of riots and violent civil disorders throughout the Nation."

No one can deny that the problems and troubles of our cities are not lessening. Obviously, they are becoming worse. Congress has not been oblivious to the difficulties in our cities. This, too, is obvious by the legislation it has considered and, in many instances, passed in recent years.

Nonetheless, I believe Congress can now best demonstrate its continuing concern and interest in the future well-being of the Nation's cities by creating a new, permanent Committee on Urban Affairs for both the House and Senate.

This is not a startling new proposal. Yet, because of the current unrest and turmoil in our cities, such a suggestion is more timely today.

Therefore, I have today introduced a resolution to organize a House Committee on Urban Affairs to consist of 25 members. This committee would deal with legislation in such areas as housing, urban renewal and slum clearance; prevention and elimination of urban blight; air and water pollution; water supplies and sewage facilities; and transportation.

As has been pointed out in previous studies, there are no less than eight standing committees of the House of Representatives with jurisdiction over urban programs. It is easy to understand

why coordination is practically impossible.

This new committee also would enable Congress to better consider priorities in considering the legislative needs of our cities. Perhaps if this proposed committee had been in operation, the recent antirat measure would have fared better.

Of course, contrary to some claims, this legislation would not have prevented the Detroit riot, and probably no other. One of the strong arguments against that $40 million measure was the fact that there are presently four other Federal agencies engaged in the control and elimination of rats. It was pointed out that the city of Detroit has made the greatest progress in rat control under existing programs. For example, Detroit drastically reduced the incidents of rat bites from 123 in 1951 to 17 in 1965. It also cut down on the number of incidents of rat-transmitted diseases and the percentage of rat-infested buildings.

We must streamline our present capability so that we can more effectively deal with urban problems. This streamlining, like the antiriot bill passed recently, will not automatically resolve our cities' problems—but it could help.

In years past, Congress has adjusted to meet pressing needs. We have seen the establishment of the Committees on Agriculture, Public Works, Education and Labor, Select Committee on Small Business, to name a few, organized to meet specific problems.

Certainly, our cities have pressing problems today. Let us begin to resolve these problems by taking positive, concrete action here in Congress with the establishment of the House Committee on Urban Affairs.

ATOMIC WASTE DISPOSAL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Secretary of Labor issued the regulations pertaining to the limits of radiation in uranium mines, which is supposedly to reduce the number of future deaths of miners.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the conflicting statements which has been issued over the years of the safety factors of the atomic power program:

MALCOLM KILDALE'S "RADIOACTIVE DIGEST"

"I have tabulated *1400* accidents involving radiation hazards of which I can vouch for a thousand. Let the truth about atomic accidents be told the American people." Leo Goodman, Secretary, Atomic Energy Technical Committee of AFL–CIO's Industrial Union Department.

"In the 20-year history of the nation's nuclear program, there have been no civilian reactor accidents which have caused loss of life or endangered public health and safety." James F. Young, Vice-President, Engineering Services, General Electric Company—Speech, Dec. 15, 1966.

"This safety record is no accident, but the result of very careful analysis and control, incidentally, that are continuing and will be continued without abatement." Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

Death by radiation—* * * "the victim was the fifth known peace-time casualty from massive exposure to radiation; three of the first four accidents occurred in Atomic Energy Commission facilities." Scientific American, June 1965.

"First, an economic atomic power industry cannot be built in this country with plants restricted to remote and thinly settled areas. They must be in or near the areas they serve. * * * Second, the atomic power program is nearing that point where it can stand on its own two feet without federal support. As a New York Times editorial put it, 'To slow down now is like faltering just short of the finish line in a two-mile race.'" John W. Simpson, Group Vice President, Westinghouse Electric Corporation (Speech Nov. 21, 1963).

"Too many catastrophes have occurred after the most solemn assurances that they were impossible—from the sinking of the unsinkable Titanic to the recent Apollo tragedy—to justify rushing approval of anything so potentially hazardous as a nuclear plant in the heart of a city of eight million people." Editorial, New York Times, May 14, 1967.

"Some 500 mines in the United States produce uranium ores and the waste products of these operations are not a major problem. While some radioactive dust and radon gas—produced by the naturally-occurring radium associated with uranium ores—results from mining operations, harmful concentrations of these airborne radioactive materials can be prevented by sufficient ventilation." From the Annual Report to Congress for 1959 of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

"The hazards of radioactive materials stem from their basic characteristics. Radiation cannot be detected by the senses (except in massive doses); its effects are often cumulative and may not be evident for some time; and it can damage both an individual and, by impairing his reproductive cells, future generations of his descendants." Radioactive Wastes, Atomic Energy Commission, Division of Technical Information, 1965.

"I want to reaffirm the basic AEC policy that all activities under its cognizance will be conducted in a manner which assures that operating personnel and the general public are well protected against all hazards." AEC Commissioner James T. Ramey, October 3, 1963.

The Atomic Energy Commission proposed in a statement by Commissioner James T. Ramey to a Joint Committee on an Atomic Energy Subcommittee on Radiation, "an early enforcement of limits to radiation in the (uranium) mines in order to cut the chances of future deaths." James T. Ramey, Commissioner, A.E.C., May 10, 1967.

In view of these comments, the words of the late Winston Churchill seem very apropos:

Men occasionally stumble over the truth, but most of them pick themselves up and hurry off as if nothing had happened.

THE AMERICAN CRISIS

Mr. KLEPPE. 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 North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excerpt from my newsletter and further remarks concerning riots in America's cities. The costly, bloody war in Vietnam is today being overshadowed in the minds of many by rioting in America and the threat of more to come. Again and again, this question is being raised: If we cannot pacify our own cities, how can we expect to pacify Vietnam, halfway around the world?

In a newsletter distributed to the people of North Dakota's west district this week, I commented on this dangerous and tragic situation:

Today the most serious and immediate threat to the security of the United States comes from within, not from without. This is not to say that the ever-present menace of the international Communist conspiracy has abated. It has not. In fact, it is a part of the agony our major cities are suffering as looters, arsonists and killers continue to tear apart the very fabric of American society.

State and local law enforcement have broken down in the strife-torn areas. Police stand by helplessly, unable even to begin to cope with wholesale looting. Fires rage unchecked in block after block of Detroit and other cities because there is not enough equipment to deal with such holocausts and because firemen are pinned down by snipers.

What is happening has no connection with civil rights, job opportunities or discrimination as such. Instead, we are witnessing a massive assault upon law and order, upon the personal security and the property of millions of law-abiding Americans of every creed and color. This is in essence a civil war. It has been openly declared by many leaders of the extremist groups who incite their followers to take to the streets to burn, pillage, maim and shoot. This unbridled force can only be met with superior force.

It is a great tragedy that the extremists have already destroyed more jobs for Negroes than the "War on Poverty" has been able to provide. When block after block of shops, stores and other business places are burned, the jobs of thousands upon thousands of Negroes who work there go up in flames along with the buildings. The "Molotov Cocktail" is no respecter of color. Negro-owned business places are just as combustible as those operated by whites.

I joined with an overwhelming majority of my colleagues in approving a House bill which would impose severe criminal penalties on persons who move from state to state inciting riots. It would also ban the use of interstate facilities such as the mails, telephone and telegraph for such purposes. This is by no means a solution to the riot problem. It is a beginning. It would serve as a backup for state and municipal riot laws and ordinances which cannot effectively reach beyond state lines. It would enable the Federal government to prosecute the "hit and run" agitators who turn one city into a shambles and then move on to promote further violence in other states.

This headline in the Washington Post of July 26 clearly shows the link between Communism and U.S. riots: "Carmichael Turns Up in Havana, Calls for U.S. Guerrilla Warfare." The Cuban news agency quotes this self-styled "civil rights leader" as saying: "We are preparing groups of urban guerrillas for our defense in the cities . . . It is going to be a struggle to the death." Carmichael reportedly is also planning to visit North Vietnam shortly.

For purely political reasons, some politicians have been promising Negroes more for tomorrow than could possibly be delivered over a period of many years. False hopes have been raised and this undoubtedly has contributed to the climate which makes for riots. Then come the firebrands who whip their followers into a frenzied belief that violence

will bring fulfillment of their demands. Self help and individual initiative receive no encouragement. Instead, the doctrine is that government can and should do it all.

In this hour, I commend to every American these words from retired Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Whittaker:

"Can any thoughtful person reasonably believe that a disorderly society can survive? In all recorded history, none ever has. On the contrary: History shows that every society which became lawless soon sucumbed, and that the first evidences of each society's decay appeared in the toleration of disobedience of its laws and the judgments of its courts."

Mr. Speaker, I believe America is at that crossroads.

I believe the Nation wants some quicker answers than the President's recently appointed Commission on riot causes is likely to supply. The Nation also wants some quicker solutions than are likely to stem from this study.

Since the Congress is being blamed either directly or by innuendo by some administration spokesmen and by much of the liberal press for the conditions which produced the riots, it seems particularly appropriate that the Congress itself should conduct an immediate and thorough investigation of the matter.

From the evidence which has been put forward thus far in news reports, riot studies and statements by police and public officials in the many cities hit by serious violence, these facts seem to emerge:

First. Most of the rioters arrested in Detroit, Newark, Watts, and other cities had jobs at the time they poured out into the streets to burn, loot, and shoot. Perhaps many of them believed they should have better jobs. Even so, this raises the question of whether widespread unemployment was a basic cause of the riots.

Second. A study by the University of California at Los Angeles found it was not just the poorest Negroes who were riot prone:

A significant number of Negroes, successful or unsuccessful, are emotionally prepared for violence as a strategy or solution to end the problem of segregation, exploitation and subordination.

The study suggests that those who are "better off" may vent their resentment by joining in a riot. In other words, the level of income of the individual may not be a major factor in his decision to riot or not to riot.

Third. A large percentage, reportedly up to 50 percent in some instances, of the people arrested in these many riots—and this includes some whites, as well—had previous felony convictions. This indicates that the criminal element plays a major role in fomenting and participating in riots. It also raises the question of whether most of these people should have been at large. To what extent have easy bail, lax parole practices and recent court decisions, which seem to protect the criminal rather than society, contributed to the presence of these looters, arsonists, and gunmen on the streets?

Fourth. Detroit was described—up to the time of its days of violence—as a model city in the field of race relations. It supposedly had made giant strides in housing, job opportunities, job training, and education. Certainly the violence in Plainfield, for example, did not stem from overcrowding, tenements, and joblessness. It had no tenements. Its rate of unemployment was low.

Fifth. Outsiders demonstrably played a part in some of the city riots. The record of arrests in Newark, for example, clearly shows this. This raises the question of whether there is a master plan and a timetable for riots in American cities. Certainly the pattern of violence was much the same in many cases. The coordinated activities of snipers and "Molotov cocktail" hurlers strongly suggest organized operations.

Sixth. The riots and the Communist conspiracy have at least some links. Witness Stokely Carmichael in Havana at Castro's side. His successor as director of the inappropriately named Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee is obviously cut from the same cloth. Hubert "Rap" Brown, whose incendiary speech in Cambridge, Md., was immediately followed by the burning of the Negro business section of the community and its church and school, is a perfect example of why the Nation needs the kind of Federal antiriot legislation which the House recently passed. Brown has been associated with RAM, which J. Edgar Hoover has described as "a highly militant, secretive organization following the Chinese-oriented Marxist-Leninist line that believes in replacing capitalism with socialism."

Today the Communists can certainly buy more rioting for a ruble right here in America than they can anywhere else in the world. They would be incredibly stupid if they were not exploiting this explosive situation. And the Communists are not incredibly stupid. I believe the Congress should move swiftly to determine the extent of Communist support and participation in these riots.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in a speech to representatives of some 14,000 municipal governments meeting in Boston, sought to pin responsibility for the riots on the Congress. He is quoted as saying:

The delay, the "go slow, take it easy" attitude (of Congress) aids and abets frustration in our urban slums, it denies government—federal, state and local—the tools and resources required to combat slumism—crime, ignorance, disease and poverty.

This is most interesting, especially when it is read along with an earlier statement he made in New Orleans on July 18, 1966. He said:

If I had to live in a slum, I think you'd have had more trouble than you've had already—because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt.

This open invitation to "more trouble" and "revolt" by HUBERT HUMPHREY lacks the incendiary tone of Hubert Brown's exhortations to the mob but it is even more disturbing because it comes from a man who is just one heartbeat from the Presidency.

On "Meet the Press" Sunday, Detroit Mayor Cavanagh said that a riot here in Washington might "lift the veil off Congress."

Since the Congress is being so widely blamed for the riots, I believe the time has come for us to lift a few veils ourselves.

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES: AN EMERGING FORCE

Mr. OLSEN. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the past decade has seen all awakening of interest in union organization among civil servants at all levels—local, State, and Federal.

David L. Perlman, an assistant editor of the AFL–CIO News, traced the recent history of public employee unionism in an article in the American Federationist, monthly magazine of the AFL–CIO. Since this is a subject that is of special interest to all of us, under unanimous consent, I place Mr. Perlman's study in the RECORD at this point:

PUBLIC EMPLOYES: AN EMERGING FORCE

(By David L. Perlman)

A decade ago, the public employe field—federal, state and local—was labeled the "growth stock" of the labor movement.

That's just what it has been and the boom shows no sign of petering out. The curve of membership, bargaining units and contracts points sharply upward and may go a long way before reaching a plateau.

There have been unions in the government service since the 19th century. And there have been examples of success to cite.

The postal unions, after surviving a bitter quarter-century of management union-busting attacks, demonstrated that a muscular, politically potent union could flourish even in the midst of a bureaucracy.

The coalition of craft unions in the Tennessee Valley Authority proved 30 years ago that collective bargaining could work successfully when an agency was given leeway to negotiate and make binding agreements. The Government Printing Office and some U.S. Department of Interior installations verified this experience, as did a scattering of cities.

Nevertheless, the surge of union growth in the private sector during the 1930s and 1940s had no parallel in government employment.

By the mid-1950s, union organization in the federal service still drifted up and down in a narrow range. There was a measurable expansion of union membership in city, county and state employment—but only when measured from its low starting point. And this in the nation's most rapidly expanding field of employment.

It would have been hard to quarrel with one commentator's description of public employe unionism of yesteryear as "the 97-pound weakling" of the labor movement.

The era of explosive growth dates from the late 1950s in the non-federal field and to the advent of the Kennedy Administration in the federal civil service.

In both areas, election of labor-backed candidates to public office helped bring about new ground rules which opened the door to largescale organization.

The key was and is the trade union fundamentals of exclusive bargaining rights for the union which represents a majority and a written contract enabling unions to do the basic day-to-day job of representing workers on grievances as well as negotiating basic conditions of employment. Along with a dues

checkoff—now common at all levels of government—this has provided both the organizing impetus and the stability necessary to retain and expand on an initial organizing success.

The first sign of a massive breakthrough came when big cities like Philadelphia and New York City demonstrated that a labor relations policy based on collective bargaining worked with a large, diverse workforce which included laborers and tax collectors, hospital attendants and typists, zoo keepers and draftsmen, mechanics and street cleaners.

The pillars of city halls did not topple nor did civil service commissions crumble when conditions of employment were negotiated instead of being set unilaterally.

It took a bit of adjustment, to be sure. There were personnel directors whose ingrained reaction to union contract proposals was along the lines of, "We can't agree to this. It's against civil service regulations." Then the union reply. A shrug, "So let's negotiate a change in the regulations. Why not?" And, indeed, why not?

The example of the cities made it easier for President Kennedy's task force to draw up a labor relations code for the federal government. And the federal executive order in turn spurred additional state, county and city laws and policies.

There are weaknesses in the federal policy and further steps toward meaningful collective bargaining are overdue. But critics of the policy agree the impact of Kennedy's executive order has been comparable to that of the Wagner Act in the private sector.

The other indispensable ingredient in the surge of public employe unionism has been the growing militancy of public employes.

Perhaps, as one union president suggests, it is the change from the depression generation, when a civil service job and pension represented security—insulation against breadlines and the factory scrap heap.

Before World War II, both pay and fringe benefits in public employment were generally superior to those in private industry.

But during and after the war, pay scales in government lagged far behind the private sector and the catch-up raises at two- or four-year intervals seldom closed the gap. Unions in private industry were catching up and starting to surpass government fringe benefits.

In recent years, public employes have been regaining some of the lost ground. And the lesson has not been lost that militant unions have gotten the best settlements.

To the general public, the visible phase has been strikes and picket line demonstrations by local public employes, including teachers. Strikes of city and county workers are not new, but there have been more of them—despite the prevalence of "no strike" laws.

And it would be hard to convince negotiators who bargain with local governments that the willingness of workers to strike if necessary hasn't been a major factor in reaching good settlements without a strike.

A news item from Gary, Indiana, makes the point: "The highest salaries in the nation for beginning teachers were won by negotiators for the Gary Teachers Union in a marathon bargaining session that ended only 30 minutes before a scheduled strike."

It was, incidentally, a first contract—made possible through a representation election in which the Teachers' local defeated the local affiliate of the National Education Association by a 1,529 to 267 margin.

There are unions which do not seek the right to strike, including the solidly-organized Fire Fighters and federal employe unions whose leaders recognize that strike talk might boomerang in Congress. But there are incidents such as the limited strike threat by New York City firefighters and the reaction of rank-and-file delegates to a speech by AFL–CIO President George Meany at a big Postal Clerks pay rally.

Meany had the current railroad dispute in mind when he told the delegates that workers "don't like to strike, but sure like to have the right to strike." The prolonged applause which interrupted the speech at that point was dramatic evidence that workers who think they are not getting a fair share react the same, whether in public or private employment.

A great many unions have some public employe membership and contracts with government agencies. Virtually every trade is represented either in separate contracts or in joint bargaining such as the metal trades agreements. But as a quick benchmark of growth, let's take a look at unions made up almost entirely of public workers or with a large percentage of such workers.

In 1959, the American Federation of Teachers had fewer than 50,000 members. Currently the AFT reports over 140,000.

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employes had already grown to a respectable 174,000 membership. But its latest report shows 330,000 members.

From 60,000 in 1959, the American Federation of Government Employes has passed the 235,000 mark.

There has been a comparable growth in the public employe membership of unions whose major strength is in private industry.

The Machinists, which for many years had an active federal employe district, more than doubled its government employe membership since the advent of federal collective bargaining.

Unions bargaining through metal trades councils quickly won exclusive recognition in most naval shipyards, although the closing of several big shipyards cut the growth rate in recent years.

The Building Service Employes showed a 35 percent increase in the public employe sector—both local and state and in the federal government.

The Laborers, barely represented in the public employe field before 1960, jumped from 7,500 to nearly 30,000 and are now actively organizing.

All the AFL–CIO maritime unions have contracts covering government vessels—another byproduct of the presidential executive order.

In the federal field, unions now have exclusive bargaining rights covering well over 1 million workers—with AFL–CIO affiliates accounting for 90 percent of the total. More than half of these—600,000—are in the postal service, where union membership long has been the norm.

Outside the postal service, however, the growth is keyed to the new era of collective bargaining.

By the spring of 1963, 15 months after the presidential order, unions had won exclusive bargaining rights for 94,000 non-postal federal employes.

By mid-1965, the number had grown to 300,000. The latest official tally was in August 1966 and the current figures certainly are higher. But at that time the total had reached 445,000. Of these, 252,000 were blue collar wage board workers and 194,000 were classified salaried employes.

It should be noted that the classified group includes such occupations as hospital attendants and guards as well as white collar jobs. And, in all areas of public employment, the bulk of union members are manual workers. But in both the federal and nonfederal fields, the proportion of organized white collar workers is moving up—slowly but apparently steadily.

It has not been easy to stake out clear-cut lines in public employe unionism.

In the era of no contracts, several unions often had conclaves of membership and old arguments over industrial versus craft bargaining units echoed at all levels of government. The possibility of meaningful bargaining also brought additional unions into the field. Adding to the complications was the presence of a number of unaffiliated organizations actively competing for membership. Some of these carved out an ultra-militant stance, with a shriller appeal to workers. Others shunned the word union and basked in the approving smiles of old-line supervisors.

AFL–CIO affiliates, however, have more than held their own and, as bargaining units are determined and contracts negotiated, the area of conflict has shrunken.

At the same time that unions have moved to take advantage of the opportunities for organizing, they also have faced the problem of leadership training from the shop steward to the negotiating committee level—and the problem of translating votes in bargaining elections into memberships.

The AFL–CIO Department of Education has helped supply this training, especially in the federal field, with individual unions, the Metal Trades Department and the Government Employes Council.

One problem, still to be fully resolved, is to sign up all the workers in a unit after winning representation elections overwhelmingly. The long-established unions, such as postal groups and the Fire Fighters, do not have this problem because a new worker is made aware that the union is something everyone belongs to.

Part of the problem, perhaps, is the more limited area of bargaining in most government agencies. In many cases, as in the federal service, wages are set by legislative action for white collar workers and on the basis of prevailing wage scales for blue collar workers. One of the chief goals of AFL–CIO unions in the federal service is to achieve a much greater degree of union participation in determining wage scales.

The union shop exists in some city and county jurisdictions, although it is still the exception. In the federal service, it appears a long way off, although concepts can change quickly. The writer remembers sitting in on a panel discussion at a conference of federal personnel officials in the mid-1950s. Bill Ryan of Machinists' District 44 shocked the audience—and perhaps some of the panelists from other unions—by insisting that collective bargaining must be the basis of government employe-management relations. It seemed then a more distant possibility in the federal service than the union shop does now.

There has been a changed attitude, too, towards the role of civil service commissions. Once they saw themselves, and to an extent were viewed by the embryo public employe unions, as avenues of appeal and arbiters between the worker and his agency. Now union negotiators tend to view them as arms of management and seek independent arbitration, factfinding and mediation as a substitute for a paternalistic personnel agency.

Attitudes towards the Hatch Act and the little Hatch Acts that have sprung up at the state and local levels have changed also. Government workers want and need protection against political kickbacks and the mass patronage turnover when a new administration takes office. But they see no reason why this requires them to give up their own citizenship rights, including the right to support their friends and oppose their enemies.

Postal workers have long been one of Washington's most powerful lobbies and other government employe unions are taking a leaf from the same book.

At the state and city level, public employe unions work hard at lobbying, usually in close cooperation with AFL–CIO central bodies. One of New York's biggest union demonstrations recently overflowed Madison Square Garden into nearby streets as members of the AFSCME, the Transit Workers and

the Teachers bitterly protested a punitive state anti-strike law.

What will the future bring? The potential for organizing remains great. About 40 percent of the federal government's 2.5 million civilian workers are organized and the figure probably will pass the 50 percent mark within a few years.

In the non-federal sector of public employment, a smaller percentage are union members or work under a union contract. A 1964 Labor Department estimate was 544,000 members of AFL–CIO unions—about 7.5 percent of total government employment. The number is considerably higher today and state and local employment is expected to soar from 7.7 million in 1965 to 11.4 million by 1975.

Some localities still bitterly resist union organization; a few have even made union recognition illegal. But in the federal government and in a growing number of states and cities, the union organizer's greatest foe is apathy, not management intimidation.

The potential for meaningful collective bargaining also is great. Some of the frustrations which limit bargaining today will be swept away and that, in turn, will make union membership more meaningful and valuable to the public worker.

In vigor of leadership, in acceptance of a more realistic dues structure than the "bargain basement" rates of a few years back, unions representing government employes are becoming a more significant factor in the American labor movement.

The past decade has been bright. The future looks even brighter.

EXTENSION OF FOOD-STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. KEE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge extension of the food-stamp program for a 2- or 3-year period. The program not only needs but deserves more than a 1-year extension in order that disadvantaged Americans whose health depends on food assistance may continue to have the opportunity to benefit from food stamps.

As we all recall, the legislation to extend the food-stamp program was passed by the House on June 8, and by the Senate soon thereafter. The House bill contains a 1-year extension and the Senate version provides for 3 additional years. Unfortunately, the conferees are deadlocked with the House managers holding fast for not more than a 1-year extension.

The food-stamp program should be continued. It should not be permitted to die.

It is designed to permit families in need to enjoy more and better food and this is exactly what it has been doing.

A food-stamp recipient's wife spoke for many others when she said that before they began receiving food stamps her children got up from the table hungry.

There were times near the end of the month when we didn't have anything to eat—

She said—

This worried me so much that I became ill and ran up a $100 doctor bill. Now that we have food stamps—we always have plenty to eat—and the children can have fresh fruit and other foods whenever they want them.

The manager of a national retail food chain recently had high praise for food stamps. He said that the food-stamp program administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Service is the best Federal program he was acquainted with. He termed it the best organized, the best administered, the least complicated in operation, and the most effective in reaching and benefiting the most people.

It is unusual when a private businessman praises a Federal program. I have heard many favorable comments about the food-stamp program. And I am pleased to note that during the year just ended on June 30 the program has grown to cover almost 2,000,000 qualified individuals throughout the Nation. For a program which moved from a pilot program just 3 years ago—this is a remarkable record.

There is an excellent reason for a 2- or 3-year extension of the food-stamp program. Local officials operate the program at the local level. They need to be given at least a 2-year assurance so they can mesh the gears of local government machinery with the Federal program.

Recent changes in the program made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the State of Mississippi makes it possible to reach more people in need. These changes will be extended to other States as rapidly as possible. It will speed up the massive and difficult program of insuring that every person has the opportunity of a full and nutritious diet.

The food-stamp program has proved an effective means and a reasonable way to feed hungry people. On behalf of the hungry people who benefit so much from it, I urge authorization of at least a 2-year extension.

DEMONSTRATION CITIES PLANNING

Mr. JONAS. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were going to have a moratorium on blame fixing for the disasters that recently have struck Detroit, Newark, and cities in other areas of the country. I believe people generally would welcome such a moratorium and would prefer to see the executive and legislative branches of the Government get on with the business of identifying those responsible for the riots and seeing that they are punished, and that we then proceed to take affirmative steps to prevent a recurrence of the riots and disorders.

But, Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Boston the Vice President joined the chorus of those who are seeking to place the blame on Congress for what has transpired. This frantic effort to find a scapegoat to blame for the wave of lawlessness sweeping the country is becoming ludicrous. It is being alleged, for example, that Congress is not moving fast enough to provide funds for the demonstration cities program and that this somehow is partly responsible for the rioting. Let us see if the facts justify that charge.

The fact is that last October Congress provided the administration with $11 million to be used in making grants to a number of cities to help them finance the preparation of their demonstration city plans. By May 1, 194 cities across the country had filed applications for planning grants.

Today—August 1, 1967—9 months after the money had been provided for the administration to go forward with these planning grants, none of the money has been distributed to the cities that filed timely applications.

I cannot account for this continuing delay to get a program started which is so widely heralded by its spokesmen as one of the administration's main weapons to be used in the war against riots. Since the money in question was made available by Congress 9 months ago and none of it has yet been spent, and since 194 cities have had their applications on file for planning grants for the last 3 months, it would seem that Congress should not be blamed for the delay in getting this program underway.

I am not making any charges against anyone or undertaking to blame anyone for this delay. I am merely pointing out that, in view of the facts which I have related, it would appear that the Vice President and others who are directing their fire at Congress are aiming at the wrong target. It would be more appropriate for the Vice President and others who are criticizing Congress to spend some time stimulating action by the administration instead of spending so much time trying to pass the buck.

RAT EXTERMINATION

Then it is being alleged that because the House did not approve a new rat extermination bill recently, this has somehow contributed to the rioting. Those who make this charge obviously did not read the report on the bill as filed by the Committee on Banking and Currency. For example, that report cites the experience of the city of Detroit as a model showing what can be accomplished in a continuous campaign against rats. The report stated that the incidence of rat bites in Detroit has been reduced from 123 in 1951 to 17 in 1965; that the incidence of rat-transmitted disease has been reduced in Detroit from a dozen or more cases per year in the 1940's to less than one case per year in the 1960's—no cases in 1966—and that the program has drastically reduced the percentage of rat-infested buildings. Yet this progress in rat extermination did not prevent the riots in Detroit.

The reason the new rat program was voted down in the House was not because Members are opposed to rat extermination but because we already have four departments and agencies of the Government engaged in rat extermination, and it was considered more advisable to continue with these existing programs than start a brandnew one.

In the supplemental views of our colleague, Representative HENRY S. REUSS,

of Wisconsin, which are attached to the committee's report on the bill in question, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], after having first expressed his concern over the existence of rats in slum areas and elsewhere and his approval of the objectives of the legislation, stated:

In dictating to the cities that they must have a rat-control program, the bill could skew local public health priorities. Whether rats present an extremely serious public health problem, as they do here in the District, or a less serious problem, as they may in other cities, the city would undertake the rat-eradication program. The bill dictates a uniformity of action where there may not be a uniformity of need for action. By artificially raising the priority of rat control by its grant-in-aid inducement, the bill could draw money away from other higher priority local problems—perhaps from treatment of alcoholism, narcotics control, or prevention of venereal disease, all serious public health problems which affect the slum family and slum child. More particularly, the bill could fragment and skew the local public health agency's program for attacking all carriers of communicable diseases. . . .

And in the minority views attached to the committee's report, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] was quoted as having said, while interrogating Secretary Weaver who was testifying in favor of the bill, the following:

I am all for exterminating rats, but just last year the Congress was at great pains to take some 10 or a dozen public health programs, including programs in the environmental field, and to put them together into one program so as to move toward greater flexibility in Federal-State-local relations. It was a remarkable piece of legislation in the Public Health Service. The President signed it last October. Under that act, which gives localities freedom to choose the things they want to concentrate on, at least seven States are now coming in with excellent sector rat control programs. But here, having done all that, what do we do but come in with another tiny specific program, very costly to administer. It gets HUD into the health business, it confuses the local health departments who have been dealing uniformly with the Public Health Service of HEW, it is going to result in shopping around, whether you get rat-control money from HEW or whether you get it from HUD.

ALLEGED NEGLECT OF CITIES

And it is being alleged that Congress has been indifferent about the needs of our cities. The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. MAHON], completely demolished this allegation in a hard-hitting speech on the floor yesterday. He listed a number of programs which Congress is funding this year in a continuing effort to aid the urban communities of our country to solve their problem. He cited the statement of President Johnson, contained on page 28 of his budget message of last January, that $25.6 billion is being programed for expenditure in fiscal year 1968 for benefits and services which aid the poor. I would like to add a few more examples to those the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] cited.

First, let me call attention to the fact that Housing and Urban Development Secretary Weaver testified last year that Federal disbursements having impact on urban communities amounted to $28.4 billion in 1966. Part of this money came out of previously appropriated but unspent funds, part out of revolving funds and part out of current appropriations.

Following is a partial list of Federal grant-in-aid programs for cities:

Grants for basic water and sewer facilities.
Public works planning advances.
Public facility loans.
Grants for neighborhood facilities.
Grants for code enforcement.
Demolition grants.
Community renewal grants.
Rehabilitation grants.
Demonstration grants.
Urban planning grants.
Metropolitan development incentive grants.
Open space land program.
Urban renewal demonstration grants.
Urban planning grants.
Urban information and technical assistance grants.
Community development training program.
Fellowships for city planning.
Urban research and technology.
Low income housing and demonstration program.
Rent certificate program.
Public housing program.
Housing for the elderly.
Urban renewal program.

It is a disservice to the country for public officials to misrepresent the facts about congressional interest in the welfare of the urban communities of the country.

THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD "THINK AGAIN" BEFORE OPPOSING ANTIRIOT MEASURES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Judiciary Committee will begin hearings tomorrow on the House-passed antiriot bill. From statements made by the Attorney General, and from the absence of any meaningful proposals by the President, it appears that the administration will continue to testify in opposition to this legislation.

The administration, it appears, will oppose this measure despite the clear and present danger to this Nation's welfare being posed by the riots and violence which have been tearing up and burning America's cities over the past month. Not even the Chief Executive's plea for a day of prayer had any effect on quelling the urban warfare this Nation is experiencing. On the very Sunday he proclaimed a day of prayer and on Monday thereafter, nearly a dozen riots took place and, thumbing their noses at any suggestion of praying for or accomplishing domestic tranquillity, the black power advocates used a church in Washington, D.C., to urge more riots and revolution, more shooting and looting, more bullets and bombing.

Stokely Carmichael is in Cuba consorting with Castro on how to accomplish guerrilla warfare on the streets of America.

In his television address to the American people in which he called for a day of prayer, the President also asked the rioters to "think again." I now ask the President and the Attorney General to think again before opposing the bill which is a necessary Federal weapon with which to fight the violence and bloodshed that has marked our cities. My distinguished colleague from Florida suggested the Attorney General has not been doing it, and the Attorney General says he has not been doing it because he does not have the authority to do it as there is no Federal law. I urge that we give him that power by passing this bill.

Think again, Mr. President, of the innocent victims of these riots who have lost their lives, and the innocent victims who have been maimed and wounded as a result of these riots, as a result of the violence which Federal authorities are presently powerless to prevent.

Think again, Mr. President, of the poor shopkeeper whose life savings have been lost to the looters and vandals.

Think again, Mr. President, of the children who must now live under even more crowded conditions because the buildings in which they lived have been burned to the ground.

And, think again, Mr. President, of the policemen and firemen who have lost their lives because of a sniper's bullet, a vandal's well-aimed rock, or an arsonist's fire.

I ask the President to think again before opposing a responsible bill which will give the Federal authorities power to investigate these riots which have become national in scope, which will provide a strong deterrent to the seditionists who are traveling from one State to another to teach and preach violence and bloodshed, and which will demonstrate that not only do the Congress and the Executive oppose rioting as a legitimate form of protest, but further that they are strongly in support of Federal laws to outlaw such anarchy.

THE NATION WILL LONG REMEMBER ADM. DAVID LAMAR McDONALD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the retirement of a good friend, an outstanding American, and a man whose dedication to the United States insures that his name will be recorded in the history of our Nation. The Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David Lamar McDonald's retirement today brings to a close 43 years of service in the U.S. Navy. His contributions to the Navy and to the defense of this Nation are outstanding.

His rise from a cadet at the U.S. Naval Academy to the Chief of Naval Opera-

tions alone speaks for his qualifications and dedication.

Along the way he has served valiantly as his numerous decorations will attest. Twelve times he has been decorated by his Nation, including the Distinguished Service Medal and the Bronze Star. Six other nations have bestowed decorations upon him for his work.

The Bronze Star was given him for his service aboard the U.S.S. *Essex* as officer in charge of the Combat Information Center during the battle of Leyte Gulf. When the ship was hit by the enemy, his efforts in organizing were so effective that normal operations were suspended for only 30 minutes with a minimum loss of efficiency.

Admiral McDonald went on to join the staff of the Commander of the Air Forces. In the following years Admiral McDonald was the commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Mindoro* and later the U.S.S. *Coral Sea*.

In 1960 he became the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff of the Supreme Headquarters of Allied Powers in Europe.

Three years later he became the Commander in Chief of U.S. Naval Forces in Europe and Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, in the Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean and by the end of 1963, he was the Commander of Naval Component of all U.S. forces in Europe.

In August of that year, he became Chief of Naval Operations and has served in that position since.

But these are the obvious historical things which show on the record.

Admiral McDonald's contributions to operating procedures that have improved the Navy and thus better served the Nation are many and perhaps not so obvious to those outside the Navy.

One of the programs which came into being during his service as Chief of Naval Operations was the search and rescue operation in the Tonkin Gulf. As a former pilot, Admiral McDonald well knew the danger of flying and the morale problems faced when a comrade is shot down.

The search and rescue program now being used in Vietnam is the most effective combat rescue operation the world has ever known. As of July 3, 1967, a total of 320 U.S. pilots and crewmen had been rescued from the waters of the Tonkin Gulf—an investment of lives, morale, and dollars whose importance is almost impossible to overestimate.

It is only fair to point out at this time that, while credit is due Admiral McDonald, he makes the point that Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze shares any credit given him.

Also during the tenure of Admiral McDonald and Secretary Nitze, the F–4 was developed for interservice use. The inception of the F–4 took place when Admiral McDonald, then a rear admiral, was director of the Air Warfare Division of OPNAV.

Despite these and other historic advances which were made by the contributions of Admiral McDonald, he will also be remembered for his efforts to raise the morale and standards for the regular sailor.

Sharing his dedication through these years has been his lovely wife, Tommy, who has given of her time, energy, and devotion. She shared her husband's problems and helped in every way she could.

This Nation and the men of our Armed Forces owe Admiral McDonald a debt of gratitude for his long and meritorious service. His name will rank high in the annals of Naval history, and rightly so.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] yielding to me at this time. I commend the gentleman for saying what so many of us feel concerning Admiral McDonald and his lovely wife.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that Dave McDonald has performed a superb job as Chief of Naval Operations during his 4 years of service. He has headed the Navy in the uniformed service during a very difficult and a very trying time. I feel that his contribution to the Navy of the present and the Navy of the future will go down in history as extremely significant.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the country owes a deep debt of gratitude to Admiral McDonald, and I wish to say on a very personal basis that there is no finer gentleman, no finer naval officer in my opinion.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to hear the remarks which the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has made on the subject of a great naval officer and a great American. I wish to concur wholeheartedly with what the gentleman from Florida has said and with what our distinguished minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD], said with reference to the distinguished career and today's retirement of Admiral McDonald.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion Admiral McDonald has been one of the outstanding naval officers of our time. I know that he will long be remembered and highly respected in the ranks of the Navy.

EQUALITY FOR LATIN AMERICAN IMMIGRANTS

Mr. RYAN. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 the Congress, recognizing the inherent inequality of the national origin quota system of our previous immigration law, passed the new Immigration and Nationality Act. Premised on the theory that immigrants should be admitted to the United States on an equal basis rather than on the irrational basis of nationality, the new law represented a vast improvement in our immigration policy. However, not long after the effective date certain defects became manifest.

The labor certificates requirement of section 214, and its implementing procedures, involve not only an unwarranted amount of redtape, but impose on the potential immigrant the burden of proving the existence of a job opening in the United States. Earlier this year I introduced legislation, H.R. 7775, designed to mitigate this situation.

Mr. Speaker, there is another defect which needs a remedy—a defect which cuts against our new immigration policy. Notwithstanding the intent to expunge from the statute books laws discriminating against certain aliens on a basis of nationality per se, the Congress by enacting section 245(c) established a different standard for those persons emigrating from Western Hemisphere nations than for those from nations not within the Western Hemisphere. Section 245(c) not only visits great hardship upon many Latin Americans, but it constitutes blatant discrimination.

Last year the Congress eliminated one of the inequities imposed by section 245 (c). Under Public Law 89–732 those, who had emigrated from a Western Hemisphere country on a temporary visa and who in good faith had applied for permanent resident status prior to December 1, 1965—the effective date of the new immigration law—were exempt from the necessity of leaving the United States to obtain a permanent immigration visa.

Moreover, Public Law 89–732 created a special exception for Cubans admitted or paroled into the United States subsequent to January 1, 1959. The Attorney General, due to Public Law 89–732, may adjust the status of such persons to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if the applicant would be otherwise eligible.

Except for Cubans, the existing law, section 245, operates to the detriment of one from a Western Hemisphere nation, compared to immigrants, from non-Western Hemisphere nations, seeking to change from temporary to permanent status.

The effect is such that one of the latter category can change his status without first returning to his country. One from a Western Hemisphere country, except Cuba, is, however, specifically precluded, by subsection (c) of section 245, from obtaining permanent resident status unless he applies for a permanent visa outside the United States.

Thus, for example, one from a non-Western Hemisphere nation, visiting the United States on a temporary visa could apply for and, if eligible, obtain a permanent visa without first having to return to his country. Except for Cubans, one in a similar situation, were he from a Western Hemisphere nation, would be required to leave the United States prior

to applying for and obtaining a permanent visa even were he to meet all other qualifications.

Mr. Speaker, not only does this constitute unwarranted discriminatory treatment of those from Western Hemisphere nations, it violates the spirit of justice and equality which prompted President Kennedy and President Johnson to recommend to the Congress the Nationality and Immigration Act of 1965.

In light of this discriminatory effect, I have introduced a bill which would repeal section 245(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, a bill, the enactment of which will place all who seek permanent status on an equal footing.

Expeditious action by the Congress on this proposed amendment will not waive any substantive standard an immigrant must meet in order to obtain permanent status. However, it will elevate the Latin American immigrant to exactly the same level as an immigrant from any other country in the world. By so doing, the Congress will further strengthen the philosophy underlying our new immigration policy, that of equality of treatment.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Monday afternoon, July 31, 1967, it was necessary for me to leave the House floor for a scheduled meeting in our State capitol in Harrisburg, Pa., on Highway Route 88. Problems of rerouting and immediate construction must be settled at once by cooperation of Federal, State, and local officials. As this is the main route from the city of Pittsburgh to our Allegheny County annual fair in my congressional district, attended by over a million visitors, I have felt it of high importance in our area to help break an impasse by working out cooperation by officials, contractors, and local parties.

On conference report on H.R. 6098 passage on Monday, July 31, 1967, I would have voted "no."

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S RAPID TRANSIT CRISIS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing our Nation's cities is rapid transportation. My city of Los Angeles with its vast urban sprawl of satellite suffers more than most cities because of its geographical size.

Mr. Robert P. Sutton, vice president of CBS radio and general manager of KNX in Los Angeles, has just finished an excellent series of radio editorials on the southern California rapid transit crisis. The series included five separate editorials dealing with various aspects of the rapid transit problem. The fifth editorial contains some very excellent and specific suggestions for action to alleviate the transit problems.

For the information of the House I submit for the RECORD these editorials in the order of their broadcast:

[July 17, 1967]

WHAT'S THE FARE FROM HERE?

Today we begin a 5-part series on the most studied subject in Southern California—Rapid Transit. Since 1925, there have been over 45 studies of this problem. It seems that studying rapid transit has become a major California industry.

Our focus today is on the most critical part of the problem—money. All other questions about rapid transit are secondary to the one of how we pay for it.

Almost every expert says public transportation must be subsidized. It is subsidized in most major cities in the country. For example, New York spends $170 million a year supporting its system. Assuming we have to have subsidized rapid transit here, how much money will it cost?

The Southern California Rapid Transit District estimates the two-phase system will cost about $1.6 billion. Privately, experts guess the final cost will run between 2 and 3 billion dollars. We are told that fares will pay the system's operating costs but not the capital investment cost. In other words, the cost of building the system will have to be paid for by the taxpayers.

The money will probably be raised by selling bonds. The cost of paying off these bonds is hard to predict precisely. It will depend on various factors in the bond market when they are sold. Nevertheless, bond experts estimate it will take approximately $100 million per year for every $1 billion worth of bonds. If we assume 2 billion as the cost of building the system, we see that it will require an annual payment of $200 million to pay off the bonds.

This $200 million will have to be paid by the taxpayers of Southern California. It might be in the form of a real estate tax; or, it might be a gasoline tax; or, it might be a sales tax; or, any number of other possibilities. For example, last Thursday the State Assembly passed two transit tax bills. One increases the cost of gasoline and the other hikes the vehicle tax by 25%. Even if these go through, they won't raise near enough money to finance construction of the system.

What it comes down to is this: no matter how it's sliced, the taxpayers are going to get hit for approximately $200 million more a year. Now this is more than the total real estate and personal property tax combined which was collected for all of the 67 cities of Los Angeles County in 1966.

Therefore, without arguing about systems, hardware, routes, or anything else, KNX asks two simple questions: Is the taxpayer *willing* to pay for a rapid transit system? And, if he is willing, is he able to pay it?

Tomorrow we will examine another part of the problem in our KNX editorial, entitled "A Fast Train To No-Where."

[July 18, 1967]

A FAST TRAIN TO NOWHERE

Southern California rapid transit appears to be a fast train to nowhere. This is our second comment in our current series on rapid transit. Our focus today is on the organization of the transit effort.

For years Southern California had a variety of bus and streetcar companies. World War II gas rationing made these very important to us. However, the end of the war saw a dramatic change. There was a massive shift to the private car; a flood of immigrants to California; the explosion of the suburbs; and, a sharp decline in public transportation.

Many voices have called for a revitalized public transit system for Los Angeles. In fact, since 1925 there have been 45 studies of the problem. So far, about the only thing everybody agrees on is that we have a problem. Beyond that there is nothing but a babble of plans, suggestions, arguments, criticisms, demands, warnings, hopes, and prayers.

In 1962, the Southern California Rapid Transit District was formed. With its formation many assumed that we finally had a central and coordinated transit agency. One that was going to provide regional public transportation for all of Southern California. This is not true.

Of the seven counties in Southern California, the Transit District only covers 3. Orange County, the second most populous country in California, is not included. Furthermore, even in Los Angeles County there are still 15 different bus companies. Their schedules are not coordinated and you generally can't transfer from one system to another.

As for the role of government in coordinating transportation in Southern California—this is a huge joke. There are more than 300 separate agencies in this area dealing with public transportation. It is unbelievably absurd that the air, sea, highway, freeway, taxicab, pipeline, truck, rail, bus, and rapid transit systems here are virtually uncoordinated.

With the fantastic brain-power and technological skill we have in Southern California, the present condition of public transportation is incredible.

KNX believes that what is needed is a central transportation authority for planning and action. It must be an organization with money and with the power to get action. Until we get this sort of coordinated effort, Southern California public transportation will be a fast train to nowhere.

Tomorrow we will look at the transit system proposed for Los Angeles. We will ask one of the fundamental questions that has never been answered. It is a question on which the success or failure of the proposed system depends.

[July 19, 1967]

YOU CAN'T GET THERE FROM HERE

Many people have a recurring nightmare about the proposed rapid transit system. What if we spend the billions needed to build it and then find out it doesn't do the job?

The plan proposed by the Rapid Transit district is a twin-rail train system radiating from downtown Los Angeles like spokes on a wheel.

The criticisms of this plan are many. First, the twin-rail system is the same kind that has been used for over a century. Today, technology is rushing toward a breakthrough that may make it as archaic as button shoes. The scientists who studied California's transportation needs for the Governor two years ago, regard the twin-rail system as a ridiculous dodo.

Besides, a fixed rail system cannot move to meet changing community needs. Older cities started with a rail system early in life and grew up around it—we didn't. Instead of expanding outward from the central city along rail lines, Los Angeles moved outward in waves. Imposing a spoke rail pattern on our sprawling, low-density city now is foolishness. Transit experts agree that you must have a land density over twice that of Los Angeles' in order to make a rail system pay out. As for the spoke pattern, one local wit puts it this way: you can go anywhere you want to just as long as you go downtown first.

Beyond this, passenger rail systems are consistent money losers. This is because the

public won't pay for what it doesn't want. The automobile is more comfortable, more convenient, and faster. It costs more to operate but this is not particularly meaningful in our relatively affluent society. In short, the transit train offers little to lure people out of their cars. The fallacy of transit thinking for years has been its almost total concentration on the supply side of the supply-and-demand equation. The notion is that, if you build a transit system, most people will automatically use it. This is simply not true. One twin-rail transit system has already gone broke in Los Angeles because it ignored the demand side of the picture.

Further, the system is designed solely to solve the downtown commuter problem. It is virtually useless for going to the market, to recreation areas, to the doctor, to school, or anyplace except downtown to work.

Finally, the greatest deficiency in transit plans for Southern California is this: The system appears designed primarily to serve downtown Los Angeles. To build it will require vote approval of a huge bond issue. Most of these voters not only don't live or work downtown—they very rarely go there.

KNX asks this question: Will the suburban voter willingly shoulder a gigantic tax burden for something that doesn't appear to benefit him? An opinion poll last February revealed that 58% favored using public funds for rapid transit. However, nowhere in the poll was the voter told the price tag. He was not told how much his taxes would go up to build rapid transit. He was asked his blind opinion about an unknown figure. This poll, then, fails to answer the question. And, yet, the success or failure of rapid transit hangs by the thread of that answer.

This has been number 3 of our 5-part transit series. Tomorrow we will look at the Rapid Transit District itself and the charge that our bus riders are the economic serfs of out-of-state financial interests.

[July 20, 1967]

WHOSE HAND IS AT THE HELM

Today KNX continues its series of the transit problem with a look at the Southern California Rapid Transit District. This is the oganization that is supposed to solve our transit dilemma.

To begin with, its name is a misnomer. It neither covers Southern California nor all of rapid transit. It does not include Orange County—the second most populous county in the state. Even in the area it does cover, the District's authority is spotty. For example, there are 13 other bus companies in Los Angeles county alone. As for "rapid," the average speed estimated for the proposed transit system is about 30 miles per hour. Hardly "rapid" by any modern standard.

Another concern is the experience of District personnel. Almost none of them has had any experience operating a modern rail system. These are the people who will have to run a rail system that is ¼ the size of New York City's. Also, the present District exists primarily for the benefit of its bondholders. The needs of the public are secondary. To illustrate: the recent flap about a subsidy of fare increase is due to the bondholders. They require the District to charge *double* depreciation expense. If it were not for this, neither a subsidy nor a fare hike would be needed.

This situation may continue with the new transit system. The District has hired economic experts to study the new transit plan. Clearly, their recommendations will swing a lot of weight in the final plan of our transit system. This firm of experts is Cloverdale and Colquitts—the same firm that is the economic advisor and representative of the present bondholders.

Finally, we must realize that, what has seemed to be several different groups tackling the transit problem over the years, has always been the same one. The name on the front door changes from time to time, but the faces remain the same.

A look at the group's history shows study after study without any action; it shows ineptness in both politics and public relations; and, it shows a total lack of imagination and bold leadership.

KNX can only conclude that there is an enormous job to be done and, on the basis of past performance, the Southern California Rapid Transit District cannot provide the leadership to do it.

[July 21, 1967]

WHAT TO DO UNTIL THE DOCTOR ARRIVES

For almost half a century, we have done little about our public transportation problem but talk. The proposed transit rail system is 5 to 10 years away from being fully operational. Therefore, in this final editorial of our current series, KNX will suggest what can be done *now* to move cars and people better.

First, existing bus service must be dramatically improved. This is vital whether or not a rail system is built. For example, a major barrier to jobs for the poor of South Central Los Angeles is the lack of good public transportation. What good is a job if you can't get to it? We need one central transit authority for all Southern California . . . vastly increased rush-hour service . . . and, much better public information about bus service.

Next, we must discourage use of private cars in congested areas. Monthly parkers and those parking before 9 A.M. and between 4 and 6 P.M., in congested areas should be heavily taxed . . . selected freeway on-ramps should be closed during rush hours . . . employers should contribute all or part of the fare for employees who commute by bus . . . there should be incentives for car pools . . . there should be a city-wide, computer matched car-pool system—car pools have been tried within companies but never on a city-wide basis . . . there should be mini-bus service within congested areas and between these areas and outlying parking lots.

In addition, we must help cars move better. Traffic signals should be synchronized so traffic can flow smoothly without stopping . . . alternative surface routes should be publicized and clearly marked . . . all public works money should be pooled in a concentrated effort to eliminate road bottlenecks . . . work and school hours should be staggered to stretch out the rush hour load . . . and, intrastate traffic should be routed around congested areas during rush hours.

Then, there should be special commuter services such as: commuter trains on our existing network of tracks . . . executive commuter bus service . . . use of school buses to supplement evening rush hour service . . . special shopper buses during the off-peak hours when most of our buses are now idle . . . we should have special weekend bus service to recreation areas . . . we should eliminate the overlapping and duplication of the more than 300 transportation agencies we now have . . . and, we should allow the operation of jitneys and peso-cabs throughout the community.

These are just a sample of the many things that could be done *now* to improve transportation in the Southland. Many of them could be done within the next 30 days with little or no additional expense.

KNK says that our fundamental need is for a central transportation authority. One that has the money, the power, and the will to coordinate all transportation in Southern California. To create such an authority and to do what else must be done takes courage, imagination, and bold initiative by our political leaders. The sooner they do it, the sooner we'll all get home to dinner.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACTION CRUSADE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the four of us wrote a letter to the President asking him to use the persuasive powers of his Office to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade to defuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban Americans. We have sent copies of this letter to all Governors and the mayors of approximately 150 of our Nation's largest cities, urging them to implement the program at the local level.

We are faced with a national crisis. Newark, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Cambridge are examples of what can happen elsewhere during the remainder of the summer.

Steps to remove the causes of the current riots will be searched out and, hopefully, these ills will be eliminated at some future date.

We are here today, however, to urge the immediate implementation of a program of preventive action—a program to relieve the tensions during the remainder of the summer before more riots become reality. We are here today to urge a united effort by the President, the Congress, the Governors, the mayors of our major cities and their citizens to quiet civil unrest.

The Neighborhood Action Crusade, we feel, can help provide this relief. It can give the President's Commission and a bipartisan congressional committee the needed time to make a thorough study with effective recommendations.

We view a substantial portion of the immediate problem as one of continuing communications—keeping in touch with the neighborhoods where riot situations exist. Clearly, a contributing cause is the basic breakdown of communications among Negro Americans, the leaders of their organizations, and the elected officials of our country. As Mayor Cavanagh of Detroit reportedly said last week in reference to the problem:

> I find out that all the civil rights leaders we've been dealing with don't even know the people in the streets.

The overwhelming majority of Negro Americans are dedicated citizens, strongly opposed to disorder and violence. Involvement of these, our fellow citizens, in keeping the peace within their own neighborhoods is essential to the resolution of the current crisis in our cities.

We urge the creation of the Neighborhood Action Crusade—largely local volunteer organizations to work constructively in rallying the stabilizing influence that exists in the neighborhoods. In this way, local neighborhood leaders, working within their own areas, can provide understanding, continuing communications, and positive direction in this crusade to assure peace in America's cities. Whereas law enforcement will not be their mission, leadership will be.

Volunteers would serve their own neighborhoods. Local government would provide administrative services and coordination of the program. The Federal Government would provide the funds and equipment to support the local effort.

We believe this can be a low-cost program of short duration carried out within existing appropriations and well-established executive precedents.

For these reasons, we are introducing a joint resolution calling upon the President to take immediate steps to launch the Neighborhood Action Crusade.

We invite our colleagues to join with us as cosponsors. We hope our plan is the beginning of a united front aimed at creating a workable tool, readily available, to ease the tension in our cities.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there follows the letter which we four sent to the President, the Governors, and the mayors of 150 of our largest cities:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1967.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We recognize the tremendous pressures on your office now, and, therefore, we hesitate to take up your time; however, in the interest of reducing national tensions we want to pass along to you a suggestion for a program which might help immeasurably in keeping order in cities threatened with violence.

The overwhelming majority of Negro Americans are dedicated citizens, strongly opposed to disorder and violence. Involvement of these, our fellow citizens, in keeping the peace within their own neighborhoods is essential to the resolution of the current crises in our cities.

We suggest you use the persuasive powers of the Presidency by dramatically calling upon the communities to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade to de-fuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban Americans. We view the Crusade as autonomous local programs organized, developed, and directed completely by local citizens.

We urge the creation of the Neighborhood Action Crusade—local quasi-volunteer organizations to work constructively in rallying the stabilizing influence that exists in the neighborhoods. In this way, local neighborhood leaders, working within their own areas, can provide continuing communication and positive direction in this crusade to assure peace in America's cities. In many instances, this should be done on a block-by-block basis.

Volunteers would serve their own neighborhoods. Local government would provide administrative services and coordination of the program. The federal government would provide the funds and equipment to support the local effort.

We recall the success of the air raid warden program in England in World War II—admittedly hazardous duty. Here were volunteers asking what they could do for their country—serving without pay to help weather a crisis.

We suggest that this program be tried in those cities most frequently mentioned as so-called "target cities." We do not offer this as a panacea, but it could be a big step forward for the balance of the summer.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE BUSH,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM O. COWGER,
Member of Congress.
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1967.

DEAR MAYOR ———: Enclosed is a letter we have written the President in the hope of providing a constructive suggestion to defuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban Americans.

We have urged the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade. Our plan enlists volunteers to serve their own neighborhoods, to provide continuing communication and positive direction to assure peace in our cities.

Knowing how vitally concerned you are with this problem, we ask you to review this program. We urge its immediate implementation to the extent that it is desirable in your jurisdiction. We would appreciate your reaction and ideas as to its value. We do not consider this a panacea or a long term solution, but we believe it may offer immediate hope of reducing tensions.

Also enclosed is a resolution which we are offering on the House floor, Wednesday, August 2. We are asking our colleagues in both the Senate and the House to join us in this effort. Additionally we have written the Governor of your state asking for his advice on the plan.

Please let us have your thoughts.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE BUSH,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM O. COWGER,
Member of Congress.
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1967.

DEAR GOVERNOR ———: Enclosed is a letter we have written the President in the hope of providing a constructive suggestion to defuse the tensions now threatening the lives and property of urban Americans.

We have urged the President to use the persuasive powers of his office to initiate a Neighborhood Action Crusade. Our plan enlists volunteers to serve their own neighborhoods, to provide continuing communication and positive direction to assure peace in our cities.

Knowing how vitally concerned you are with this problem, we ask you to review this program. We urge its immediate implementation to the extent that it is desirable in your jurisdiction. We would appreciate your reaction and ideas as to its value. We do not consider this a panacea or a long term solution, but we believe it may offer immediate hope of reducing tensions.

An additional enclosure is a resolution which we are offering on the House floor, Wednesday, August 2. We are asking our colleagues in both the Senate and the House to join us in this effort. Also, we have written the Mayors seen on the enclosed list, asking for their advice.

Please let us have your thoughts.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE BUSH,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM O. COWGER,
Member of Congress.
CHARLES E. GOODELL,
Member of Congress.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

PRAISE FOR RURAL JOB DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, although there have been many letters of praise, plus editorial comment, about the Rural Job Development Act which I introduced in the House last week to supplement the legislation authored by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] and his colleagues, one letter which I feel is particularly apropos to the problem at hand came from Father John Lahey of St. Joseph's Church, Damar, Kans. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Father Lahey's letter appear in the RECORD. He sets forth some additional reasons why the adoption of this legislation is in the public interest. The letter follows:

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH,
Damar, Kans., July 25, 1967.

Hon. CHESTER MIZE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MIZE: I read recently, with considerable interest, of your proposed bill on rural job development.

Your efforts, and that of Senator Pearson, seem particularly timely in view of the riots which are now sweeping our large cities and producing problems which these centers of population are thus far unable to cope with. It is rather appalling, to say the least, to see so many small rural towns literally "die" because of the lack of job opportunities, while the problems of over-populated "inner cities" continue to mount.

The sad part about the situation is the fact that many of these small towns already have schools, housing and many of the other necessities to support a larger population if they could only come up with more job opportunities for potential residents. If the ever-decreasing farm population could somehow be replaced with workers in small businesses, manufacturing enterprises and the like these communities could not only survive, but could at the same time, I believe, contribute immeasurably to the solution of the very problems confronting cities (eg racial discrimination, over-crowding, etc)

I wish to compliment you for your efforts on behalf of the "small town" and wish you every success in your venture. I would appreciate receiving a copy of your bill and other pertinent literature.

Respectfully yours,
Rev. JOHN LAHEY.

P.S.—Thank you for your kind note on the occasion of my recent ordination to the priesthood.

JOHN McNAUGHTON

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last week was a very sad one for us as we attended the funeral of John McNaughton, his wife, Sarah, and their youngest son, Ted, who were killed in the tragic airplane accident in North Carolina.

Many glowing tributes have been said and written about John whose star shone so brightly in public service. We were

personally very proud of John's many fine achievements since he comes from our congressional district and his family is so deeply rooted in Pekin, Ill. The funeral, with the highest military honors for both John and his wife who was a former Wave, was a most impressive one which I shall never forget. The Navy hymn and anthem sung by the Navy Band Sea Chanters was very beautifully done and the eulogy of Mr. Yarmolinsky and sermon of Dr. Mason were most appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, as a lasting tribute to John McNaughton, I should like to have printed in the RECORD at this point the funeral service, the eulogy, sermon, and several of the articles written by John's father, Mr. F. F. McNaughton and appearing in the McNaughton family newspaper, the Pekin Times, on July 20, 21, 22, 24, and 25.

We shall mourn for years the loss of our friend John McNaughton, for he was truly one of our Nation's brightest rising stars:

FUNERAL SERVICE FOR JOHN THEODORE MCNAUGHTON, SARAH ELIZABETH FULKMAN MCNAUGHTON, THEODORE MCNAUGHTON, TUESDAY, JULY 25, 1967, THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL IN THE CITY AND DIOCESE OF WASHINGTON

THE ORDER OF SERVICE

(One o'clock)

The prelude

O Welt, ich muss dich lassen, Johannes Brahms.

The Navy Hymn, John Dykes.

Mein junges Leben hat ein End, Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck.

Das alte Jahr vergangen ist, Johann Sebastian Bach.

Prelude and Fugue in E minor, Johann Sebastian Bach.

Jesu, Joy of Man's Desiring, Johann Sebastian Bach.

The people stand as the procession enters the Cathedral.

Then shall the Minister say—

I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Then shall be read responsively the 23rd Psalm.

The Lord is my shepherd; therefore can I lack nothing.

He shall feed me in a green pasture, and lead me forth beside the waters of comfort.

He shall convert my soul, and bring me forth in the paths of righteousness for his Name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil; for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff comfort me.

Thou shalt prepare a table before me in the presence of them that trouble me; thou hast anointed my head with oil, and my cup shall be full.

Surely thy loving-kindness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.

Hymn (Tune: St. Anne), William Croft, 1708.

O God our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home:

Under the shadow of Thy throne
Thy saints have dwelt secure;
Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
And our defence is sure.

Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame,
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same.

A thousand ages in Thy sight
Are like an evening gone;
Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Be Thou our guide while life shall last,
And our eternal home. Amen.

(Isaac Watts: 1719; based on Psalm 90.)

Eulogy: *Read by Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor, Harvard Law School.*

Anthem: *Ralph Vaughan Williams.*

Let us now praise famous men, and our fathers that begat us. Such as did bear rule in their kingdom, men renowned for their power. Leaders of the people by their counsels, and by their knowledge. Such as found out musical tunes, and recited verses in writing: All these were honored in their generations, and were the glory of their times. And some there be, which have no memorial; who are perished, as though they had never been. Their bodies are buried in peace; but their name liveth for evermore (*from Ecclesiasticus 44.*)

Sermon: *Dr. Joseph A. Mason, Grace Methodist Church, Pekin, Illinois.*

Then shall the Minister say, The Lord be with you.

People. And with thy spirit.

Minister. Let us pray.

(All kneel.) Our Father, who art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy Kingdom come. Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

The prayers: *The Reverend Canon William G. Workman, Canon Precentor, Washington Cathedral.*

The Navy Hymn (sung kneeling): *"Melita."*

The blessing: *The Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., Suffragan Bishop of Washington.*

Seven-Fold Amen: *John Stainer.*

The Organ will play the National Anthem.

The Congregation will remain in their places until the procession has left the Cathedral.

Music by the United States Navy Band Sea Chanters directed by Warrent Officer Eugene McGowan.

[From the Pekin Times, July 26, 1967]

EULOGY: "EVERYONE LEARNED FROM HIM," SAYS MCNAUGHTON'S EULOGIST

Secretary of the Navy-designate John T. McNaughton was eulogized Tuesday in Washington National Cathedral by Dr. Adam Yarmolinsky, professor at Harvard Law School, where McNaughton held the rank of full professor and was a faculty member from 1953 until going to Washington, D.C., early in 1961, upon request of the late President John F. Kennedy.

The Navy Secretary-Designate, who with his wife, the former Sarah (Sally) Fulkman, and their younger son, Ted, 11, died in a plane crash near Hendersonville, N.C. last Wednesday, would have assumed his new duties as head of the United States Navy on Aug. 1.

Following is the eulogy delivered by Dr. Yarmolinsky, as official representative of Harvard Law School:

"The last time I saw John McNaughton was just a month ago when we spent an evening with a group of friends talking about the enormous demands that people in the world of ideas make on their government to be wise and just and good, and the enormous difficulty that people in government have in getting anything done at all.

"If ever anyone was fitted by temperament, by preparation, and by rigorous self-discipline to bridge the gap between those two worlds, it was John McNaughton.

"He recognized, as sharply as anyone I've known, the difficulties of effecting a change in the practice of government, once a decision had been taken in principle. Whether the task was to remove obsolete missiles from foreign bases, or to introduce new concepts into NATO doctrine, he knew in advance the kind of effort that would be required, and he marshalled all his resources to meet the challenge.

"And those resources were his sheer intelligence, his articulateness, and the physical energy that enabled him to put in 12-hour days six days a week. It was a measured energy too. He seldom came into the Pentagon on Sunday mornings. Part of that time was reserved for accumulated reading at home on matters that could be deferred during the week.

"His multiple careers, as a newspaperman, a lawyer, and a teacher, all contributed to his achievement.

"Whether it was a clause in the test-ban treaty, or the sham of the naval quarantine proclamation in the Cuba missile crisis, or a reply to Congressional mail, his lawyer's skills were focused on the problem as he turned to the typewriter that was always available behind his desk. No bureaucratic controversy ever dimmed his lawyer's sense of fair play. He insisted on precision in thought and word. I remember when we were considering a man for promotion to a new job, and I observed that he had some blind spots. John corrected me: "He doesn't have blind spots; he has bright spots. He sees some things so clearly they obscure other things he ought to pay attention to." There were few blind spots or bright spots in John McNaughton's vision of the world. He had already mastered the lawyer's highest art, the art of the relevant.

"His newspaperman's sense of where the spotlight of popular attention would turn stood him often in good stead. One day he came out of a meeting and called for special precautions to anticipate a possible news leak, because, he said, an incident in the meeting was the kind of story he would want to tell his wife, and that was an infallible test of news. The story did leak almost immediately, but the government was prepared and could minimize the consequences.

"Since he first taught the law of evidence at Harvard, John McNaughton never stopped being a teacher. Everyone who came into contact with him, learned from him. And the standards he set for his students were no higher than the standards he set for himself.

"With all the talents and energies that he brought to his work, he still had talents and energies to spare. His physical energies found expression in class tennis, his mental energies in music and painting. The abstract oil painting he did of the Cuba missile crisis expressed not only for him, but for many of his associates, the feelings we shared during those critical days.

"John never wasted energy. I wondered why he chose the stairs rather than the escalator to reach his office till I discovered that one could get there faster by taking the steps two at a time instead of riding with the crowd.

"John made time in his life for his family, whom he loved. He and Sally were on the way back from picking up Ted at summer camp when they were all killed. We cannot speak of him without speaking of them.

"Sally's openness and grace warmed her friends, while the work she did in the District schools warmed many who never knew

her. She enjoyed her roles as hostess, housewife, and mother, and she enjoyed them in part because she did them so well. We can be happy that she had the satisfaction of seeing Alex well launched into life. And we know that Alex will have the support of his whole family, from Indiana to California, just as John and Sally did.

"John McNaughton had few illusions about the problems he faced in his work. He never underestimated his own antagonists or his country's. His view of the world was expressed in Houseman's poem:

"'I to my perils
Of cheat and charmer
Came clad in armour
By stars benign.
Hope lies to morals
And most believe her,
But man's deceiver
Was never mine.
The thoughts of others
Were light and fleeting,
Of lovers' meeting
Or luck or fame.
Mine were of trouble,
And mine were steady;
So I was ready
When trouble came.'

"But John was not a gloomy man. He was a natural member of Mr. Justice Holmes' 'imaginary society of jobbists, who,' Holmes said, 'were free to be egotists or altruists on the usual Saturday half holiday provided they were neither while on their job. Their job is their contribution to the general welfare and when a man is on that, he will do it better the less he thinks either of himself or of his neighbors, and the more he puts all his energy into the problem he has to solve.'

"If, as has been said, happiness consists of the fullest use of one's powers in the pursuit of excellence, then John McNaughton was indeed a happy man."

[From the Pekin Times, July 26, 1967]

SERMON: HONOR, INTEGRITY ARE JOHN T. MCNAUGHTON'S LEGACIES TO SON: MASON

"For everything there is a season . . . and a time for every matter under heaven.
There is a time to be born and a time to die,
A time to weep and a time to laugh
A time to dance—and a time to mourn."

This is our time for mourning.

But as we mourn, we are not without comfort. There is a balm in Gilead, there is solace for our souls, there is healing for our wounds.

Such comfort we have found today in God's Word as we have heard it read; in the great hymn of our faith as we have heard it sung; in the eloquent words of eulogy from the lips and heart of a trusted friend. There is comfort, too, in the wealth of tender memories that reach back far across the years as happy moments are lived and relived over and over again. Of these memories I shall not seek to speak—for they are your own. Private and precious—in them your loved ones seem very, very close again.

There is a quality of life which lives on after man has gone—that which is noblest and finest—that which endears him to his loved ones and his associates. For John McNaughton, that quality was integrity.

In 1953, General Dean, a prisoner of the Communists at Chong-ju, was told he had 30 minutes to live, and was given writing material for a farewell message to his family. The letter was not long—I remember one line. Referring to his son, he said, "Tell Bill the word is integrity." With John McNaughton—and with his family, the word is integrity—and this is the noble legacy he leaves for his son—honor, integrity.

Back home, Mr. McNaughton, Sr., has a daily column, "The Editor's Letter," in our paper. It is the best part of the paper—the first thing to which we turn each day. Somehow, his columns remind me of the Psalms: one day grappling with some great international problem—one day probing at the mysteries of the universe and speculating about the space age—the next a wistful memory out of the distant past and the next opening up his heart, revealing some anguish of his spirit, and bringing tears to our eyes.

And, like the psalmist, his words carry penetrating spiritual insights. On the day following the tragic news that stunned our nation, he wrote simply "John's life is an unfinished story." He went on, then to speak of shining dreams now shattered—of Sally's charm and ready laughter—of young Ted. And then in closing he recalled their last letter from John, received only an hour before his death, a letter that closed with these words: "All's well, John."

Now we take heart today that our faith is a faith built for the storm. Surely "we are not as those who have no hope." For what we believe about life and death is largely determined by what we believe about God and Man:

We believe God is a Spirit, and man, created in His image, is spirit.

We believe that God is Eternal, and man, created in His image, bears the stamp of immortality.

So this is our faith—that life is not finished—for John, or Sally, or Ted.

Their story is "to be continued" in the eternal dreams and purposes of God.

To be sure, lonely hours will come when we shall echo the ancient cry of anguish—"Why, God, why?" But this calls for an answer God does not intend us to have; our hearts and minds are not great enough to hold it. The puny measuring sticks of man can never measure the horizons of God's infinite wisdom and love.

We can only declare with Whittier—

"To one fixed trust our spirit clings,
We know that God is good!"

And somewhere out there in the great Beyonds of God, life goes on—for John, and Sally, and Ted—together.

This is the faith in which we come today to lay our dead away: "Their story is not finished."

But, if in some dark and lonely hour that faith should ever waver, may we recall John's own last words of confident reassurance: "All's well! All's well!"

[From the Pekin Times, July 20, 1967]

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

John's life is an unfinished story.

He had ongoing plans.

He had stacks of notes on the very inside of things in these exciting years; notes that now will not find their way into books.

His mother, too, had an unfinished book.

For years, with painstaking effort, she has been assembling a memory book of little and big events in John's life. This summer she was bringing it to a sort of semicolon, and planned to give it to John this Christmas.

But now! How small will be the Christmas box to Washington, D.C.

We will read the memory book.

Thanks, John, for wonderful, wonderful memories.

John escaped wolf packs of submarines in the Atlantic. He escaped suicide dive bombers in the Pacific. Only 10 days ago he escaped death's tricks in Vietnam. Then yesterday, while John and Sally were bringing Ted home for his 12th birthday, Death reached out and took them all.

Ted is a big loss, too.

Dean and later (two weeks ago) Foy visited in John and Sally's home, and both had been telling us what a brilliant child Ted was.

Ted didn't get a chance at life.

Sally also had so much more of youthful life to offer. She was quick of mind and quick with laughter. She handled help well and during their years in Paris, she became fluent with French. Having a second language helped greatly in entertaining, at which she was expert.

She was an only child.

Ceil and I take comfort in the fact that John enjoyed life.

Going up is fun. Much of John's life, he was going up. There had to be bad years ahead—bad years and old age. That plane crash freed him of them.

Nobody knows how much we'll miss his letters. His last one came an hour before his death.

Last words of letter were:

"All's well.—John."

Again, John, thanks for wonderful, wonderful memories.

[From the Pekin Times, July 21, 1967]

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

When heartbreaking news comes to a friend, I wonder:

"Where did he get the news?"

"How did he hear it."

Ours came from a phone call.

But not crushing, at first.

The phone call came from Sally's mother, Mrs. John A. Fulkman of LaGrange.

"Did you hear about the plane crash?"

"No I've been outside."

I must have misunderstood the next words. (Our party line is not working well.)

I heard her say "Atlanta."

"They could not have been at Atlanta."

Maybe she said the flight originated in Atlanta.

Anyway, I promised to call the Pentagon. Then I told Ceil there had been a plane crash in North Carolina; and we just had a letter written the day before from John in Asheville, N.C.

So I called personally for John at the Pentagon.

"Sorry, he's out of city."

Then John's secretary heard my voice ask: "Is he due home this morning?"

Instantly she said:

"Mr. McNaughton, don't leave the line."

She never had said it that way before.

John's aide, Col. Hixon, came on the wire:

"Mr. McNaughton, we too have heard the radio reports."

I asked:

"Were John and Sally and Ted scheduled for that plane?"

"Yes; but we do not know if they got on it nor do we know if there were survivors. Will call you as soon as we learn anything."

To Ceil I said: "The information is very bad, John doesn't miss planes."

Half hour later the Pentagon called:

"Their names were on the passenger list."

Another half hour later:

"They were seen going thru the gate."

'Twas more than one gate they were to pass within minutes.

The second one was forever.

[From the Pekin Times, July 22, 1967]

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

Tears are in our eyes.

Tears over the honors which our government plans to give to John and Sally.

Yes, and to little Ted.

Perhaps not before in Washington have the caskets of man and wife both been flag-draped in a full military funeral.

Right after our arrival in Washington, Secretary McNamara told us the plan. (All pending the recovery of John's body).

We had thought perhaps we would have a quiet service in the chapel at Arlington National Cemetery.

"Oh, no," they said.

It will be in the great National Cathedral. John, having been appointed Secretary of the Navy, and Sally, having been an officer in the WAVES, the Navy band will play and the WAVES Chanteers will sing during the cathedral service.

The Defense Department is sending a plane to Pekin to get the Reverend Joseph A. Mason, D. D., pastor of the church in which John grew up. Also, it will pick up pallbearers from Pekin; some from Sally's home city; and a president of an Indiana university.

Ah—there came an interruption.

We've just found Alex.

Found him in Venice, Italy.

Dean has just joined the Defense Department in telling Alex that all his family had been killed.

When I was interrupted, I was about to tell you that the route to the cemetery will be the same as that taken for the late President Kennedy; and, note this, the three will be buried in one grave within nine feet of the lawn that surrounds the grave of President Kennedy, who brought John to Washington.

When Dean learned that we were to get that burial plot, it was almost more than he could take.

So greatly did he want that spot, on a little knoll, on a direct line between the Lincoln Memorial and the Robert E. Lee mansion.

President Kennedy, too, has a boy buried with him.

[From the Pekin Times, July 24, 1967]

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By. F. F. McNaughton)

At high noon Tuesday (Illinois time) the nation will begin its memorial service for Secretary of the Navy-Designate John T. McNaughton, and for his wife, Sally, who was an officer in the WAVES, and for brilliant young Ted, who would have been 12 yesterday.

Two events Sunday made the Tuesday funeral possible.

First, we found Alex in Venice, Italy. Dean and Alex' Grandmother Fulkman flew to New York and met the Pan-American jet that brought Alex winging home from Europe. They and John's highly capable aide, Col. Nixon, whisked Alex (18 and 6'4''), and his traveling buddy right on to Washington.

Second, the FBI identified John's body.

So now we have the third coffin; the second flag-draped casket; and we are digging the one grave for the three of them. We had been in deep dismay lest John's body never be found. That would have been no grave in Arlington, close to the President who brought him to high government circles.

To our dying day we shall be grateful to and proud of the men who will honor John and Sally by being their honorary pallbearers.

They are:

Governor Otto Kerner of John's and Sally's home state.

Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen from John's home town of Pekin, Ill.

Robert McNamara, Secretary of Defense.

McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to President Johnson, next door neighbor and tennis partner from Cambridge, Mass., days.

Deputy Secretary of the Treasury Joseph Barr from Bicknell, Ind., where John was born. They were fraternity brothers at DePauw University.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze.

Dr. William E. Kerstetter, president of DePauw University, where John was a trustee, and from which both John and Sally were graduated.

James M. Unland, thru whom Pekin friends are showing their personal sorrow in the loss of John, Sally and young Ted.

As this is being written, the sun is shining on beautiful Arlington National cemetery; but the forecast for Tuesday is "chance of showers." So those who have not already left for Washington would do well to bring rain gear. However, the memorial service will be inside the great National Cathedral, where all attention will be on the Navy band, the Sea Chanters, the speakers, and distinguished guests of this and foreign nations.

The time of the service will be 1 p.m. EDT, Washington; noon, CDT.

[From the Pekin Times, July 25, 1967]

THE EDITOR'S LETTER

(By F. F. McNaughton)

If some day you go to Washington, D.C., and if you should want to visit the grave where John T. McNaughton and his wife, Sally, and their son, Ted, were buried together on July 25, 1967, here are the directions for finding the grave:

You drive across the Potomac River to the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Memorial Bridge crosses the Potomac on a direct line from the Lincoln Memorial to the Robert E. Lee Mansion.

You ask how to get to the President Kennedy grave. It is in the front yard of the Robert E. Lee Mansion which has a wide front porch with many tall pillars.

The Kennedy plot is about as big as half a city block. A sidewalk circles it—a wide sidewalk, because thousands climb that circle.

You are directed to go up the right side of the circle.

About midway up, behind a small magnolia tree, there is a knoll; and on this lovely grassy knoll is the grave of Oliver Wendell Holmes—one of the nation's most beloved men.

Immediately beside the Holmes grave, on the right as you face it, will be a new tombstone with the one word, McNaughton. (On the other side will be a statement of who is buried in the grave, and a brief history of John's life.)

If you miss it on the way up, you can stand at the Kennedy grave and look across the Potomac towards the Lincoln Memorial. The McNaughton grave, where we just now, after a full military funeral with the President of the United States in attendance, put John, Sally and Ted, will be about 30 degrees to your left, and a few feet from the edge of the grass which is part of the expansive Kennedy area.

ATTENTION: BIG SPENDERS AND DO-GOODERS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members of Congress are requested by constituents to invite the attention of other Members to certain problems or issues.

By letter dated July 27, 1967, Mrs. Faye Wilson of 93 E. Chase Road, Columbus, Ohio, for herself and other "worried citizens" indicated a desire to express their views to the President and the Congress as follows:

Mr. President and Congress:

This letter is only for the big spenders and so called "do gooders." This is from little taxpayers. We cannot afford *any* new income or social security taxes on top of the state and local ones. Inflation takes care of what's left "after" taxes. We younger married people have enough burdens without more! We stand to lose our little homes we're attempting to pay for. *We* can't increase taxes or a "debt limit." We live on what we make and feel the government should do the same. Why *want* something one can't afford?

Your "War on Poverty" should be called *"for"* Poverty! Why is it your tax increases only affect us "median" income people.

Never the rich? Why social security increases *up to* $7,800 or $10,800? Why not *after* $20,000 or up? Why Medicare for the rich? *Surely* they can pay their own doctor bills! Soon there will be only the very poor or very rich! Various "war on poverty" schemes have been tried and failed for 30 years! Surely it's time to admit it can't be done? You can lead a horse to water but you can't make it drink! People that won't help themselves *can't* be helped! "Eradicate poverty" indeed! For shame, gentlemen! You're trying to go over God's Head! Jesus said "the poor ye shall have with ye always." And *you're* going to "eradicate" poverty!

We come from the hills of Ky (not all of us from Ky or South) where people are very poor, and have worked hard to get where we are. It makes us mad to see us being pushed back where we started by high taxes and supporting people too sorry to work and educate themselves. We worked for 40¢ an hour to put ourselves thru high school and feel others can do the same. Some of our parents went thru the 4th or 6th grades only, but they never went on welfare or A.D.C.! They worked at any job they could find and still do! There are *pages of* want ads for maids, cooks, laundry work, service station attendents and so on! You don't need college for these jobs. Also most unemployment offices have job training programs, and yet people aren't working!

There's the Hod Carriers & Common Laborer's Union, etc., that "uneducated" men, or that have guts enough to WORK! Most of the poverty money seems to go for salaries, for we don't see anyone that's been "helped."

Why should our hard earned money go for high school "dropouts." Let them return to school or night school! We have children in school and can't afford to send them to college at the rate things are going! I don't see *you*, Mr. President, or the Kennedys, and other rich people donating *all* your salaries or *all* your money to poor people! You give all your "dough" away *then* we'll believe you're sincere!

As for Viet Nam, we say either win the "war" or get out! Why waste one American's life when Viet Nam will go to the Reds anyway? Get Mr. McNamara out of office, and get someone who knows what he's doing, IF possible!

Also more should be done to stop these race riots and crime. There *are* poor whites as well as *other* minority races living in the slums and they aren't rioting! Neither are the decent Negroes. They realize it'll take time and work on their parts, too, to improve their conditions! *I'm* a Southerner, but feel Negroes that are qualified and work should have the same pay, jobs and homes we whites have. No, its not poverty causing these riots! They're instigated by guess who?

Have slum landlords fix up their property and if people don't keep it clean and nice, *evict* them! It's not right for landlords to fix up places only to have them wrecked. Being poor is no excuse for being *dirty* or without morals!

As for these "beatnick" teenagers and students being so bad, no wonder! Too many mothers *have* to go to work to support them and aren't at home to guide them. Babies don't need their mother at home as much as older children! Too many parents today seem too "busy" or lazy to teach their children morals and respect for others they cry "what's wrong with kids?" I say what's

wrong with these parents. I've seen children 12 and under left *alone* to roam while *both* parents work, also 2 yr. olds playing in the streets and roaming over the neighborhood *alone!* And this in so called "professional" or upper class neighborhoods!

Gentlemen, we are told we are a free country, governed by the people! Not so anymore! We go vote, but for what? Our wishes aren't carried out you all know whats *"good"* for us better than we do! You all cry "fight communism," then proceed to practice it yourselves in the guise of wars on poverty, medicare, and other schemes. No, we no longer have a free country governed by the people, or it wouldn't be in this mess!

Does power and position mean that much to you, gentlemen, that you'll do *anything* to stay in office? Your grandchildren will grow up, too, you know: and there was *once* powerful and wealthy families in Russia, China etc.? Where are *they* now? They *started* out to help the "workers" and poor, too!

No wonder Americans are confused and in a "state of apathy and do nothing." What good does voting, etc., do? We seem to be fighting a losing battle so *why* try?

"Unfortunately," we are "die hards" or this letter wouldn't have been written!

MRS. FAYE WILSON
and WORRIED CITIZENS.

LEST WE GET TOO SMUG

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, contrary to the thoughts of some Americans, senseless destruction is by no means confined to the ghetto. There are times when it occurs, and where it takes place, away from the underprivileged, that defy even rationalization. Does it make any sense for one of the highest per capita income counties in the country to experience the type of destruction to its parks described in a column by William A. Caldwell in the major suburban daily newspaper, the Record, of Bergen County, N.J.?

Just contemplate it. In white, middle-class, suburban America, plumbers equipment is used to rip out pipes and toilets in park restrooms, special tools are brought in to dismantle heavy equipment like bulldozers, drag races take place on public golf courses, lumber is dumped into ponds, equipment is stolen, even signs identifying trees and plants are slashed.

What do these people lack in terms of equal opportunity? In schools? In jobs? Perhaps we should ask, What do they lack in moral education directed toward their responsibilities within society? Is there really any answer? Or are we left, with Columnist Caldwell, to consider the young who "mugs nature herself under the cover of darkness" as a mystery, leaving us with nothing to do "but gasp a prayer."

There is a certain self-satisfied type of American who looks to the ghetto riots with a mixture of fear and disgust, and smugly believes that "it can't happen here"—meaning his own comfortable community or neighborhood. But it does happen "here." And how do we cope with society when "the parks are not safe in the parks anymore"?

The column by William A. Caldwell in the August 5, 1967, issue of the Record, of Hackensack, N.J., follows for all thoughtful Americans to consider:

THE ENEMY IN THE PARK
(By William A. Caldwell)

In a way that ought to but won't fascinate the President's select committee on what's bugging us this time, the violence in the suburbs this short, wet summer is more noteworthy than the violence in the ghettos.

Regardless of the midcity rioter's psychic anatomy, you know what he wants.

He wants equality. He wants respect. He wants not to be different or treated differently when he goes to ask for a house or a job or an education.

It doesn't matter whether you hold with William Golding in "Lord of the Flies" that humanity is innately and incurably evil or with Albert Camus in "The Plague" that it is innately and incurably noble. Violence in the slum states a demand. Give me liberty or give me six bottles of whisky, a color television set, and the studious attention of the United States Army.

The ghetto rioter serves an ultimatum. Receiving no response, he goes to war. He walks with kings. You have to grant to kings and rioters the virtue of clarity.

But I can't help wondering what a white boy, well brought up in the suburbs of wide lawns and strong family structures, has in mind when he wrecks a county park.

It seems to me that when James A. McFaul, executive director of the Bergen County Park Commission, described the other day the mean and mindless disfigurement of public parks he raised a question that goes to the heart of mankind's dreadful illness.

A rioter's anger can be understood, and so can his willingness to appease himself with an armload of booze and toasters and maybe an air-conditioner he'll never know how to install and operate.

He is a simple case of cause and effect. The rioter has a purpose, and the fact that it is an evil purpose need not be relevant. At the very least he's getting even with somebody for something.

This is lofty ethics indeed compared with the motivation of young people who spend their evenings destroying their own parks.

Look at Mr. McFaul's catalogue of destruction and defacement in parks which the people decreed so that the pressure of living crammed together might be relieved a little for us all, including the young:

Plumbers' equipment is lugged into the parks to rip out pipes and toilets in rest rooms.

Specialized tools are brought to disable heavy equipment like bulldozers.

Obscenities are written or painted on fences and buildings—of course.

Motorcycle riders drag race on the fairways and greens of the Overpeck Golf Course, which hasn't been opened to players yet, and our most precious resource has been riding bicycles through newly seeded greens.

Windows are broken, lumber is laboriously dragged to a pond and dumped in, surveyors' stakes are ripped up, equipment and materials are stolen, signs identifying trees and plants are slashed.

This is a protest against what? It is a demand for what? It is a statement of what hunger of grievance or wrath?

The questions are meant to be considered seriously, because it seems to me that until we understand what impels young people to desecrate themselves and their own household we shall not understand why young people become old people who make a mess of the world they must live in.

Again, the rioter in the ghetto is comprehensible. He knows what he's doing and why. Comprehensible is the gang of privileged suburbanites who so hate their world that they took a sledge-hammer to Pascack Hills High School. Likewise as respectable as a law in physics is the Klansman who mugs Catholics, the Wasp who mugs Jews, the white Christian who dynamites black churches. They are as natural and specific as a rattlesnake.

But in the presence of the black and bottomless mystery of the child who loathes woods and seedling grass and air and open space, who assaults with tools the environment which defines him and holds him in his shape, who mugs Nature herself under cover of darkness—in the presence of this mystery what can you do but gasp a prayer?

We have learned to deal at least inwardly with the sound of shots and shattered glass and running feet. But how shall we cope when the parks aren't safe in the parks anymore?

TAX INCREASE?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a statement by the Committee on Taxation of the National Association of Manufacturers on the state of the economy makes an excellent presentation of the magnitude of our present fiscal dilemma, and the reasons for its existence. The statement points out the basic reason for the fiscal crisis—uncontrolled Federal spending—and suggests long-range methods by which the Congress could acquire and assert meaningful control over the pace of Federal spending.

All of the alternative ways to finance a deficit of the size presently contemplated—$30 billion in fiscal 1968—involve economic damage. Marketing $30 billion of Government bonds to the public would raise interest rates to intolerable levels, and seriously depress the housing industry, State and local government construction, and business investment. If the Federal Reserve System purchased $30 billion in bonds, the uncontrolled expansion of the money supply would certainly lead to increased inflation. The problems in financing the deficit by a tax increase are the economic harm that higher tax rates might cause, plus the danger that higher rates could bring on a recession—and actually reduce total revenue.

The only way out of the fiscal mess is a cut in Federal expenditures by as much as possoble, but at least by $10 billion. Then, and only then, would it be worthwhile to discuss what mix of a tax increase, debt financing, and sale of capital assets would cause the least harm to the economy. The statement referred to follows:

GOVERNMENT ACTION IN THE CURRENT FISCAL CRISIS

(Statement of views of the NAM Taxation Committee)

The present state of the American economy in general, and the fiscal situation of the federal government in particular, make

this a period of extreme difficulty in the formulation of tax policy. An increase in taxation could delay and impede a resumption of economic growth after the present business slowdown. Profits have been on a downslide since a year ago, and there has been some impairment of business confidence. A tax increase might make these tendencies worse. But the large federal deficit which appears likely in the absence of a tax increase would also have severely damaging effects on the economy.

The reason the country finds itself in this unpleasant dilemma is its earlier failure to exercise control over the growth of federal spending. Non-defense spending has been rising at a faster rate than the revenue yielded by the existing tax system. This continuous growth of non-defense spending is the heart of the nation's present fiscal problems. Any program for dealing with these problems must have as its keystone a concerted and carefully planned effort to regain control over non-defense spending.

The immediate situation is that we are threatened with a fiscal 1968 federal deficit which, in the opinion of reliable authorities, may go close to $30 billion. The necessity for funding a deficit of this magnitude would place severe strains on the nation's credit resources, and raise interest rates to a level which would make it extremely difficult for the private economy to provide capital, particularly in such fields as housing, state and local construction, and business investment. Alternatively, if the Federal Reserve System were to expand the credit base so as to accommodate funding so large a deficit at low interest rates, the nation would be subjected to powerful inflationary pressures.

The most desirable method of dealing with this problem, of course, would be to eliminate or greatly reduce the threatened 1968 deficit by a cut in expenditures. To control inflation, expenditure reduction is more effective than tax increases which may be passed on in part in higher prices. Without extensive evaluation of programs, Congress and the Administration may, however, be limited at this time in their ability to accomplish an adequate reduction in non-defense spending for fiscal 1968 since much of the spending is a result of substantive legislation passed in earlier years. If this turns out to be the case, an increase in taxation might be considered as "the least of the evils."

There is an inherent danger, however, in using a tax increase as a corrective for an excessive deficit. A tax increase might so reduce the pressures for spending reduction, that its end-effect could be to increase expenditures over what they otherwise would have been, rather than to reduce the deficit below what it otherwise would have been. Whatever is done in the present fiscal crisis must guard against such a tendency.

At the present juncture, anything that is done, and anything that is not done, involves its own set of risks. But decisions have to be made, and the NAM Taxation Committee recommends the following program for government action during the present fiscal crisis:

(1) Congress and the Administration should immediately undertake a program for reducing federal expenditures and controlling their future growth. This program should have the following characteristics:

a. It should be carefully planned and organized. The same kind of detailed planning should be applied to achieve economy as is now applied to developing proposals that involve spending more money.

b. Specific responsibility for the program should be assigned to definite persons in the Administration and to definite members of Congress. Without such an assignment, efforts to achieve economy might amount to no more than pious declarations.

c. The program should have the short-run objective of reducing the deficit in fiscal 1968, so as to avoid or minimize the need for a tax increase.

d. The program should also have the long-run objective of regaining control over the growth of spending in the future. This would require consideration of changes in substantive legislation, as well as appropriations. This long-run effort would be necessary to ensure that any tax increase enacted in 1967 or 1968 would be only temporary, and would not be used to support a permanently higher level of spending. The concept incorporated in H.R. 10520 introduced by Chairman Mills on June 5, 1967 merits support as part of a long-range program to control federal spending. It would establish a Government Program Evaluation Commission comprised of private citizens whose duties it would be to evaluate existing federal programs and make recommendations to the President and to the Congress as to their effectiveness, whether they should be continued, and their relative priority. Without a high-level coordinated effort of this nature, proliferation of federal programs can be expected to continue unabated.

(2) If, after such an economy effort it appears that the nation is nevertheless threatened with the probability of a deficit in fiscal 1968 so large as to be potentially damaging to the economy, Congress may be impelled to enact a tax increase. If a tax increase is enacted by Congress, it should be designed in accordance with the following principles:

a. Any tax increase should be clearly labeled "temporary" and should provide for its own termination at the end of one year. A tax increase for any longer period would reduce the pressures for government economy, and is therefore undesirable.

b. Any tax increase should be of such character as to do minimum damage to business profitability and business confidence, since these factors are so vital in determining the general level of employment and economic activity. For example, any further speedup of corporate tax collections, especially one which is concentrated on small business, should be avoided at this time. Past speedup of such collections has impaired the cash resources of business for meeting its needs for current operation and expansion.

c. Decision as to the dollar amount of any tax increase must of necessity be a compromise. It should be sufficient to reduce the deficit substantially, but not so great as to impair the economy. We should not try to make up by a rise in taxes that part of the deficit which results from the present economic slowdown. Such a course would be self-defeating.

d. During the period of any temporary tax increase, no fundamental changes in the tax structure should be made.

e. Any tax increase should take the form of a one-year surcharge of a common fixed percentage on all net liabilities for personal and corporate income taxes.

(3) In undertaking such a program, Congress should make a firm declaration of its intention to halt the excessive growth of federal spending and to be guided, in both appropriations and substantive legislation, by that objective. This will help create confidence that any tax increase if enacted will in fact be temporary, and thus minimize its adverse impact on the economy. The absence of assurance on this point would create the fear that such a tax increase is only the first of a series.

* * * * *

At the time of its enactment, the 1964 tax reduction was hailed as a clear indication that henceforth the Nation would seek to grow by expansion of the private economy rather than by expansion of government. The NAM Taxation Committee is convinced that this is still the wish of the American people. The program recommended above is designed to get us back on that track as quickly as possible.

If the economy continues to maintain its growth trend of the 1960's, the over-all gain of federal revenues should approach $8–$10 billion per year. There are many indications that this revenue gain may be appropriated for expansion of existing programs and adoption of new programs. Taxpayers, who bear the cost of government and to whom the government turns when revenue emergencies arise, should insist that in the disposition of the expected revenue gain, absolute priority be accorded to tax rate reduction when the present emergency is over.

PULP AND PAPER INDUSTRY TRADE EXPERT EVALUATES U.S. FOREIGN PULP AND PAPER TRADE AND KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Eric G. Lagerloef, international trade director of the American Paper Institute, recently spoke on the question "Did the Paper Industry Benefit From the Kennedy Round?" at a meeting of the institute's government relations committee in Washington on July 20. Mr. Lagerloef answers the question he posed affirmatively, concluding that the pulp and paper industry, on balance, did benefit from the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

I recommend Mr. Lagerloef's speech to those who are interested in a good explanation of the results of the trade negotiations in the pulp and paper sector.

I also draw particular notice to Mr. Lagerloef's concluding remarks about the problems of the future in trade negotiations:

> The future thrust of international trade conferences will be on non-tariff barriers . . . Since our industry will have no really strong arguments on tariffs, it might be well for us to begin thinking about these non-tariff barriers, and artificial trade obstacles. Many export opportunities are present, but we are hindered by local regulations which could possibly be eliminated through negotiations.

Because it is our exporters themselves who are hindered by other-than-tariff barriers, and who therefore have the facts about them, they must bring such cases to government with adequate documentation. Mr. Lagerloef recognizes this and asks his industry's international trade committee, whose members represent 20 companies accounting for 80 percent of U.S. pulp and paper exports, to bring such cases to light. I repeat my previous assurances that I will do everything possible to try to correct those non-tariff barriers brought to my attention.

Mr. Lagerloef's speech follows:

DID THE PAPER INDUSTRY BENEFIT FROM THE KENNEDY ROUND?

Just a little over a year and a half ago, I had the pleasure of talking to you on the current and near-term outlook for U.S. pulp and paper exports. At that time, I directed my talk to four main topics: balance of pay-

ments, GATT developments, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the prospects for trade legislation.

Today, the main emphasis will be on the results of the Kennedy Round and its possible long term effect on the paper industry. Brief reference will be made to the other three topics to provide continuity of developments.

In this discussion I would like to give a brief review of GATT and the long, intensive negotiations; and then, take what country information is available and review each in the light of the concessions granted.

THE KENNEDY ROUND—THE SIXTH GATT NEGOTIATION

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or GATT was established by the Havana Charter of 1947, and was ostensibly set up to break down world trade barriers to provide for a greater flow of trade and for a quicker rehabilitation of the world after the devastating World War II. Since its inception, six negotiating sessions have been held, the first five providing but modest progress, while the last, the Kennedy Round, proved that the way for freer world trade was now open. These latter negotiations begun in May, 1963, were concluded May 15, 1967—four years later. The general agreement was signed on June 30th, the exact date the negotiating power under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 expired. For many months the outcome was in doubt, but in the final two weeks of very intensive bargaining, pieces fell into place and the results were successful. Had it not been for the sincere desire on the part of the major trading nations to successfully conclude the many months of arduous negotiating so that many nations would benefit, the negotiations would have ended in failure.

At these sessions, 60,000 items, covering $40 billion in world trade were negotiated. The United States alone had 6,300 products on the bargaining table, valued at $16 billion—$8 billion each in import and export trade. Fifty-four countries participated, and of these, forty-six signed the accord. However, of this number only thirty-eight undertook to make tariff concessions, but these included all the principal trading nations, accounting for seventy-five percent of world trade.

Many important agreements and understandings were arrived at on anti-dumping, agricultural products and with the less developed countries, but I am going to confine my remarks to the industrial sector, which includes pulp, paper and board. Here is where our interests lie and where specific emphasis should be placed.

Let me just explain the staging process which under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, required the United States to phase out its concessions in five successive steps. With a general 50 percent cut given on most products, inclusive of all paper and board items, the first 10 percent cut will go into effect January 1, 1968, and for the next four successive years, tariffs will be lowered 10 percent annually, until the final stage is reached January 1, 1972. For example, if the current duty rate on a product is 5 percent, the rate will drop to 4 percent on January 1, 1968, and there will be a 1 percent decline each January 1 up to 1972.

RÉSUMÉ OF U.S. TARIFFS CUTS SINCE 1930

The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 was highly protectionist in character and the paper and board industry had protective tariffs ranging from 5 to 75 percent, with the major number of items covered by rates of 30 percent and above. Over the years, due principally to the first five GATT negotiations, tariffs had been whittled down to less than half of the 1930 rate in many instances. It is a well known fact that in these bargaining sessions, paper and board were used to negotiate lower duties for other products abroad. Despite strong protests from the industry before each GATT negotiating session, the State Department continued this practice.

In the Kennedy Round, paper and board products were offered on a linear basis cut of 50 per cent, as were the products of many other industries. In these latest negotiations, several large trading nations, especially Canada, offered meaningful cuts in paper and board tariffs. Each of the countries where information is now available, though in some instances somewhat sketchy, will be reviewed later in this talk.

Our industry can expect an increase in imports of paper and board over the next several years, due to the across-the-board cuts. The question can now be asked, how much of an effect will these added imports have on certain sectors of our industry? Past cuts in tariffs have caused a number of maladjustments, but generally speaking, developments in new and faster paper machines and the growth in output per man-hour have been able to balance off some of the effects of these imports.

An analysis of the import value of dutiable paper and board in 1966 shows that cumulative value was about $96 million. If one were to subtract building board items from this total, the value would drop to about $80 million. This figure has not varied very much over the past several years. It will be interesting to see if there will be a marked rise over the next five years as duty rates are gradually lowered.

In the fall of 1963, when the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations announced public hearings as a prelude to the GATT negotiations, it was stated that all dutiable paper and board items with a rate of 5 percent or less ad valorem would be offered on a "free list." Inclusive of building board, eleven paper and board grades were in this category, with an approximate import value of about $9 million. In the Kennedy Round, only six of these items were placed on the "free list," but these will be phased-out over a period of five years. They were building boards of vegetable fibers, inclusive of wood fibre, building papers and building paper felts, beer mat board, pulpboard in rolls chiefly used in the manufacture of building boards, untreated; paperboard, not specially provided for, inclusive of wet machine board, and other, and hanging paper. 1966 imports were about 36,000 tons, valued at about $4.8 million. The remaining five items not placed on the "free list," were offered on the general list for 50 percent cuts.

Before reviewing the paper and board tariff cuts made by other countries, as now available, I would like to explain the workings of the "Most Favored Nation" clause, better known as MFN. Under the GATT Charter, each negotiating country is obliged to extend to all other participating nations on an equal basis, all tariff cuts that have been agreed upon, whether or not the other trading partners even place those items up for negotiation. Our industry as previously stated, has had a sad series of experiences in this field, for we did not receive any meaningful cuts in paper and board tariffs from our major trading partners in the past. In fact, in most cases, they kept their paper and board tariffs up, but gave concessions in other products. These results are what made a very strong impression on our industry, and its statement backing the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 for freer world trade could really be called a last gesture and a hope that the Kennedy Round could achieve in part or in whole what the previous five negotiations failed to attain.

The importance of the duty cuts received from other countries, though they may be less than they had been hoped for, will still further open up our export markets for pulp, paper and board. Our industry is beginning to rely more and more on world markets as an outlet, as evident in the growing export volume. Last year, wood pulp exports were over 1.5 million tons, while paper and board exports neared the 2 million ton mark. In value, this was over $700 million, an increase of over 10 percent from 1965, and over $200 million since 1963.

To summarize briefly this overall review of our industry's experience in tariff cuts under the six GATT negotiations, suffice it to say that duty rates had been cut substantially, and the latest 50 percent cut will set many paper and board duty rates in the 5 percent or less category by January 1, 1972. The final rates were enumerated in our industry letters of June 30th and July 7th.

OTHER COUNTRY CONCESSIONS

Before giving you what information is available at this early date from other countries, it should be pointed out that there may be minor modifications in the rates, as errors and omissions are reviewed by the negotiating participants because of the hectic atmosphere of the "do or die" last two weeks of negotiating.

Canada

The first country to be reviewed is Canada, which has issued very complete information. This was sent to our industry on July 11, based on data received from the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association.

Canada is our largest single market for exports of paper, board and products, $87 million in 1966; and that she has granted very broad concessions is a hopeful sign that this important market can be expanded. Canada for years has had a tariff on paper and board products ranging from 20 to 25 percent, but averaging about 22½ per cent. She granted concessions averaging about 33⅓ per cent, but in some cases placed several articles on the "free list" to match U.S. like concessions. Generally speaking, her duties will be reduced to the 15 to 17½ per cent range. Concessions on items where existing duty rates are in the 5 to 7½ per cent range should result in the complete elimination of these duties.

Of specific interest to you gentlemen, are two items on which rates were reduced significantly, namely printing papers and paperboard. Printing papers, coated or uncoated, in rolls or rectangular sheets, weighing over 18 pounds (Canadian Tariff No. 19750–1) has been reduced 44 per cent, from 22½ per cent to 12½ per cent. This matches the U.S. concession. Giner Board has been reduced from 20 per cent to 15 per cent.

Tariff concessions made will be staged over a period of four years beginning January 1, 1968, with the rates being reduced by no less than one fifth on January 1 next, and the next four successive years. This follows the schedule of U.S. staging. Precise information about the staging percentages is not available as yet.

The fact that this is the first time that Canada granted significant concessions is an important plus for our industry. Previously, she received the benefits of the U.S. concessions under the Most Favored Nation without granting much in the way of reciprocity.

The Common Market (EEC)

As a unit, the EEC is our most important market. In 1966 pulp and paper exports to this area amounted to $157 million, an increase of $50 million since 1963. Our pulp exports have grown from $55 million to $77 million in this three year span.

The Common Market duties on paper and board have been cut 25 per cent, from 16 to 12 per cent. On wood pulp, the rate has been cut 50 per cent, from 6 to 3 per cent. The 3 per cent rate will apply only to tonnage above the duty-free quota of 1,935,000 metric tons, about 2,128,500 short tons. Newsprint remains unchanged at 7 per cent, but this rate will apply only to imports above the

duty-free quota of 625,000 metric tons, 687,-500 short tons.

Though details are still not yet available from Ambassador Roth's office, it has been reported that kraft linerboard has been reduced from 16 to 12 per cent; corrugated container board from 21 to 14 per cent; other papers (building paper; wet machine board; writing and reproduction paper) from 16 to 12 per cent and paper and paperboard, cut to size from 13-16 to 6.5 to 12 per cent.

It should be pointed out here that the Common Market staging will be different from the other negotiating countries. Due to the EEC's Common External Tariff (CXT) reaching 16 percent on July 1, 1968, and the internal tariff reaching zero on the same date, the EEC resolved that rather than go through the throes of figuring and refiguring its Common External Tariff on both January 1, and July 1, 1968, it would put its first tariff cut into effect on July 1, 1968. To catch up with other negotiating countries, the EEC will cut its CXT rates 40 percent or two-fifths. The next cut of 20 percent or one-fifth will be January 1, 1970, and then successively in stages until January 1, 1972. By January 1, 1970, the EEC will have reached an equal basis of cuts with the other GATT participating nations.

The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom is our second largest market, importing $23 million of pulp and $41 million of paper and board from the United States last year. It is our largest customer for linerboard, and we are the largest supplier. It was hoped that the United Kingdom would grant meaningful concessions, but as it turned out, only minor cuts were effected in its MFN rates.

Originally she had offered 50 percent cuts, but in view of the fact that she could not obtain certain concessions from the United States, which we were unable to give, the U.K. reduced her offers on paper and board and other products to less than 20 percent. She also retained the Commonwealth Preference, thus continuing duty-free paper and board from Canada. Pulp has always been duty-free from all suppliers.

Information available to date on a limited number of items shows that linerboard was reduced from 13⅓ to 10 percent; Machine glazed paper from 14 to 12 percent; tissue from 16½ to 15 percent; printing paper from 16⅔ to 15 percent; and writing paper from 16⅔ to 15 percent.

The staging of cuts has not been announced yet, but on the basis of the minimal concessions granted, they will be very small each year.

Switzerland

The only reported concession granted by Switzerland was on wood pulp. Duty rates will be reduced from the current 70 Swiss Francs to 40 Swiss Francs. This is a reduction of about 43 per cent, and would apply to all grades of paper pulps, bleached and unbleached.

U. S. exports of wood pulp to Switzerland last year amounted to about $1.3 million, and paper, board and productions, about $4.7 million.

No information is available upon the staging of the wood pulp cuts. Possible paper and board cuts are to be announced later.

Japan

Information on Japanese concessions on paper and board is still sketchy.

Newsprint duties were lowered from 7.5 to 5.5 per cent; and paper and board, impregnated, coated, etc. in rolls and sheets, n.e.s. from 20 to 10 per cent. Other cuts are expected in the 35 to 50 per cent range.

In all likelihood, as further data becomes available, substantial concessions will have been made in the paper and board grades.

Japan is a large market for U. S. pulp and paper. Pulp exports in 1966 were $50 million and paper and board $6.6 million. In the latter category, meaningful concessions can open up this market still further.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND INVESTMENTS ABROAD

Earlier in this talk, I stated I would briefly refer to these two important subjects, and how the Kennedy Round may effect their future status.

The Kennedy Round should provide a strong stimulus to exports and thus aid in gradual elimination of the payments shortage. Though our imports are still sizeable, principally pulp and newsprint from Canada, the expected increase in exports will help.

As to investments abroad, it was the contention of the speakers at the Chamber of Commerce Forum on the Kennedy Round on July 7th that with tariff barriers going down, there will be less incentive for United States companies to invest abroad. Our industry's direct investments abroad are in the neighborhood of $1.3 billion, of which 80 per cent are in Canada. It is reasonable to believe that U.S. investments in Canada will slow down sharply after present projected pulp and paper mills have been completed. As to the rest of the world, I believe our industry will do only very selective investing, as investments are already substantial in about forty-two countries.

SUMMARY

To bring together all the loose ends of the many subjects covered in this review, let me refer back again to the title: "Did the Paper Industry Benefit from the Kennedy Round?"

On the minus side, the industry has taken its sixth and largest tariff cut since 1948. This cut, however, will be phased over five years to allow for such dislocations as will inevitably occur as imports increase. Also on the minus side is that several of the countries did not give as large concessions as had been hoped for, and therefore, the known results in many instances are a disappointment; they were only moderately successful. Our industry's continued and strong requests for true reciprocity were only partially met, but it must be said that we were more successful than in all the previous five negotiations combined. It cost us, but we did receive more than a "widow's mite" this time.

My own point of view is that there was more achieved on the plus side than ever before and that this outweighs the minus factors that resulted. Canada at long last has granted concessions; the Common Market's external tariff has been lowered 25 percent; and as other country data becomes available, we may find that additional opportunities will reveal themselves, which are not evident as yet.

The purpose of the Kennedy Round was to achieve trade liberalization among the major trading nations of the world. In addition, the less developed countries in time would have greater access to world markets, which in turn would benefit their slowly expanding economies. Another plus of the Kennedy Round was that opportunities have been opened up within the framework, and these can be used as a tool to further expand exports. This may lead to more aggressive selling abroad to take full advantage of what has been offered, limited though it may be in some instances.

Our industry achieved over $700 million in sales abroad last year; and in 1967, exports should reach $760 million. It is reasonably expected that we can achieve $1 billion in exports in 1970. Not impossible, but it will take a great deal of travel and aggressive selling.

As a final comment and one which may offer a balm to those who have looked askance at the Kennedy Round results, this will be the last tariff cutting session for some time, for as far as the United States is concerned not too much is left on paper and board to bargain with. The future thrust of international trade conferences will be on non-tariff barriers. Ambassador Roth's office, at the President's request, is to develop a comprehensive study of future trade policy, with the sole purpose in mind of further opening up world markets for all U.S. industry. All industries have been assured a voice in formulating a new trade policy through in-depth conferences with high level administration officials. Since our industry will have no really strong arguments on tariffs, it might be well for us all to begin thinking about these non-tariff barriers, and artificial trade obstacles. Many export opportunities are present, but we are hindered by local regulations which could possibly be eliminated through negotiations.

The API's new International Trade Committee representing 20 companies which account for close to 80 per cent of U.S. exports, would welcome any suggestions or assistance you may wish to offer.

Thank you.

BOSTON HERALD SUPPORT FOR INCREASED TRADE—GLASSBORO OR KENNEDY ROUND?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the July 3, 1967, Boston Herald properly emphasizes the importance of the Kennedy round trade negotiations to increased world interchanges of goods, believing that—

> Such exchanges, far more than mere words, lead to better understanding among the diverse nations and peoples of the world.

In the opinion of the Boston Herald, therefore, the successful conclusion of the Kennedy round has made the world a little safer, "far more so than the summit conference at Glassboro."

I agree with this assessment, having long argued that there is more war and peace wrapped up in trade than in any other single area of international affairs. I also urge that individual Americans reflect on the importance of world trade as the Boston Herald has, and that individual American industries, which tend to seek relief from economic stresses through special import controls, also realize that in arguing for special trade controls they could endanger the carefully created web of international economic relationships that are immensely more important than the summit conferences at Glassboro.

The Boston Herald editorial referred to follows:

OF WINE AND BOURBON

Agreements from the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations have been signed by 46 nations, and the whole world stands to gain in what is the largest liberalization of international trade in history. Clothing, textiles, iron and steel, agricultural products, cameras, tape recorders, cars, liquor and thousands of other goods imported into the U.S. will be cheaper, provided that wholesalers and retailers pass the savings on to customers.

Some will argue, of course, that lowering trade barriers will hurt American industry

and put American workers out of work. We don't agree. For the beauty of a large tariff agreement including many countries is that the U.S. can also export much more, particularly to those developed countries that have huge markets for Amercian manufactured goods.

The economic significance of freer trade is that it allows a more efficient use of the world's goods by those participating in the agreement. The lowering of tariffs in this case, for instance, should allow the American to enjoy a fine French wine at a lower price. Conversely, it will allow the Frenchman to enjoy a fine Kentucky bourbon at a lower price.

Such exchanges, far more than mere words, lead to better understanding among the diverse nations and peoples of the world. Good will, rather than the flag, follows trade in the modern world.

Significantly, 38 of the 46 nations signing the pact undertook tariff concessions. The eight that did not were developing nations. Like New England in the 18th and 19th centuries they need a measure of protection for their infant industries.

Far more than the summit conference in Glassboro, we think the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round has made the world a little safer.

ORGANIZATION OF JAPANESE INDUSTRY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an item in the July 21 Foreign Letter of the Whaley-Eaton News Service has come to my attention. It notes that a Japanese research organization has called for the reorganization of Japan's steel and synthetic fiber industries into larger groupings to make them more able to "compete internationally." It makes similar recommendations for other industries.

This recommendation for the steel industry is particularly interesting, as the Japanese industry, already reported to be the lowest-cost steel industry in the world, is by its rapid expansion and new capacity continuing to undermine price levels in Western European steel markets and in the United States. The Japanese steel industry, it would seem, hardly needs to become "more competitive." It operates now, according to scholars of the industry, at very low rates of return on investment. Government subsidy and cartelization are no substitute for marketplace efficiency bringing about lower prices. Indeed, these techniques merely hide and redistribute the real economic costs. The interest of Japanese steel industry, it would seem, would not be to become more internationally competitive, but more internally competitive to bring about real efficiencies. To allow prices to rise at least fractionally, to increase it own profits, or to cover its real costs, and thus take pressure off the hard-pressed European and American steel industries, would be beneficial to Japan, both domestically and internationally.

Beyond this observation about Japanese steel, I would make the further observation that Japanese industry as a whole would do well to increase its independence of Government control.

Many Japanese are acutely aware that one of the criticisms most frequently leveled against them by their competitors in other countries is that Japanese industry tends to be cartelized and even subsidized. Reports of the nature of the Whaley-Eaton letters simply increase the concern of those like myself who want American business to compete with Japanese business in foreign and domestic markets, but who want such competition to be based on fair marketplace rules. The article referred to follows:

A Japanese Research Organization, supported by business firms, recommends streamlining the steel and synthetic fiber industries into three groups so as to be able to "fight" international competition.

The Japan Economic Research Institute said the automobile and petroleum refining industries should be combined into two or three groups each.

In recommending concentration into big business rather than encouraging small firms, JERI said the petrochemical industry should promote enterprises, or groups of enterprises, having facilities for producing a minimum of 300,000 tons of ethylene a year.

For two other industries, there were these suggestions:

Machine tool firms should continue to strengthen their grouping and reorganization moves.

Electronic computer makers which rely chiefly on domestic capital for their operations should be strengthened with Government aid.

The Government, however, JERI added, should take steps to maintain "proper conditions for competition" within the consolidation program.

FEDERAL SHARE OF HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the gentleman from Idaho, Congressman HANSEN, in introducing legislation today which would relieve the burden of States having untaxable public lands for which they receive no proper compensation under the present system of matching Federal funds for primary and secondary highway systems.

The present formula includes a reduction in the requirement for a State's contribution for Indian reservation lands and other large public domain lands. However, a serious inequity exists in its exclusion of such lands as national parks, national forests, public lands, and monuments, all vast untaxable areas. The burden of financing public highway systems falls directly on the people of these States through the responsibility of matching Federal highway funds. A truly equitable system must allow due compensation for these untaxable lands which are not now taken into consideration.

The national parks, forests, public lands, and monuments which comprise so vast an area of my own State of Idaho, and of which its people are so justly proud, have thus become the source of a financial burden which they can no longer be forced to bear. In the public interest, these lands must be maintained, and the importance of an adequate public highway system to the enjoyment of these lands as well as to the economy of the State is undeniable, but the burden must be relieved.

This proposal seeks to avoid the necessity of increasing Federal appropriations by decreasing the percentage by which the States will be required to match Federal highway funds in proportion to the acreage of untaxable areas in the State not now included in the formula.

Consideration of these lands in the proposed formula would allow the States to use State highway funds for purposes designated by the State, free of Federel programing requirements and regulations. Increased State control of its own funds would facilitate the execution of highway projects and hopefully increase the efficiency of its programs for the improvement of its State highway system.

AMERICANS ABROAD: BEHAVIOR FOR CRUSADERS

Mr. BUSH. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions, I have spoken highly of the Experiment in International Living on the floor of the House—especially in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 3, page 2866, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 3, page 3662. It has long been a leader among organizations working in international youth-exchange programs. Since its modest beginning in 1932, it has enjoyed such success that it now yearly arranges homestays for over 2,000 young Americans who go abroad in its programs, and for over 2,000 young visitors to our country.

Those who go abroad under its auspices return with a deep appreciation of another culture. Almost without exception, experimenters come to consider their homestay family as their "second family"—they refer to their Austrian brothers, Canadian fathers, and Norwegian sisters, to the confusion of nonexperimenters, and to the nostalgic understanding of other experimenters.

EXPECT THE UNEXPECTED

In recent years, it has assumed the task of training many of the Americans who are going abroad to live for extended periods of time. These include Peace Corps volunteers, diplomats, businessmen, and students. The motto of the Experiment in International Living,

"Expect the unexpected," is the key to their training.

True to its name, the Experiment in International Living has been a clear leader in experimental programs designed to prepare Americans for life abroad, especially in the underdeveloped countries. Since 1961, the experiment has trained over 1,500 volunteers for the Peace Corps, and has made a great contribution toward making that program the success that it is. Its training programs have been unorthodox—and very successful.

The fine work of the Experiment in promoting international understanding deserves the commendation and appreciation of us all. This excellent organization certainly contrasts with the very expensive foreign aid programs operated by the Federal Government. While the objectives are somewhat different, the ill-will and bitter feeling that all too frequently has accompanied foreign aid should make us appreciate the good work of the Experiment all the more—and perhaps learn some lessons from them.

The July 21, 1967, issue of Time magazine has a fine article on the work of the Experiment in International Living. The article follows. I hope it will receive the wide attention it deserves.

BEHAVIOR FOR CRUSADERS

Dropped into Berlin one morning without guide or direction, the young man in search of education floundered in a mere mess of misunderstanding.

So wrote befuddled Bostonian Henry Adams about his first trip to Europe in 1858. Until recently, most Americans were hardly better prepared than Adams was to face the languages, customs and currencies of the countries they planned to visit. But more and more U.S. citizens today face the prospect of living abroad for extended periods during their lifetime, as students, diplomats, businessmen or Peace Corps volunteers. Training them to cope with alien habits has become a burgeoning new branch of American education.

One of the best trainers in the business is the Experiment in International Living in Putney, Vt., which this summer is prepreparing 2,700 Americans for life in 44 different lands. The Peace Corps is relying on the Experiment to prepare 174 volunteers for duty in Afghanistan, Brazil, and Iran, has sent it 1,500 trainees in all since 1961. A score of colleges and universities, including Pomona and Dartmouth, count on it to manage their overseas studies program. At the same time, the school also serves as a welcoming center for 2,000 foreign students preparing to live in the U.S. Among them are members of the State Department-sponsored Volunteers to America, a kind of "reverse Peace Corps."

HARD KNOCKS

The Experiment's training programs for the Peace Corps, which last as long as twelve weeks, are a common-sense blend of inventiveness, idealism and practical pointers. Languages, ranging from Iran and Afghanistan's Farsi to Yugoslavia's Serbo-Croatian, are taught by natives in classes of ten or fewer, using audio-lingual techniques developed by U.S. Army language schools. Training officers for the Peace Corps are generally about the same age as their students, frequently have fresh but forceful ways of preparing them for expectable hardships. To give her 28 Afganistan-bound charges some notion of what they face, Anne Janeway, 30, deprived them of chairs, beds, eating utensils, showers and Western-style toilets. She even staged a mock wedding, Afghan-style, between a girl volunteer and an Experiment staffer.

One goal of the Experiment is to purge its trainees of any notion that their problems can be solved by calling the nearest U.S. consulate or American Express office. Thus most Peace Corps trainees go through "Operation Drop-Off," whereby they are simply put down in a big city or an isolated New England town with a few dollars, told to penetrate the "local culture" and survive for up to two weeks on newly formed friendships. Initially, the hazards of the project were more apparent than its benefits. Two Iran-bound trainees could find lodging the first night only in a jail, while one frightened girl sat numbly in a general store all day, afraid to ask for help, until a clergyman came to her rescue.

Home Stays. The Experiment in International Living was founded in 1932 by Donald B. Watt, the son of a wealthy department-store owner from Lancaster, Pa. Originally, Experiment did little more than arrange for students to board during summer vacations with amenable European families, after giving them a brief and genteel orientation on how to act politely overseas. Under Watt's successor, former Colgate Administrator Gordon Boyce, the Experiment still handles more than two thousand students bound for summer "home stays" the world over, but the emphasis is increasingly on good works as well as foreign family living. Some of the Experiment's home-stayers are building an international youth camp in the French Alps, while others are conducting a health survey in Nigeria, teaching English to secondary school children in Japan.

In addition to its other projects, the Experiment has just launched an International Career Training Program, a 15-month course (tuition: $3,000) blending academic study, home stays and travel designed to train men and women for employment abroad by government, business or foundations. In the future, the Experiment hopes to develop other programs specifically aimed at service to the underdeveloped world. "I am convinced that the latter half of the 20th Century," says Boyce, "will be looked upon as equal to the Crusades or the great migrations in the movement of men and ideas among nations."

CONSCIENCE VERSUS CONSTITUENTS: A CHOICE

Mr. BUSH. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, all Representatives are occasionally faced with the disturbing fact that on some issues they must vote against the views of a majority of their constituents. As elected Representatives, we do, of course, reflect the views of our constituents as we understand them, but when it comes time to vote, our ultimate guides should be our consciences.

The English statesman, Edmund Burke, wrote:

Certainly, Gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. . . . It is his duty to sacrifice his response, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. . . . Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

I was very glad to read an excellent editorial entitled "Fundamental Question," which clearly comes to grips with this conflict. This editorial was printed in the July 10, 1967, edition of the Valley News of Lebanon, N.H.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the Valley News and its editor, Mr. Marvin Midgette, for this intelligent and revealing editorial. I insert it in the RECORD in hopes that both my colleagues and many voters alike will profit from reading it.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTION

A fundamental question in our American system of representative government is whether our elected officials should vote the issues according to the majority wishes of the people in their own districts—or according to their own personal convictions.

The question arises in all levels of government.

On a relatively small, local controversy, but important nonetheless, we've expressed doubts these past few months whether the Orford School Board has always voted or acted in accordance with the Orford citizenry majority. On many issues, we've taken issue with the majority of the Board, and particularly its chairman, because we felt they were not serving the best interests of the citizens—including the students—of Orford.

In other Upper Valley communities—we're thinking particularly of Lebanon—we've seen fairly conclusive evidence that the elected officials didn't always follow majority opinion. Yet on the Urban Renewal controversy, we believe the Lebanon councilors were sound and correct and considerably more far sighted in their thinking than those who opposed the project.

On a much larger scale, we have nothing but praise for Cong. James C. Cleveland's (R–N.H.) efforts to determine the feelings of the folks back home through his annual questionnaire, the answers to which he is currently compiling and which, if his past questionnaires are any indication, will strongly influence his voting record.

In this connection we're reminded of the case of Rep. Lee H. Hamilton (D–Ind.). Hamilton represents a largely rural district with strong Republican conversative leanings, yet he frequently votes along liberal Great Society lines.

Recently Hamilton polled his district with this question: "Should I vote according to my own conscience and judgment?"

About 9,000 voters responded. Only 31 per cent of them wanted him to vote according to his own convictions. The overwhelming rest wanted him to be governed by the back home majority thinking.

If second-termer Hamilton wants a third term in the House, he's got some serious thinking to do.

For ourselves, we'd like our officials at all levels to travel double-hitched. Certainly they must be guided by the feelings of the home folks. But there will be times when they must follow their own personal convictions, when they must use their own best judgment regardless of how we feel.

After all, our vote which helped elect them was really a vote of confidence in their abilities to think for themselves and to dig to the heart of complex and often unfamiliar issues which we the home folks, with our limited opportunities to get all the facts, obviously can't always grasp with the same understanding they can.

Besides, it should never be in the American tradition to elect rubber stamps.

TO WIDEN THE CHICKAMAUGA DAM BRIDGE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing my bill to authorize funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority to widen the Chickamauga Dam bridge to four lanes.

The two-lane bridge, which connects a four-lane highway, is located on State Highway 153 and spans the Chickamauga Dam 7 miles upstream from Chattanooga on the Tennessee River.

There was a vital need for expansion of the bridge when I introduced the bill over a year ago in the last session of the Congress—the need is even greater today.

Congestion at the bridge is not only extremely burdensome to the hundreds of people who commute daily to Chattanooga. It also is hazardous and has been the direct cause of numerous accidents.

The traffic conditions at the bridge continue to deteriorate, and I urge my colleagues to take immediate action on the measure in order that this situation can be alleviated.

CONGRESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BIESTER] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some time that the Congress has not sufficiently involved itself in the determination of policy in Vietnam and specific steps to bring that conflict to an early, honorable, and purposeful end.

I was therefore impressed with the unique proposal made by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], and seven other Members of this House, which proposal might bring a conclusion to the hostilities. This proposal should not be taken as a weakening of our determination to protect the sovereignty and independence of South Vietnam, but rather as a demonstration of our continuing efforts to do so while at the same time actively seeking a peaceful and diplomatic solution to this agonizing situation.

In essence, tested gradual deescalation by both sides with appropriate safeguards makes sense to me, both in its military and diplomatic possibilities. It offers the chance to deescalate in steps toward peace without jeopardizing the security, safety, and military position of American servicemen in the field. It recognizes the nature of a limited war, and constitutes a positive approach to the specific problems.

I wish to associate myself with this proposal. I hope that as the administration studies it, so will Hanoi. As Members of this House, we have the heavy responsibility to seek by every effort to find a way to an honorable peace for Vietnam and for ourselves.

ILLINOIS POINTS THE WAY FOR GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the able and hard-working president pro tempore of the Illinois State Senate, Russell Arrington, testified before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, on the current controversy over firearms registration.

Illinois this year, under the capable leadership of Senator Arrington, passed a gun control bill that had wide public and bipartisan support. The provisions of the Illinois law are simple. In order to purchase or possess any firearm or ammunition a person must receive an owner identification card from the State Department of Public Safety following its thorough investigation. Several specified categories such as convicted felons, narcotics addicts, mental patients, and juvenile delinquents are prohibited from obtaining a card. The card must be carried on the person and displayed upon demand at every sale and at any time that one is in possession of firearms or ammunition thus providing continuing control.

Senator Arrington correctly believes that control of firearms is basically a local responsibility, a function of the exercise of normal police powers which rests with the States. However, he also reminds us that it is the Federal Government which must control interstate traffic of these weapons.

Because of the timeliness of his remarks, Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the Senator's statement in my remarks at this point:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR W. RUSSELL ARRINGTON, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND MAJORITY LEADER, ILLINOIS STATE SENATE, BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, JULY 31, 1967

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Senators, I am honored and most appreciative of this opportunity to discuss with you our common concerns for the control of firearms in our troubled States and Nation.

In Illinois we have recognized the great danger posed by uncontrolled access to deadly weapons. We recently have taken a giant step forward with new stringent state legislation. Unfortunately, the record for years of most States' response to this problem has been not unlike that of the Congress, despite the diligent efforts of members of this subcommittee and others.

But time is running out! The opportunity and need for a creative and practical common Federal-State effort is at hand.

Gun control is basically a local responsibility—a function of the exercise of normal police powers which rests with the States. The enforcement of criminal laws designed to promote internal order are basically a local obligation. We in the States are not fearful of that responsibility nor unmindful of its significance. Rather, we welcome the opportunity to demonstrate that state and local government, close to the people and responsive to their needs, can forthrightly do the job.

Several groups in Illinois this past year mounted a massive public campaign for gun control legislation. Most had hastily seized on a typical gun registration bill as the answer before they had explored any new ideas. The ensuing verbal jousts which were echoed in 46 other state legislatures this past year are quite familiar to each of you. We developed in Illinois a new approach in the belief that the real solution was more than a cataloging of ownership. Far more important was the need for a system to control the flow of weapons before they fell into undesirable hands, not after.

Once our proposal was introduced and after several working sessions with those from both sides of the traditional registration controversy, we were able to fashion a law which provided a new and genuine answer.

Surprisingly, we received enthusiastic support not only from all major law enforcement officials and the very active Special Mayor's Citizen Committee for Gun Control, but also from all legitimate sportsmen and gun collectors. We had bridged successfully the unfortunate gap in understanding which had existed between these two groups. The bills passed both Houses of our General Assembly with strong bi-partisan support. We have been assured of their approval in the coming week by Governor Otto Kerner whose deep common concern for strong gun control laws is indicated by his recent special appointment by the President.

The provisions of our Illinois law are simple. In order to purchase or possess any firearm or ammunition a person must receive an owner identification card from the State Department of Public Safety following its thorough investigation. Several specified categories such as convicted felons, narcotics addicts, mental patients and juvenile delinquents are prohibited from obtaining a card. The card must be carried on the person and displayed upon demand at every sale and at any time that one is in possession of firearms or ammunition—thus providing continuing control.

This law is a tough gun control measure. It will make a significant impact within the borders of our State. But standing alone we knew it would solve only part of the problem. The recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice stated the issue succinctly: "Strict controls by one State or city are nullified when a potential criminal can secure a firearm merely by going into a neighboring jurisdiction with lax controls or none at all . . . A truly effective system of regulation requires a meshing of state and federal action."

The Chicago Police Department recently made a spot-check survey of three California firms dealing in the mail-order sale of firearms. During the period of survey these three firms mailed weapons to 4,069 Chicagoans. Of these purchasers, 948 had prior criminal records. Thus, nearly ¼ of these sales should not have been made. Under the law as it heretofore existed in Illinois we were powerless to act. But with our new Illinois Gun Control law, in conjunction with the pres-

ent 1938 Federal statute, we will be able to prohibit such illicit traffic in firearms.

We have to rely on federal law to achieve interstate control. The opportunity for Federal-state cooperation in this area is available in Section 2(c) of the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. The Illinois law was built around this provision of the Federal Firearms Act. Under that law, before an out-of-state seller of firearms can transport weapons into Illinois, he must verify that the purchaser has a valid identification card.

With your permission, I should like to offer some suggestions regarding proposed Federal legislation, so that we might continue and expand our concerted efforts at all levels of government.

First: The provisions of Section 2(c) should not be weakened. The requirement that a state license for purchasing guns must be exhibited to the out-of-state dealer is crucial. This is the only tool we presently have to control mail-order sales; its removal would create a regrettable loophole in firearms control.

Second: This section of the Federal Firearms Act should be broadened to be applicable to other forms of state gun control laws, not solely those that require a license to be obtained prior to purchase. The Federal government interstate power should operate to enforce differing approaches of local authorities.

Third: The law should be applicable to over-the-counter sales to out-of-state residents as well as mail-order sales. It is only a half solution to prohibit an unqualified Illinois resident from purchasing a gun from a California mail-order house, for instance, and yet allow him to purchase unrestrained across the counter 10 minutes away in Indiana or Missouri.

Fourth: The law should be applicable to the out-of-state sale of ammunition in similar manner as the sale of weapons. A unique feature of our Illinois Act is to include ammunition. This has attracted considerable interest as a particularly effective way to provide a frequent and continuous check on gun users. Further, it is easy to manufacture firearms. The well-publicized "zip-gun" of the juvenile gangs provides a good example. But it is more difficult to obtain needed ammunition. States regulating ammunition need the assistance of authorities in enforcing that provision as well.

Recent tragic events have demonstrated that the availability and use of guns is only one part of the real trouble. The frightening attitudes of disrespect, anarchy and mob psychology turned to mob rule will not be altogether removed by better laws controlling firearms—however stringent they may be. But it will help considerably.

Last week I addressed the Midwest Council of State Governments in Omaha and sought support for such gun control laws in other states. The enthusiastic response was indicative of the new positive resolve of state governments to assume their rightful burdens of responsibility. Last weekend the National Society of State Legislators met in Chicago. We worked with leaders from several states to shape this approach to gun control to their own state's use. Federal action now should spur state action to join the common fight for basic law and order.

A true partnership of balanced federalism can provide the answer. I hope I have outlined some areas today where your considerations of new federal legislation will recognize and assist our state laws in this joint endeavor. The full exercise of the States' police power within its own borders coupled with the interstate shipment controls of the Federal government can get the job done. Your utilization of this partnership may pave the way for you as it did for us in Illinois, to the practical achievement of getting enough support and votes to legislate meaningfully in this emotion-laden area.

PEACEFUL LIBERATION POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United States should use every available tool of foreign policy to advance freedom of the press through the world. The right of free expression in other countries is almost as important to our basic interests as it is right here at home.

We seek a world, as well as a nation, in which the personal freedoms essential to the dignity of man are secure, and press freedom is the key to all other freedoms. In countries where people can read newspapers which are free of government censorship and control, the local regime is unlikely to put over policies hostile to our national interests. It is as simple as that.

We will therefore serve both our national self-interest, as well as the broader and higher interests of universal brotherhood, by using foreign aid, military aid, and trade concessions as bargaining tools to encourage and advance press freedom in foreign countries.

The fact that press freedom in Yugoslavia is in what the University of Missouri calls a transitional status shows that change for the better is possible, even in Communist countries.

We should demand loosening-up of press restrictions as a condition in granting aid. Our aid should be used as a reward for progress, and conversely, it should be withdrawn if press restrictions are reimposed.

The Johnson administration recently let the Tito regime in Yugoslavia buy $9 million in vegetable oil on low credit terms heavily subsidized by the U.S. taxpayer, and about the same time relieved Poland of the need to pay in dollars a $17 million debt due this year. The administration last October approved Export-Import Bank credit to most of the Communist bloc countries, and then asked Congress to extend most-favored-nation treatment to them—a tariff advantage that has already been extended to Poland and Yugoslavia, to their substantial benefit.

These could have been tied to specific forward steps toward press freedom—or to some similar improvement in basic freedoms. But nothing of the kind was even attempted, so far as I can determine, despite the fact that the University of Missouri School of Journalism rates all Communist bloc nations except Yugoslavia as having the world's highest degree of press control.

Yugoslavia, I am glad to report, is a notable exception. There at least the status of press freedom is in a mid-position, and to describe it the university uses the hopeful expression, transitional. It shows that loosening of controls is possible, and perhaps it is more than a coincidence that Yugoslavia is least active of all bloc countries in aiding our Vietnam enemies.

Even there, however, press freedom is far from the desirable level. Evidence of this is the recent 4-year prison term given the would-be political journalist, Mihajlo Mihajlov, for his attempts at free expression.

GOVERNOR ROMNEY'S "REPORT TO THE PEOPLE ON THE DETROIT RIOT AND OTHER CIVIL DISTURBANCES"

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the Nation begins the search for the causes and solutions of the outbreaks of disorder and violence which are plaguing the land, I believe that recent appraisals made by Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, relating specifically to the Detroit, and also to the national, situation deserve careful study and consideration. I, therefore, am inserting the Governor's "Report to the People on the Detroit Riot and Other Civil Disturbances," which was broadcast statewide on July 30, 1967; and his address before the National Association of County Officials meeting in Detroit on July 31, 1967, at this point in the RECORD.

GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY'S REPORT TO THE PEOPLE ON THE DETROIT RIOTS AND OTHER CIVIL DISTURBANCES

My fellow citizens, Detroit and much of Michigan has just lived through seven days of terror and trouble and tension.

The magnitude of the damage done cannot be over emphasized . . . not only the physical and material damage, but the emotional damage to our citizens as well.

The statistics are still not complete.

We know that at least 40 persons have died, and at least 300 have officially been reported as injured.

We know that Detroit was rocked with about 1,600 fires, and that property damage in Detroit has been estimated by the Detroit Fire Department at $500 million. That would be equivalent to the destruction of every taxable building in counties the size of Berrien, Jackson, Calhoun or Muskegon.

We know that more than 4,000 persons have been arrested in Detroit and other Michigan cities.

We know that the trouble in Detroit ignited outbreaks of disorder in Grand Rapids, Flint, Saginaw, Muskegon, Benton Harbor, Kalamazoo, Albion and Pontiac . . . all of them of a serious nature or a potentially serious nature, overshadowed only by the magnitude of the Detroit riot.

And we also know that many other Michigan cities lived the past week in tension and fear . . . afraid that violence would spread even further.

It appears tonight that Michigan is again ready for normal activity, and that violence has been contained for now.

This is a credit to the fine law enforcement and fire fighting personnel in Michigan, and their valiant and untiring efforts in Detroit and the other Michigan cities.

It is also a credit to the men of our outstanding state police force, which was hurled into the centers of gravest crisis, and the men of the Michigan National Guard, who

upheld the finest traditions of that organization.

And it is also a credit to the Federal troops who answered Michigan's call for more help.

Without the personal efforts of the thousands of fire fighting, law enforcement and military personnel, doctors, nurses and the communications media, Michigan would be in far sadder shape tonight than it is.

On behalf of all Michigan citizens, I extend my warmest thanks to these men, and the women and children of their families.

Sadly, the price of public service has been heavy for some families.

The toll of the injured includes 29 firemen, 70 Detroit policemen, 4 state troopers, and 19 members of the National Guard. The hopes and prayers of a grateful state are with those seriously hurt.

In addition, two Detroit officers have paid the supreme sacrifice in line of duty, to protect the lives of their fellow citizens. The sympathies of the entire state are extended to the families of police officer Jerome Olshove, and fire fighter Carl Smith.

And we all profoundly regret the loss of those killed in the disorder and grieve for their loved ones.

My purpose in reporting to the people of Michigan tonight is fourfold:

1. To try to avoid an even greater tragedy and to make Detroit and our entire state a place where every citizen has equal opportunity.

2. To try to prevent a backlash that could only result in a third explosion in Detroit even more devastating than those in 1943 and 1967.

3. To help defeat the effort of some members of each race to build two separate societies in America.

4. To pledge strengthened law enforcement and firm maintenance of law and order.

What happened in Detroit could start in most big cities. Unless we take the proper course, this nation in the years ahead could be plunged into civil guerrilla warfare.

In the days and months ahead, questions will be raised and debate will rage over what actions the country should take.

Some already are saying the answer is brute force such as would be used on mad dogs.

Others are questioning present social and economic programs because they claim the Negroes don't appreciate what has already been done; instead of doing more to eliminate social and racial injustice, these critics would do less.

Some white people and public officials will advocate the return to states rights as a way to legalize segregation. White extremist organizations are preaching hate and arming.

More and more Negroes are listening to and supporting Negro leaders who advocate a separate black society in America. These militant revolutionists are preaching hate, violence and rebellion; furthermore, they are organizing on a national basis, and they are arming for that purpose. We should not ignore these grave facts.

As citizens of Michigan, as Americans, we must unhesitatingly reject all these divisive courses. A nation is no stronger without than it is within. The fate of our nation—yes, the fate of a free world—could be determined by the choices we make and the actions we take.

The riot in Detroit was not caused just by events and circumstances in Detroit. It was caused more by national conditions than by Detroit although we could and should have done much more on our own to prevent it.

None of us can afford to be indifferent to what happened, why it happened, and what we must do to keep it from happening again.

Exactly what was the Detroit riot?

It was integrated looting, with whites and Negroes both taking part, sometimes side by side; and the looting was conducted by a small minority of the populations of both races.

It was an attack on property, policemen and fire fighters; the targets of the firebombers appeared to be selective for the purpose of hitting white owned property.

It produced an integrated effort to restore law and order, with Negro and white both working for peace, again side by side.

There were few instances of Negroes out to mob whites, or vice versa; this was the biggest difference between the 1943 riot and the 1967 riot.

When order was finally restored to Detroit, it was through sufficient force; until our force was strong enough, disorder reigned.

But the question that begs for answer is this . . . why did it happen?

There is no single response, but in my judgment, these are among the reasons:

1. Because too many do not really believe and practice the belief that each American is endowed by his creator with the same inalienable rights and must have equal opportunity for self-development and participation in a truly open society.

2. Because of a decline in religious faith and moral character that leads to a rising pattern of permissiveness, corruption and crime.

3. Because we have failed to recognize the urgency of eliminating social injustice and human discrimination.

4. Because we have failed to adequately support responsible Negro leadership.

5. Because the movement of Negroes to the northern urban areas has created great concentrations of unskilled and uneducated people living in unbelievable poverty and human indignity, surrounded by the world's first generally affluent society.

6. Because well-intentioned urban renewal programs displaced ghetto Negroes from their homes in other sections of the city and produced even greater overcrowding in the already incendiary 12th Street area.

7. Because too many Negroes have become supersensitive to race even to the point of defending those guilty of violating the law and even advocating violence and revolution.

8. Because the response to non-violent demonstration and peaceful petition has been superficial and politically self-serving.

9. Because too many people have thought they could escape the problems of the ghetto by moving to the suburbs.

10. Because we have undermined self-reliance and weakened personal initiative.

11. Because our welfare rules have rewarded illegitimacy and penalized family life.

12. Because we have in too many ways substituted government money and professionals for our personal responsibilities as neighbors and brothers.

13. Because most white people do not really know any Negroes and because most Negroes do not really know any white people.

14. Because in places like 12th Street, Detroit, children see adults who violate the law with impunity and prosper.

15. Because of long-standing friction between the Negroes and a predominantly white police force.

16. Because of low police pay and low teacher salaries.

17. Because poverty is being made worse by inflation.

18. Because the greatest economic progress in America is now being made by those who have organized the greatest amount of private power.

This then, is a catalogue of some deficiencies in our society and our personal attitudes and endeavors that have built up the situation which resulted in the havoc of the Detroit riot.

How do we stop lawlessness and violence that can lead to riots?

(*a*) Enforce the law without fear or favor; apply the force necessary to maintain law and order; and use weapons to the extent necessary.

(*b*) The use of force must never be brutal or unreasonable but it must be adequate and consistent with the crime. This has been my standing order to state personnel at all times.

(*c*) Criminal acts cannot be ignored or go unpunished.

These policies worked in Highland Park, Hamtramck, Pontiac, Saginaw and Grand Rapids. They will be used to prevent disturbances from becoming riots whenever state police or National Guard assistance is required.

In the case of Detroit, my on-the-scene appraisal resulted in the decision to ask for Federal troops at 3:00 a.m. on Monday, July 24. This early effort to secure Federal assistance was to make certain we could apply adequate force to bring the rioting under control as quickly as possible, and I was assured at that time by the Attorney General of the United States that my oral request was adequate. That request was never withdrawn nor did I ever cease pressing for the earliest possible use of Federal troops on the streets. As Governor of Michigan I have not hesitated to take the steps necessary to maintain law and order, and I will not hesitate in the future.

Now, what must we do to avoid a repetition of the Detroit riot or to keep something even worse from happening?

First, we must be willing to involve ourselves personally in helping to solve the problems of our communities and our brothers. We must not expect government or the other fellow to do it all.

Second, we must create genuine equality of opportunity in education, in employment, and in housing.

In education, we must work with preschool programs, with community schools; we must develop summer educational programs or summer job programs for our school aged youth, emphasize adult education, work toward a metropolitan school system where every youngster in the metropolitan area will have equal educational opportunity and equal financial support for his schooling.

In employment, emphasize study-work vocational training; replace hiring tokenism with employer in-plant training, and hiring of Negroes across the board; have genuine merit promotion; remove union apprenticeship and other restrictions to equality of job opportunity.

In housing, we must have open housing on a statewide basis. Zoning that creates either large scale economic or racial segregation should be eliminated. We must provide low cost private housing through non-profit organizations in all parts of the metropolitan area, and throughout the state. We must compel real estate agents to show all listed properties, report all offers, and abstain from any effort based on race or religion to influence the property owner in the listing and sale of property.

Third, provide adequate funds for the State Civil Rights Commission.

Fourth, stimulate local human rights ordinances and human relations commissions.

Fifth, encourage more private initiative and responsibility in eliminating social injustice in all fields involving all races.

Sixth, accelerate metropolitan regional planning and services without eliminating needed decentralization of city and neighborhood organizations.

Seventh, secure a just application of the principle of reward related to contribution so as to permanently improve teacher and police compensation.

Eighth, provide improved training for the police and National Guard.

Ninth, Federal encouragement of state, local and private action through cooperation with and reliance on the states except in those instances where state policies do not measure up to basic national standards.

In our free society where we can use our

rights as citizens to change that which needs to be changed, there is no justification for any violation of the law. If each individual is free to decide which laws he considers moral and which ones he will obey, we are on the sure road to lawlessness, riots and anarchy. The social and economic injustice that exists cannot be corrected in this way. It can only be corrected through law and obedience to law, both God given and man made. Violation of law to secure needed social and economic improvement cannot be countenanced. No American has the right to break the law.

I know that all but a small number of white and Negro citizens now recognize that criminal conduct must be curbed and punished quickly whether it is committed by black or white—that enforcing the law is not a discrimination against race.

I appeal to every citizen to increase respect for law by every word and deed.

American success and abundance have produced a generation of Americans, too many of whom have been allowed to grow up by doing as they please, without sound discipline in their homes, churches, schools or amusements. Too many have not known the meaning nor do they understand the essentiality and value of authority.

Young people want and need to have rules and have them enforced. They lack respect for parents, clergy, and teachers who let them do as they please. Permissiveness, laxity, and rationalizing away the validity of proven principles of human decency and moral responsibility are eroding the foundations of American life.

On every hand, each of us must accept a personal responsibility to fill this void and rebuild respect for law and authority.

Considering all of those conditions, I have faith the people of Michigan will support necessary action. I believe you will recognize that the principal responsibility to prevent another holocaust is yours individually; and through all of the private institutions of which you are a part.

The greatest satisfactions from life come when we inconvenience ourselves to do things for others. The greatest human progress is produced by those who find ways to more fully serve others.

The greatest human problems are overcome only when we care enough to help another.

Time prevents discussion of all the many emergency steps being taken to meet food, clothing, housing and other needs, as well as the moving voluntary response of citizens and private organizations.

Mayor Cavanagh and I have, with the support of representative community leadership, designated John L. Hudson, Jr. to head a representative area-wide committee to mobilize action programs needed to rebuild a better Detroit.

In addition the Mayor and I plan to appoint a joint group of top experts to searchingly investigate the causes of the riot, the actions taken to end it, and the programs needed to eliminate state and local conditions that helped trigger it.

I believe we can rebuild Detroit and make it a model for the nation in human well being for all.

Detroit and Michigan have provided national and world leadership in many fields. We can do it in race relations and urban improvements. We have made a start and we must press forward. It will take persistence and total commitment. Human beings change slowly. There are no short cuts. The achievement of essential goals will take time. There will be those who will not do their part. But this must not discourage us or delay us. For the fate of America depends on our success in demonstrating that all that America is is for every American to enjoy, and all that America can be is for every American to build.

Thank you and may God help us.

ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY, OF MICHIGAN, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, DETROIT, MICH., JULY 31, 1967

I had planned to talk this morning about the importance of local government and outline ways to make it more effective. However, I know that in the course of this past week your attention, like that of all Michigan state and local government officials, has been focused on the tragic holocaust which has devastated this city.

There are lessons in the Detroit experience for all Americans, and particularly for local government officials. I don't mean to suggest that any of us here are ready with pat or easy answers to guide you in dealing with civil disorders or in getting at their root causes. We are seeking these answers ourselves. But surely there is much that we have already learned, and much more to be learned, which will improve the safety and quality of life in our urban centers.

Detroit has been particularly sensitive to interracial relations ever since 1943, when whites and Negroes battled each other in a bloody race riot. In the intervening years Detroit has been regarded a leader in good race relations, and Negroes have undeniably made great progress.

Despite major racial disturbances in other cities in recent years, Detroit has remained calm. In 1963, for example, 100,000 Negroes and whites marched peacefully and quietly together down Woodward Avenue to urge national improvements in civil rights legislation. We had reason to hope that the lessons of 1943 had been well learned and that Detroit would be free from strife.

But our whole state has just undergone seven days of terror and trouble and tension.

As I said in a report to the people last night, the magnitude of the damage cannot be overemphasized . . . not only the physical and material damage, but the emotional damage to our citizens as well.

The statistics are still not clear.

At least 40 persons have died, and at least 300 have officially been reported as injured.

Detroit was rocked with over 1,600 fires and property damage in Detroit has been estimated by the Detroit Fire Department at $500 million. That would be equivalent to the destruction of every taxable building in any of the Michigan counties of Berrien, Muskegon, Jackson or Calhoun.

More than 4,000 persons have been arrested in Detroit and other Michigan cities.

Trouble in Detroit ignited outbreaks of disorder in Grand Rapids, Flint, Saginaw, Muskegon, Benton Harbor, Kalamazoo, Albion and Pontiac . . . all of them of a serious nature or a potentially serious nature, overshadowed only by the magnitude of the Detroit riot.

And many other Michigan cities lived the past week in tension and fear . . . afraid that lawlessness would spread even further.

It appears that we are back to normal now. Considering the size and spread of our holocaust, this is a great tribute to the dedicated effectiveness of the men of state and local police departments. Our fire fighters, our National Guardsmen and Federal troops.

The toll for public service was high. Two Detroit officers, policeman Jerome Olshove and fireman Carl Smith gave their lives. The list of injured included 70 Detroit police officers, 29 Detroit firemen, 19 National Guardsmen and 4 state troopers.

Without the personal efforts of the thousands of fire fighting, law enforcement and military personnel, Michigan would be in far sadder shape today than it is.

Most of you are generally familiar with the history of Michigan's trouble this past week.

It began at about 4:00 a.m. July 23, when Detroit police conducted a routine raid on an illegal drinking place and arrested 80 persons. The arrests were orderly, but a crowd gathered. Someone threw a bottle through the window of a police car. Sparked by this incident, hoodlums in the crowd nearby broke store windows. More people gathered, and a pattern of vandalism and looting followed.

Detroit police, following a strategy designed to avoid inflaming racial incidents, tried to seal off the area and confine the violence to the few blocks on 12th Street in midtown Detroit. This pattern of police restraint, which had worked successfully in a potentially similar disorder in Detroit last year, this time failed to bring the situation under control.

Instead arson and destruction and looting spread. By Sunday afternoon, Detroit city officials requested state help. I immediately committed 200 state police and 1200 National Guardsmen. At the time city officials estimated these numbers would be enough to handle the outbreak.

But by early Sunday evening, the looting and violence spread from the 12th Street area where it had begun, and it became apparent that the situation was beyond the capacity of Detroit and state police and the Guardsmen then committed. The main body of the guard, then in summer camp 200 miles north, was ordered immediately to Detroit.

Things kept getting worse through Sunday night, and it appeared that even the entire 5,000 man National Guard in support of state and local police would probably not be enough to prevent major disorder. Early last Monday morning, about 2:30 a.m., Mayor Cavanagh and I advised the Vice President and soon afterwards, the Attorney General, that in our judgment Federal troops would be needed to prevent a major riot. Federal troops finally arrived at the riot scenes about 22 hours later, although Mayor Cavanagh and I were consistent in our request for assistance.

Calling on the United States Army in a civil disorder is a tough and difficult decision. Equally difficult must be the decision to send the Army to help control civil disorder. I'm confident local, state and federal officials all made their separate decision only after the most careful consideration and with the greatest reluctance. I know for my part that I did.

But the most important consideration to me had to be the lives and safety of American citizens, not only in Detroit but in other potential trouble spots throughout our state.

From a high point of disorder through Monday night, the violence in Detroit was doggedly and systematically brought under control during the next several days. By this last weekend, I was able to lift the curfew and other restrictions which disorder demanded. The most serious outbreak outside of Detroit apparently was in Grand Rapids, where state police also were sent to help local officials.

In most other Michigan cities where violence briefly flared or was imminently threatened, stern enforcement tactics at the outset apparently were instrumental in minimizing the disorder.

That, in brief, is what happened in Michigan. I would like to outline to you, as responsible local government officials, where we go from here. Some of you, I know, have faced these problems in your own localities, others of you, I fear, will in the future.

The most immediate problem before us now is the task of rebuilding.

It calls for all of the resources we can bring to bear. It is not just a task for the Federal Government, though we need its help, and I am satisfied that blanket Federal disaster aid should be forthcoming, in addition to the Small Business Administration loans already authorized.

The Federal Disaster Act of 1950 defines "major disaster" to include: "Any . . . fire,

. . . other catastrophe . . . which, in the determination of the President, is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant disaster assistance by the Federal Government. . . ."

The principal physical damage in Detroit was caused by fire, and the damage was of a severity and magnitude unmatched in this country. I think that if, as was decided a couple of weeks ago, this statute authorizes Federal aid to a suburb inundated by a heavy rain, then Detroit citizens should be eligible for assistance in repairing fire damage resulting from this period of violence.

Our state and local units of government have major responsibilities in the rebuilding process which they are prepared to meet.

First among these is the matter of continuing maintenance of law and order. This must have priority attention. One thing we have learned is that both local and state police departments must be strengthened and rendered better able to deal with the sort of emergency situation with which we were confronted in Michigan. This is a matter of more policemen, it is a matter of more effective techniques for coping with problems of this character, and it is a matter of better pay and more comprehensive training. Our cities, our counties and our states must be better equipped to enforce the law than they are at present.

But the rebuilding task is not one for government alone. It is one in which every citizen has an important responsibility. Here are some of the things which have to be done, and which require the combined efforts of government and of our people working as individuals and through their enterprises and voluntary associations.

First, there is the matter of emergency aid to victims of the disaster . . . for food, clothing, shelter, medical assistance. This appears to be going forward effectively with magnificent efforts by both the public and private sectors.

Second, steps must be taken to insure prompt and complete justice for the thousands of people who have been arrested and who are now in custody. The Detroit Bar Association, the Wolverine Bar Association of Negro Attorneys, and others, in cooperation with the courts, are organizing to provide volunteer legal representation for those accused.

Third, the clean up of areas which have suffered major destruction must go forward rapidly. We do not want the ugly scars of burned out buildings to mar our progress to a better community. The labor organizations of Greater Detroit have volunteered help in this clean up, I know this will be of great help, not only for the physical appearance but for the spirit of the city.

Fourth, insurance claims must be expedited, and in cooperation with the insurance industry the State Department has set up an insurance information center to aid disaster victims.

Fifth, jobs must be found for those unemployed because their employers were burned out. The Michigan Employment Security Commission is taking steps to assist those economic victims of the riot.

All of these measures are designed to deal with the emergency aspects of our problem.

Next is the matter of the development of long range plans for rebuilding. We have already begun to mobilize our resources for this purpose.

Last Thursday, while the ashes still smouldered, Mayor Cavanagh and I called together the leadership of the metropolitan Detroit community to report to them and to solicit their commitment to the rebuilding effort. The response from every segment of our community life was overwhelming. Joseph Hudson, Jr. has been named chairman of a top level representative group to mobilize the community commitments to rebuild.

Detroit has a long tradition of responding to crisis, and I am confident that we are well launched in our response to this one.

Many things must be done to accomplish the physical and commercial rebirth of the devastated areas. Here are some of them:

. . . We must assure the availability of credit on reasonable terms to those who wish to rebuild lost businesses and homes. SBA loans will help, but this may also require government loan insurance. From my contact with those who want to rebuild, they are not looking for handouts or artificially low interest rates. They want credit available to them on fair and competitive terms, so that they can stay out of the hands of the "sharks."

. . . We must assure the availability of insurance protection for those who wish to rebuild. This, too, may require government re-insurance. But if normal business services are to be available in the devastated areas, we must make it possible for businessmen to invest there without extraordinary risk.

. . . We must consider the use of some of the devastated area for parks and recreation facilities, letting air, sunshine and breathing room into some of the most congested areas of the city.

But more important than the physical and commercial restoration of the area is the strengthening of its human resources.

We must make sure that to the extent possible the "outsiders" are made full participants in our society. This will require the best that is in all of us.

The final point I want to cover today is perhaps the most important and the most difficult.

What can we do to make sure that something like the Detroit riot does not happen again?

Just as there appeared to be no clear, single cause of the riot, there appear to be no clear, single answer. But there are several things we can do that, in my opinion, will lessen the chance of another riot.

1. Maintaining law and order is the only solid basis for a stable society. Without law and order we can accomplish nothing. We must enforce the laws firmly, fairly, and in proper time. We must make it plain that the public policy is respect for law and order. Those who choose the way of the lawless must be on firm notice that violence and lawlessness will not be tolerated. There can be no such things permitted as a little looting, a little rioting, a little sniping, a little arson. We must be firm in this resolve.

2. We must recognize the Detroit riot for what it was . . . and for what it was not. The Detroit riot certainly involved race, but there were few incidents of a gang of whites out to get Negroes, or vice versa. Those responsible for the Detroit riot, in my opinion, had various motives:

Those who wanted something for nothing . . . the genuine lawless.

Those who sought only thrills, kicks, or excitement.

The black extremists, under the influence of black separatism or black supremacy.

Those who, once the riot was started, were caught up in the infection of the moment . . . who, under normal circumstances and without a riot atmosphere would never even think of burning, looting or violence.

Those who genuinely feel deprived by circumstances, by society, by the white community . . . who truly feel their chances for self improvement are frustrated.

The fact remains that all those who joined in the disorder make up only a small fraction of the total population of either race. The vast majority of both races were victims.

But even though the percentage of participants is small, they are important. That even a small percentage could wreck such violence and disorder proclaims its importance.

To protect and strengthen our community and our society, the differing motives of riots must be recognized as different and dealt with in different ways.

For the lawless, there must be strict law enforcement.

For the confused, there must be understanding and guidance.

For the extremists, there must be controls and channels for conversion.

For the genuinely disaffected, there must be concern and improvement.

3. We must recognize that the drive for human justice has gained ground during the past few years. All our efforts have not been wasted, all our programs designed to bring about equal opportunity are not now valueless. We must not permit a backlash to weaken the valuable programs and policies designed to bring about first class status for all citizens. I believe our people yearn for effective answers to maintenance of law and order, and for the solutions to problems that continue to create and perpetuate the ghettos of our cities.

I don't believe our efforts have been ineffective. I believe instead they have been incomplete. While these attitudes and programs have been successful in improving the lives of most Negroes in Michigan and elsewhere, there remain a minority within the minority that is still outside the increasing affluence of our Negro communities, and views these gains with growing envy and even enmity.

In disorder's frenzied aftermath, we must not accept indictments of futility and despair, but rather build on our progress and intensify our struggle toward full social and economic equality.

4. In the backwash of questioning and disgust and fear, the dangers of the demagogue follow just as certainly as rats follow a flood. Demagoguery knows no color barrier, there will be unreasonable appeals from both whites and Negroes, men of reason should recognize these dangers, and guard against compounding error by piling misdirection on top of disorder.

5. Detroit, especially after Newark and Watts and other charred ruins, must cause us to re-evaluate our national priorities. We have paid attention to our internal problems, but not enough attention. We have assigned them priorities, but not high enough priorities. The human, social and economic problems of our own people must become our number one national objective.

6. And finally, we must each face squarely as individuals the dilemma that the Detroit riots have raised in each man's heart.

The flames in the ghettos of America grow from many sparks . . . from the declining moral atmosphere in our country, from the disregard for duly constituted authority, from the disdain for law and order, from the aura of permissiveness our society encourages, from the refusal to accept personal responsibility, from our reverence for gold instead of God.

The flames leap higher when fed with prejudice and poverty and frustration and despair.

America is indeed "one nation, under God, indivisible".

But a minority of our fellow citizens are questioning with some justification the next phrase in our pledge of allegiance to America." They question whether there is in fact "liberty and justice for all".

This question cannot be answered by violence and riot. That route cannot be permitted, and will not be permitted in Michigan.

But the answers must be made. And it must come from the hearts of each American.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKHARDT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee

[Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, the Federal Communications Commission extended the so-called fairness doctrine to commercial advertising. Although at first glance, I was appalled and disturbed over the ruling, I set the matter aside to allow for a more complete study and analysis on a later date.

It was but a short time after the ruling was handed down that expressions of alarm and concern could be heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I decided then to give the matter immediate attention, and I was pleased to find that the Nation's media as well as the Congress was concerned and speaking out in opposition to the ruling.

On file in my office are newspaper editorials, comments by newspaper columnists, printed comments by broadcasting stations, and magazine articles numbering in the hundreds. Although I feel that all of the printed matter on this subject deserves a place in the RECORD, to insert it all would take a great deal of space and be costly.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, I have chosen an editorial from the Johnson City Press-Chronicle in my district, and several others which, I think, are a good cross-section sampling and which, in my opinion, truly reflect the attitudes and positions of those who have spoken out on the issue.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Morning Press-Chronicle]

IN ALL FAIRNESS

Whether you believe that cigarets are a serious health hazard or not, the Federal Communications Commission's application of its "fairness doctrine" to broadcasters accepting cigaret advertising has opened up new areas of confusion.

Under its doctrine, the FCC says that broadcasters accepting cigaret commercials must provide a "significant amount of time" —paid or free—for the antismoking point of view. Stations can comply with its ruling, the FCC says, by presenting each week "in addition to appropriate news reports and other programing" dealing with cigaret hazards to health "a number of public service announcements of the American Cancer Society or the Department of Health, Education and Welfare."

It is the "personal opinion" of FCC Counsel Henry Geller that a station can satisfy the "significant time" requirement by devoting one-third as much time to antismoking programing as it does to cigaret commercials.

Guidelines so loosely drawn and interpreted are bound to pose questions. For instance, who besides the cancer society and HEW is to be selected to prepare antismoking announcements? Who is going to handle, and pay for, the staggering job of policing the FCC's vague "significant amount" requirement?

Then there is the possibility that the FCC may be abusing its considerable authority. The Cigaret Labeling Act of 1965 prohibits any Governmental requirement that health warnings be included in cigaret advertising or on packages other than the "caution" package label specified in the act. The FCC's ruling on broadcasters apparently seeks to wriggle free of this limitation.

Surely a court test of the legality of the FCC action is in order. The public has come to tolerate cigaret commercials; if it is faced with anticigaret commercials as well, the mass tuning-out might make the whole issue academic.

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Citizen, June 12, 1967]

FCC HAS OPENED A CAN OF WORMS

The Federal Communications Commission has opened a can of worms by applying its "fair treatment" doctrine to cigarette commercials carried by radio and television stations.

In the broadcast industry, this FCC decision is bound to have ramifications and consequences as significant and far-reaching as those which the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote ruling had on state and local governments.

What the FCC ruling means is that every radio and TV station which carries cigarette advertising—and don't they all?—will have to provide not necessarily equal time, but a "significant amount of time" for "responsible groups" to present the case against cigarette smoking.

This opens a pretty wide door. The American Cancer Society or the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare presumably can now have a substantial number of anticigarette "commercials" broadcast by every radio and TV station in the country.

Ever since statistical research linked cigarette smoking with lung cancer, cigarette advertising has been controversial.

Until now FCC has applied its "fairness doctrine" primarily to politics. With the recent ruling, however, it has extended the doctrine to advertising of controversial products.

Once you start this game, where do you stop it?

There are other controversial products. If the FCC is to be consistent and fair, it will have to apply its fairness doctrine to at least some of the others.

How about automobiles? If a TV network carries advertising for the Superburp 8, can Ralph Nader or the National Safety Council demand a "significant amount of time" to declare the darn thing is "unsafe at any speed"?

Can an air pollution expert then go on the air to warn that the Superburp 8, along with automobiles in general, is producing most of the smog which is choking our large cities and poisoning the population?

The primary reason for the existence of FCC is to assign frequencies and prevent one station's interfering with another. The commission has come a long way past that and seems preparing to go even further.

We seriously question whether the broadcast industry can live with many more stringent regulations. In both politics and commerce, the FCC should quit trying to dictate program content with mandatory rules based on the fairness doctrine. General guidelines which give the station operator some latitude, while pricking his social conscience, might be of honest help to the industry and the public.

[From the New York Daily News, June 27, 1967]

THIS FIGHT IS ESSENTIAL

The Federal Communications Commission on June 2 ruled that television and radio stations carrying cigaret commercials must give "a significant amount of time" to the ideas and opinions of persons who claim cigaret smoking injures the health.

After thinking it over for a time, the Columbia Broadcasting System has protested the ruling in a strong letter to the FCC, and the National Association of Broadcasters says it will fight the FCC on this point "all the way to the Supreme Court."

It is to be hoped that these and other interested parties will indeed fight the FCC in all available arenas.

The ruling is a tyrannical piece of bureaucratic impudence, as we see it. If allowed to go unchallenged, it could lead to complete FCC control of TV and radio program content—and there would go a tremendous chunk of freedom down the drain.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, June 22, 1967]

"EQUAL TIME" DOCTRINE BECOMES MORE ABSURD

Difficulties in applying the Federal Communications Commission's "equal time" doctrine came to light for the second time in recent days when the United States Court of Appeals upheld the so-called fairness requirement.

The appeals court in Washington ruled that the doctrine under which radio and television stations must give free time to persons wanting to answer statements or charges is constitutional.

The court made its ruling after an author who had been attacked in a broadcast over a Pennsylvania radio station by the Rev. Billy James Hargis' Christian Crusade appealed to the FCC. The author charged that the station at first told him he would have to buy time for a reply but later said he could have free time if he was unable to pay for it. The FCC ordered the station to give the author free time, and the station filed suit.

Absurdity of the "equal time" doctrine was pointed up recently when the FCC ruled that radio and television stations which broadcast cigarette advertisements must provide equal time for the anti-smoking lobby to reply.

The "equal time" doctrine violates the constitutional right of free speech, in addition to forcing broadcasters to permit replies to trivial and unimportant points.

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, July 10, 1967]

NOT "FAIR" DOCTRINE

An entirely new and ominous concept of the use of federal powers has appeared with the latest edict of the Federal Communications Commission. By ruling that television stations must give free time for anti-smoking propaganda commensurate with cigarette advertising time, the commission has opened a Pandora's box.

From the practical standpoint the FCC has not specified exactly what the opposing agencies may demand in the way of time, nor given any guidelines as to content.

From the standpoint of legality and precedent, the ruling is totally unwise and unsound. There are well-meaning groups opposed to almost everything advertised, from milk to automobiles, on the grounds of hazards to human life. Their objections, in their own eyes, are valid and should be heard. This new rule could lead to widespread abuse of such "public service" demands to negate legitimate advertising.

Cigarettes are not illegal. By a 1965 act of Congress they must carry certain cautionary words concerning health on their packages. But only a caution. The FCC interprets this in a much wider sense than Congress intended and has paved the way for outright official control of advertising, the backbone of the United States free enterprise system.

The "fairness doctrine" of the FCC has been accepted as a necessary adjunct to opposing views in political matters. It was never meant to apply to the content of paid advertising time, which can always be answered in other advertisements.

A test case of this ruling is needed quickly.

[From the Lafayette (Ind.) Leader, June 15, 1967]

AMAZING RULING

Since television came into popular and widespread use not too many years ago it has provided speakers, writers, comedians, columnists and commentators (to mention only a few) with grist for their mills. New developments and unusual turns appear to follow one another in rapid succession.

The most recent conversation piece to hit the television industry is the weird ruling

by the Federal Communications Commission concerning the donation of free time for crackpots to answer paid commercials.

FCC now says that broadcasters who use cigarette commercials must make free time available for rebuttal comment by people who say cigarettes are harmful to the health.

There is no way to determine how much thought the Commission gave to this theory before making its ruling, but evidently not much. Such a practice could lead to utter chaos in the broadcasting business. The "equal time" ruling could be applied to any product advertised on television, from mouthwash to automobiles.

Incredible as it may seem, such a procedure leaves the advertiser in the position of paying for the time required to permit someone to knock his product. The advertisers pay for the television industry to operate and any free time donated to whatever purpose is necessarily paid for by the paid commercials.

The FCC calls this unusual ruling a "fairness" doctrine. However, it is rather difficult for a layman to see what's fair about it.

The groundwork was laid back in 1963 when FCC first issued its manifesto concerning "fairness" in political broadcasts. There was nothing fair about that either. One political ideology should be just as able to pay for its commercials as another. Nevertheless FCC formed an opening wedge with the political ruling and now it has used the doctrine to cover the entire spectrum of broadcasting.

The ruling is probably more dangerous than may appear on the surface. If the Commission can thus dictate to the broadcasters what they must carry on the airwaves, it can just as easily tell them what they must not carry. It could be the beginning of a complete take over of the television industry by the Federal Communications Commission.

It should be hoped that the recent ruling will evoke sufficient protest to cause Congress to move for corrective measures on the activities of some of the Federal authorities who get carried away with their work.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Advocate, June 13, 1967]

FREE TIME FOR CRITICS

Among the less plausible rulings handed down recently by federal agencies is the one on which the Federal Communications Commission says that radio and television stations which broadcast cigarette advertisements must provide time for anti-smoking programs. Stations may attempt to get sponsors for the anti-smoking message, but if this is not done they must provide the time free of charge.

The FCC says that it has acted on the basis of its "fairness doctrine" which requires that broadcasters make available reasonable opportunity for conflicting points of view to be aired.

The "fairness doctrine," reasonable enough in principle, already has been subjected to some unusual interpretations by the FCC. But no previous interpretation has been as unusual as this or so potentially productive of confusion and controversy. If it is applied in all similar situations, television and radio stations soon will be making available about half their time free to speakers who have some complaint against products advertised or against the manner in which they are advertised.

The FCC says it does not intend any such result and that the ruling is confined solely to cigarette advertising. But on the basis of precedent, the anti-cholesterol people certainly can demand free time to "answer" advertisements of meat, eggs, milk and many other foods. The Women's Christian Temperance Union will expect free time to answer beer and liquor advertisements. Safety critic Ralph Nader may demand free time to answer motor company advertisements. He says cars are more unsafe than cigarettes and that he has a lot of statistics to back up his claim.

Lest we seem to carry our logic—or that of the FCC—to a ridiculous conclusion, we add only that the agency's latest ruling soon may appear mischievous and troublesome, even to its authors.

[From the Salem (Mass.) News, June 14, 1967]

TORTUOUS ROAD

Demands for "equal time" on the air waves usually have been sounded in the arena of politics. Recently one arose over cigarettes, and now the Federal Communications Commission has agreed that tobacco foes have a right, without charge, to the TV screen.

Networks carrying cigarette ads, ruled FCC, must devote an unspecified amount of free time to the view that smoking may be harmful to health, just as it says on the packages.

But demands for equal time lead to still more demands, and the temperance groups may now ask why beer commercials should not be answered with discourses on temperance.

Educating the public is a tortuous road and one the government should—but will not—travel with caution.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, June 14, 1967]

"DOCTRINE OF FAIRNESS"

Columnist Roscoe Drummond touched on part of the problem about free air time in his column the other day.

Mr. Drummond pointed out that the new ruling of the Federal Communications Commission, that radio and TV stations must provide substantial free time to those who wish to answer controversial cigaret advertising, can't be limited to that. What the FCC calls its "doctrine of fairness" would apply to many other groups and products, ranging from jet airplanes to beer to pacifists objecting to the recruiting ads.

This is all true enough, but the essential question is even more basic. Why should a radio or TV station have to supply free air time to anyone to answer something said on paid time?

If a cigaret company buys time to promote its product, anti-smokers should also have to buy the time to answer.

[From the Independence (Kans.) Reporter, June 18, 1967]

A POOR FCC RULING

The Federal Communications Commission sat down on a hornet's nest when it ruled if broadcasters put cigaret commercials on the air they must also give time to those who oppose smoking. Whatever one thinks about smoking's pros and cons it seems hard to get around the view of the National Association of Broadcasters that this ruling is a "dangerous intrusion into American business."

The real hornet's nest lies in the implications of what the FCC has ordered. If those who don't favor smoking get broadcast time to answer cigaret commercials how about those who oppose drinking or fast driving or, for that matter, the use of deodorants? Is the FCC to be the arbiter of which advertising claims can be disputed on free time?

The FCC should reconsider an ill-considered action.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the editorial from the Johnson City paper—surely a court test of the legality of the FCC action is in order, and I am hopeful that the next action in this matter is along this line.

FOOD PRICE STRUCTURE

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of the Nation's food price structure is one which concerns all our citizens, on the farms and in the cities alike.

As a Member of Congress representing both an agricultural and urban constituency, I am especially aware of the need to keep our citizens informed regarding this vital area of economic concern.

Recently there appeared in the July 24, 1967, issue of the magazine U.S. News & World Report an excellent article entitled "Housewives Wrong? Food Really a Bargain?" This article objectively reports on the current situation prevailing in the American food marketplace, and offers substantial evidence that despite economic pressures, food remains the American consumer's biggest bargain.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of all Members of Congress as an excellent study and source of information dealing with one of the most important economic subjects of the day, and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

HOUSEWIVES WRONG? FOOD REALLY A BARGAIN?—WHAT THE FACTS SHOW

A new stir is developing over rising food prices, and yet the facts show it is not food that pinches the family budget.

People spend a smaller part of income on food than ever.

Farmers are in a profit squeeze. So are supermarkets. Still, a feeling grows that somebody is getting rich at housewives' expense. The truth is food prices are edging up again, and housewives are grumbling. The belief is widespread that the cost of food is the major factor in the long-term rise in the cost of living.

The facts, however, tell quite a different story.

Food actually is a bargain when its cost is related to that of other items which go to make up the family budget. Official figures shown in the charts and tables on these pages tell the story.

The average family today is spending a smaller portion of its income on food than at any time since records of this kind have been kept. On an average, 17.6 cents of each dollar of income, after taxes, is spent to keep the family fed. That leaves 82.4 cents to be spent on other necessities and luxuries.

Not only that, but the farmer's share of the dollar spent on food is expected to drop this year to 32 cents—close to the lowest level recorded since the end of World War II.

DEMANDS OF HOUSEWIVES

Labor is getting a bigger cut of the food dollar. This is due in part to insistence of housewives on more services in supermarkets and more convenience foods that are either precooked or partially processed.

It is not the supermarkets that are getting rich in the fast-changing food business, in spite of all the clamor a few months ago about profiteering, packaging, trading stamps and prizes.

Grocers, in fact, are in something of a depression, struggling to make ends meet by cutting costs and stepping up sales.

A study of eight large food chains by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found profits of these firms amounted to 1.2 cents on each dollar of sales each year from 1957 through 1964, and then dropped to 1.1 cents to 1965.

Using returns from the same companies, the Economic Unit of "U.S. News & World

Report" found that the profit margin held at 1.1 cents in 1966, but will narrow to .8 cent this year. The 1967 figure is based on returns during the first quarter of the year. As the over-all price of food edges upward, grocers are wondering whether there will be a new clamor by housewives, with boycotts such as spread across the U.S. last year. Those boycotts were abandoned when the price of farm products eased off and prices in supermarkets followed suit.

WHAT'S AHEAD?

After eight straight months of declining food prices, the Government's latest cost-of-living report showed an upturn in May. The increase in food prices is expected to continue in the months to come.

Rising prices for milk, bakery products, fruits and many fresh vegetables were the major cause for the upturn of the food-price index. Now prices at meat counters are reflecting the higher prices that farmers have been receiving for cattle, hogs and sheep.

The White House moved on June 30 to firm up prices paid to farmers for milk by ordering a cutback in imported dairy products.

The volume of dairy imports coming into the U.S. had more than tripled since 1965. And there is growing pressure in Congress to restrict more sharply the volume of imported beef.

In its most recent outlook on food costs, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported:

"Average retail food prices are expected to rise more than seasonally this summer, if supplies of many livestock products are reduced, as now indicated, and demand continues strong. Prices likely will be relatively strong in final months of the year."

UPROAR: THE CAUSES

Why is it that housewives react so sharply to any increase in food prices?

Part of the answer appears to be that Americans have come to expect food to be cheap when compared with other things they have to buy. Until the last two years, food prices rose at a rate considerably less than that of other items in the cost of living.

In 1964, the price of food consumed in American homes had jumped by 4.7 per cent from the 1957–59 period that is used as a base in the Government's cost-of-living reports.

But, in the same period, prices of all other items in living costs had gone up by 8.9 per cent.

Through 1965 and most of 1966, food prices advanced sharply, touching off an outcry among the nation's homemakers. Then, in the last four months of 1966, costs eased off and continued to decline through the first four months of 1967.

Another reason increases in food prices trigger quick reaction from housewives is that food is the largest single item in the family budget. Thus, any increase in the price of food is quickly noticed.

The impact of food on the family budget is seen in the chart on page 70. Figures there show what happens to the family's spending dollar.

Whereas food will take only 17.6 cents of the average family's income dollar this year, it will take 19.2 cents of each dollar actually spent.

The next largest items in family spending are housing, which takes 14.58 cents of the dollar, and household operations, which take 14.33 cents.

Transportation is next in line, getting 12.33 cents of the spending dollar. Medical care takes 7.37 cents, and recreation accounts for 6.34 cents. Tobacco, liquor and wine get 4.92 cents.

The same chart shows that food is taking 3.69 cents less of the average family's spending dollar now than it did 10 years ago. Meanwhile, spending for housing, recreation, medical care and other items has been rising.

Actually, the families of this country today are enjoying 9 billion dollars more spending power for things besides food than they would have had if forced to spend the same proportion of their income on food that they spent only five years ago.

COST VERSUS POPULATION

Total outlay for food produced on American farms has been rising as population has increased and per capita consumption of food has edged upward.

This year, U.S. families will spend an estimated 86 billion dollars for foods produced by the nation's farmers. That is 27.7 billion more than the total outlay of 58.3 billion dollars in 1957.

Of this additional 27.7 billion dollars spent for food, the farmer is getting 7.1 billion. Profits of corporations in the business of processing, distributing and retailing food will be up a billion dollars. Another 8.6 billion will go to labor engaged in getting the food from farmers to housewives. Packing, fuel, electricity and all other costs will account for 11 billion of the total increase spent for food this year as compared with 1957.

THE MIDDLEMAN

Companies processing and retailing food are faced with shrinking margins in a business where profits are already low when compared with those of most industries.

Profits of member companies of the National Association of Food Chains averaged 1.31 cents out of each dollar of sales in 1966, and the association reports: "Current average profit rate is reliably estimated to be at or very slightly below 1 per cent."

Food-processing firms reported profits of 2.7 cents on each dollar of sales in 1966—the same margin as in 1964 and 1965. This year's profit margin in food processing, based on returns of the first three months of 1967, will be down to 2.5 cents.

For comparison, profits of manufacturing firms averaged 5.6 cents in 1966.

Wages paid to labor in the food-processing and retailing firms have been in a steady rise. The increase from 1965 to 1966 was 4 per cent, according to food-industry officials.

Farmers are finding profits no easier to come by than are food processors and retailers. Their share of the food dollar has been dwindling over the long term.

Farmers' share of the food dollar was 44.4 cents in 1948. It had dropped to 40.9 cents in 1950. By 1964, it was down to 31.4 cents, the lowest since the end of World War II.

In 1965 and 1966, when most farm prices were increasing, the farmers' share of the food dollar climbed back up, reaching 32.9 cents in 1965 and 33.7 cents in 1966.

This year, however, it will drop again to an estimated 32 cents.

FARM EXPENSES HIGH, TOO

Farmers, it is true, are taking in more and more money in most years. That is reflected in the fact that their share of the increased spending for food in the last 10 years will come to an estimated 7.1 billion dollars this year. But farmers, unlike industrial workers who have little expense connected with their jobs, have been hit hard by rising costs.

The gross income of U.S. farmers is expected to total around 49.5 billion dollars in 1967, equaling the record high received in 1966.

But economists of the Agriculture Department say the increase in farm-production expenses this year probably will exceed the average annual increase of a billion dollars in the past decade.

Expenses of farmers are running 4 per cent above those of 1966, thus eroding the net income that they can expect to have left at the end of the year.

Agricultural economists say farmers have been subsidizing America's food bargains. While getting less and less of each dollar spent for food, the growers have increased efficiency and volume in an effort to maintain income.

Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman describes the farmers' situation in these words:

"Our farm prices today are lower than they were 20 years ago. Yet the cost of what the farmer has to pay has gone up 35 per cent.

"Only by increasing his labor productivity 6 per cent annually, which is more than twice the improvement made by American industry, has the American farmer managed to survive.

"It's true that Government payments will help some, but, even so, our per capita farm income today is only two-thirds of our nonfarm income."

WHY INCREASES ARE NEEDED

The nation's grocers are trying to prepare housewives for the increases in food prices that are being predicted by Government officials.

This comment comes from Clarence G. Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains:

"Food prices are going to increase this summer and fall, regardless of the most favorable growing conditions and regardless of every cost-cutting economy food distributors can apply.

"As a matter of fact, food retailers want prices to go up. Modest increases are needed in some basic food products—notably beef, milk, poultry, and eggs—in order to interest a sufficient number of farmers to stay in the business.

"Unless the business of producing these basic farm goods is made more attractive, we will face very serious shortages in the years ahead."

Whether housewives like it or not, there is broad agreement in the nation's food industry that prices in the grocery store are headed upward.

FOOD CHAINS ARE CAUGHT IN A PROFIT SQUEEZE

[Figures in cents]

Earnings per dollar of sales, for eight large food chains:	
1950	1.3
1955	1.0
1960	1.2
1965	1.1
1967 (prelim.)	0.8

(Source: through 1966, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture; preliminary estimate for 1967 by USN&WR Economic Unit based on first three months of the year.)

Actually, the profit margin of chain stores could fall even lower than .8 of a cent in 1967. At that level, it would equal the historic low of 1952.

HOW PEOPLE'S SPENDING PATTERNS ARE CHANGING—HERE IS THE BREAKDOWN OF EACH DOLLAR OF CONSUMER SPENDING AMONG VARIOUS GOODS AND SERVICES

[In cents]

	10 years ago	Now (1967 estimate)	Change
Food	22.89	19.20	−3.69
Tobacco, liquor, wine, etc.	5.27	4.92	−.35
Clothing, shoes	10.49	10.45	−.04
Housing, including rental value of owner-occupied homes	13.68	14.58	+.90
Household operations	14.63	14.33	−.30
Medical care	5.40	7.37	+1.97
Transportation	13.47	12.33	−1.14
Recreation	5.45	6.34	+.89
Haircuts, other personal care	1.52	1.75	+.23
Legal and financial fees, other personal business	4.21	5.28	+1.07
Private education	1.01	1.40	+.39
Other expense	1.98	2.04	+.06

Note: In general, the trend of these boom years has been toward spending a smaller proportion of each dollar for the basic necessities of life, and a larger proportion for "discretionary" items, notably services of many kinds.

Source: 10 years ago, U.S. Department of Commerce: 1967, estimates by U.S.N. & W.R. Economic Unit based on official data.

ACHIEVING STABILITY IN THE HOUSING INDUSTRY

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of Congress remembers vividly the financial turmoil of last year, when interest rates reached record levels and the housing industry was plunged into a depression. While there is no firm indication that we are about to enter a similar period of chaos, signs point ominously to a tightening of credit that could set back the housing market just as it is on the verge of recovery.

On no less than three occasions since 1950, the housing industry has been severely constricted as the Federal Reserve tightened credit to ward off inflation. Last year, the cost of mortgage loans rose to their highest levels in the past 40 years and the construction rate of new homes and apartments dropped 909,000 units for the year.

In my view, this boom and bust cycle in the housing industry is intolerable. Congress has an obligation to take positive steps to encourage stability in this vital sector of the economy. Before the year 2000 the increase in population and income will create a demand for new housing greater than all the housing built since this Nation was first colonized. In light of this, recurrences of the 1966 fiasco would be intolerable.

The Department of Treasury stated, in a report to the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, that:

> Without question, the 1966 decline in housing starts can be explained in terms of the reduced availability and increased cost of mortgage money. If it were not for reductions in availability of mortgage funds, housing starts probably would have increased in 1966; so it seems reasonable to assert that financial conditions fully accounted, and in effect more than accounted, for the year-to-year decline in housing starts.

The cause of the 1966 shortage of mortgage money was just part of the overall lack of sufficient savings to meet the combined demands of consumers for financing their purchases, business for financing plant and equipment and expansion of inventories, and the Federal Government for its increased military and domestic programs.

The burden, however, fell mainly on homebuilding and its related industries. I think it is appropriate that we take legislative action to alleviate that extra burden on the housing industry, but I want to make clear that such action is necessitated by the administration's failure to adopt and implement a sound fiscal policy and conduct that policy in close coordination with monetary policy.

While the administration has been willing, even eager, to stimulate the economy when it lagged behind full capacity, and employment was at an undesirable level, it has been reluctant to take appropriate steps to eliminate some of the excess demand that has put pressure on capacity and prices. Instead of reducing expenditures or closing tax loopholes, it has insisted upon funds for programs that could either be eliminated outright—such as farm subsidies, certain "pork barrel" public works, and the supersonic transport—or deferred until such time as economic stability is achieved.

I want to issue a clear warning to all those who may have been lulled into a false sense of security by the relatively easy money situation of the past few months: last year's experience may well be repeated. Many segments of the business community are already making preparations for a tight money period. It is time that the Federal Government faced up to the realization that monetary policy alone is an inadequate tool to promote a healthy economy, and that when not used in tandem with responsible fiscal policy, can wreak havoc with vital segments of American banking and business. As Governor Robertson of the Federal Reserve Board stated last year during hearings on the mortgage credit crisis:

> If fiscal policy is not used, monetary policy must be used, and this in turn will result in an upward pressure on interest rates which could focus the impact of monetary policy more on the housing industry than on other areas of the economy.

Unfortunately, the effect of fiscal and monetary policies on the homebuilding and related industries is never fully discussed until they have been carried out and their impact is being felt. Decisions made by the Federal Reserve Board, the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board can turn the volume of homebuilding up full blast or reduce it to a mere trickle. But the Congress never debates these decisions until it is too late—until savings banks and savings and loan associations are teetering on the brink of insolvency, construction workers are laid off their jobs, and would-be homeowners are unable to find credit.

Fluctuations in the homebuilding industry do not occur by accident. They are the result of policies that have been planned and implemented, and as such, they can be anticipated. We can plan and anticipate far better than we have been doing, and I am introducing legislation today that will enable the administration and the Congress to do the kind of planning that is necessary to achieve stability in homebuilding.

This legislation provides—

> The program of the President as expressed in his annual message to the Congress shall include statements and recommendations concerning a residential construction goal. In furtherance of the realization of this goal the President shall transmit to the Senate and the House of Representatives, after the beginning of each session of the Congress, but not later than January 20, a report which shall include the following: (1) a statement indicating the minimum number of housing units which should be started during the then calendar year, or such year and the next following calendar year, in order to be consistent with the program of the President; (2) an indication of the manner in which fiscal and monetary policies will be administered by the executive agencies to achieve the number of housing units specified under clause (1); and (3) any recommendation for legislative action that the President determines is necessary or desirable in order that the construction of such specified number of housing units may be started.

Had this legislation been in effect a year ago, Congress would not have been faced with taking emergency steps to bring the homebuilding industry out of a depression. Congress would have already deliberated and debated the administration's economic plans and outlook and taken appropriate action to maintain stability in this vital area.

This has been recognized by the U.S. Savings & Loan League, which told the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs:

> We would also believe that the top level of government will be much more quick to recognize and prevent actions that will start the chain of events that dries up housing credit and home construction. Perhaps some Congressional statement in legislation or a report directing greater consideration to housing credit and homebuilding in establishing monetary policy would be appropriate.

Enactment of the legislation I have introduced today is mandatory if we are to insure that there will be stability in the allocation of public and private resources to meet this Nation's housing needs.

THE ESSENTIAL MISSION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, let us not permit the awful rioting and destruction which have plagued Newark, Detroit, and other cities in recent weeks to cloud our vision or to divert us from our essential mission. We have known for many years that we live in an extremely difficult and painful period of history. We also know of the terribly urgent problems which urban ghettos pose for our Nation, and of the potential for social explosion which urban poverty breeds.

Certainly we must support the President in demanding an end to rioting, pillage, and violence. Certainly we must support local law enforcement authorities in demanding just retribution for those who have so flagrantly and shamefully violated the basic concepts of our social order. Certainly we must see to it that law and order prevail.

But these imperatives, Mr. Speaker, should never blind us to the fundamental need to proceed, calmly and responsibly, with effective programs to overcome poverty, and to bring decent jobs, decent homes, and decent education to all Americans.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, it is especially crucial to our future as a nation that we proceed undaunted with

the war on poverty, which has opened up to millions of disadvantaged Americans the first chance to help themselves, and to earn their own opportunity for constructive and purposeful citizenship in a healthy society. Now more than ever, Mr. Speaker, we must rededicate ourselves—without regard to party affiliation—to overcoming the ravages of poverty and deprivation by maintaining and strengthening a program that is working well, and that provides hope where only despair has existed before.

So let us have an end to the rioting and disorder, Mr. Speaker, and let us punish those who are guilty, but let us act as statesmen to see that the war on poverty is won, and the sores of social discontent removed from our body politic.

H.R. 11978: CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER'S BILL TO INCREASE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the guaranteed student loan program, which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has met with severe setbacks and has to date been unable to meet its full potential.

This program of low-interest insured loans to qualified college students is a commendable one. It was intended to assist middle- and low-income families in financing college educations for their children.

The loan program provides that all qualified students are eligible to receive insured low-interest loans regardless of family income, and that those students from families having an adjusted income of less than $15,000 would have all their interest paid by the Federal Government while they are in school and 3 percentage points of the 6 percent total during the repayment period which begins 9 months after the student leaves college or graduate school.

The loans may be made to students by banks and other lending institutions and insured by State loan guarantee authorities or by private nonprofit agencies. A Federal loan insurance program is authorized on a standby basis, if adequate State and private plans are not reasonably accessible to students. To date the Federal Government has not guaranteed any student loans.

The Federal Government advances money, known as "seed money," to strengthen or to help establish State and private nonprofit agencies insurance funds.

This loan program which got underway last summer has provided about $360 million in loans to an estimated 430,000 students—a praiseworthy achievement, but unfortunately not adequate to the student demand for these loans.

The average cost today of attending a public college or university is estimated by the Office of Education at $1,020 an academic year—and for a private college or university at $2,066 a year. Many writers and economists have arrived at considerably higher estimates.

The latest estimate of the Bureau of Census put the median money income of American families with heads under 65 years at $7,352. Clearly those families with incomes of $7,352 or less would find it very difficult if not impossible to support one, let alone two or more children through college. Therefore it is imperative that we, in a nation that honors equality of educational opportunity as a basic principle of justice, aid those families who have present difficulties in sending their children through college.

It has been obvious for many months now that the problems besetting this program have resulted in a reluctance on the part of many private lenders to participate and a refusal of others to accept more than a very limited number of applications for insured loans to students.

Consequently many students have been unable to obtain these loans, and have been unable to continue their education.

There are two main problems Mr. Speaker, that have prevented this program from functioning fully. First, the banks and other lenders contend that the maximum interest rate of 6 percent does not cover the cost to the lenders in today's tight money market.

When this maximum interest rate was arrived at over 2 years ago, it was considered a break-even rate for the lenders. The banks and other lending institutions insist that this was never a realistic appraisal, and that 6 percent maximum has proved to be a "loss" rate for them.

Student loans are given for comparatively long terms. The loans do not contribute to bank liquidity through repayment of principle in the way that other loans, including installment loans, do. Repayment of principle on an installment loan, which is comparable to a student loan, begins within a month after credit has been extended, whereas repayment on student loans may not begin until at least 9 months after the borrower completes his course of study. Loans are repaid within 5 to 10 years after graduation. This creates a long timelag in the "rollover" time of this money.

This 6 percent interest maximum is the same rate that many banks charge their prime business borrowers.

Second, there is a burdensome amount of paper work involved in making and processing these loans. Student loans, because of the extra paperwork and the extra time involved, cost more than most other types of loans.

These pressing problems must be remedied before the lenders will decide in favor of allocating their limited funds for student loans.

Today I am introducing a bill to increase the effectiveness of the guaranteed student loan programs. This bill would amend provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and of the National Vocational Loan Insurance Act of 1965, to encourage banks and other lenders to participate fully in this timely and much needed student loan program.

Since the main obstacles to the efficient functioning of this program are the maximum interest rate allowable on loans, and the cumbersome and costly paperwork involved in making these loans, my amendments concern themselves largely with these two areas.

My bill would permit the President of the United States, after consultation with the Federal Reserve Board, to set interest rates, by Executive order, in excess of 6 percent when the President has determined that such a rate is necessary for this program to be fully realized, and would provide for Federal payment of the additional interest cost.

I am fully aware of the fact that 11 States—Delaware, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia—have usury laws which set contract rates at a 6-percent maximum. These States could, however, amend their usury laws to make an exception of the long-term guaranteed student loans, as many States now make other exceptions to their usury laws when it serves an important public purpose.

This interest rate, set by the President in an Executive order, would not be mandatory. A lending institution could charge less than the maximum. But this variable ceiling would prevent the establishmemt by the Federal Government of any arbitrary interest figure which might become a bar to the effectiveness of this program. It would enable the President to assure that, insofar as the Federal Government would be concerned, there would be no arbitrary barrier across the road of higher education.

I further propose that the private lenders be entitled to charge certain fees, to be set on an appropriate basis by the Secretary, to cover the costs of making these loans that are not adequately compensated for by allowable interest charges.

Private lenders would be permitted up to $35 for processing each approved student loan application and up to $35 for work involved in consolidation or other conversion fees when the repayment period begins. A servicing fee of up to $1 for each installment payable by the borrower would also be permitted. All processing, consolidation and other conversion fees would be paid for by the Federal Government.

The passage of these amendments would insure fulfillment of the great potential of the guaranteed student loan program, by giving it greater appeal to those lending institutions that have to date been reluctant to commit themselves to this program.

Today we are faced with the problem of ever-spiraling costs to the student and his family for attendance at an institution of higher learning. Over the past 10 years the cost of attending a public institution has risen 19 percent and there has been a 41-percent increase in private school costs.

If we are to make meaningful finan-

cial assistance to all students willing and able to benefit from a college education, then we must amend the guaranteed student loan program. This program is based on sound principles and with the adoption of my amendments it could make a major contribution to the financing of undergraduate, graduate, and vocational education for students of low- and middle-income families. A democracy must invest in the education of all its young people if it is to flourish.

CONGRESSMAN PEPPER INTRODUCES THE HOSPITAL EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there are serious problems in many of our Nation's hospitals—problems of inadequate and overcrowded facilities, problems of people with serious fractures and other disorders having to wait hours for admittance and treatment in overburdened hospitals. In an effort to alleviate this critical shortage and relieve the misery caused in many communities by this crisis in hospital facilities, I am introducing the Hospital Emergency Assistance Act of 1967. This bill is cosponsored in the other body by Senators MAGNUSON and TYDINGS.

Feeling as I do that this legislation represents the best in the fine tradition of creative legislative assistance to hospital construction and care first established by the Hill-Burton program in 1946 and continued through the years, it is my pleasure to introduce today H.R. 11979, a program of direct emergency Federal aid to critically overburdened and obsolescent hospitals in the Nation. I also commend my colleague from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] for his leadership on this legislation. I would like to submit, at this point in the RECORD, a telegram from the AFL–CIO and a letter from the American Hospital Association in support of this legislation.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 26, 1967.

Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The AFL–CIO strongly supports H.R. 6418, as amended, to include hospital emergency assistance programs. We urgently request your support.

ANDREW J. BIEMILLER,
Director, Department of Legislation.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
WASHINGTON SERVICE BUREAU,
Washington, D.C., July 18, 1967.

Hon. RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Longworth House Office Building,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. OTTINGER: We were greatly interested in the firm support evidenced by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in adopting your amendment to H.R. 6418. Certainly this indicates the concern the Congress has in the need for additional hospital facilities.

An inquiry has been made as to whether we believe your proposal is in conflict with the Hill-Burton program. As we understand your proposal it would offer emergency financing to relieve the immediate pressure upon hospitals not only for the construction of hospital beds, but other services which may be needed. We further understand that the amendments resulting from your proposal would be administered in such a manner as to be consistent with the over-all planning of the Hill-Burton program. Therefore, it does not appear to us that your proposal is in conflict with the Hill-Burton program.

May we express to you our appreciation for your deep concern in the needs of hospitals and for your efforts to assist them in meeting the needs of their communities for hospital services.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER'S AMENDMENTS TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced four amendments to the current OEO bill in an attempt to fight for the attitude that our senior citizens can serve some useful purpose to our great national effort in decreasing the poverty which has ensnared so many of our citizens, while at the same time raise their standard of living because of Government recompense for their services. I would like to give a brief summary of these amendments.

My first proposal would earmark a total of $150 million of the funds appropriated for title II of the Economic Opportunity Act to be used for programs to assist senior citizens who are poor. This figure is not pulled out of thin air. The aged poor in this country represent one-seventh of our total population, and therefore should benefit from at least one-seventh of the moneys expended by OEO.

My second, third, and fourth amendments would encourage administrators of the poverty programs to make maximum use of senior citizens in administrative and advisory capacities; would suggest that when current contracts for community action programs come up for renewal and examination, the Office of Economic Opportunity require that the agency show that it has made an effort to use all qualified senior citizens who are interested in participating; and before OEO renews a grant the program must demonstrate its use of senior citizens.

Senior citizens who are ready, willing, and able to serve, and who have the required expertise, should be allowed to serve. It is a criminal waste of good talent and important resources not to take advantage of those dedicated senior citizens who want to do something to aid and advance the general standard of living in our great democracy so that we may become a stronger nation, better able to meet the increasing challenges of our future.

Mr. Speaker, I have requested permission to insert after this statement my testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor on July 28, which, I believe will clarify many points of these proposals:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. It gives me a great pleasure to welcome my distinguished colleague before this committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. It is always his custom to come here on matters of great importance to the nation. Naturally, you are one of the outstanding students of Government in the Congress. You have demonstrated that in so many different ways. It is a pleasure to welcome the gentleman that has taken so much interest before the House Committee on Rules where we get more measures like this.

Proceed, Senator Pepper, in any way you like.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this distinguished committee. It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to speak here today in favor of HR 8311, the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967. I have given my continuous support to the programs authorized by this act, and would enthusiastically urge that they be extended and in some cases expanded.

I would like to commend this committee for their diligent efforts in evaluating the poverty program. In a program so new and so innovative in its approach, there is a great danger of improper activities being funded, of mismanagement of funds, and of funds being used for political purposes. We in Congress must constantly be vigilant in watching for this type of criticism, and must make every effort to see to it that such activities are not funded by the Federal government.

On the whole, however, I think the antipoverty programs have made an impressive record. It may be a period of years before we can evaluate their long-term effectiveness. But as we see individuals being trained so that they may secure permanent employment, as we see little children in Head Start receiving much-needed medical attention, as we see students able to finish high school because they are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps—we know that the poverty program is having an immensely important impact.

I will give my full support to the 1967 Amendments. However, there are several changes which I would like to see made in the legislation. I hope this committee will take these suggestions under consideration before the bill is reported out.

The first amendment I would suggest is one which would amend Section 205(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act by inserting a sentence to the effect that title II funds could be used for construction of night illumination systems for public recreational areas. This amendment would read:

"Page 50, at the end of line 12, insert the following: Component programs may also include projects for the construction of night illumination systems for public recreational areas."

Such an addition would serve the purpose of directing OEO to allow funds allocated for summer programs to be spent on erecting the lighting fixtures so that the recreational programs at the swimming pool, playground,

or baseball diamond could be continued into the evening hours.

I very much favor the expenditure of funds for summer programs. I have seen how helpful these programs can be in keeping young people occupied and out of trouble. The President, in his message to the Congress requesting the appropriation of $75 million for summer programs and specifically mentioned that the funds would be used "to keep schools, libraries and playgrounds open, to build swimming pools, and to light basketball courts and baseball diamonds in the evenings." Congress acted with dispatch and passed this appropriation, with the understanding that playground lighting was an integral part of the program.

And yet, when the community action agency in my home district in Miami submitted their application for funds for their summer program, they were told they could not have the money for providing illumination. The policy of the Office of Economic Opportunity was to provide funds for the operation of recreation programs, insofar as this includes the payment of salaries of youth workers to supervise the playground or the swimming pool at night, but not to construct or operate the lights. OEO cited legislative restrictions on construction in its programs. I talked to Mr. Shriver personally about this and Mr. Chairman he affirmed this understanding of the limitations against this sort of provision in the law.

Fortunately, in this case our local authorities were able to work out an arrangement to provide part of the lighting needed. But I think we should remove any doubt that while we prohibit use of OEO funds for general construction, the Congress does not intend that OEO should be prohibited from assisting in the provision of lighting equipment where this is necessary to permit recreation areas to operate at night. We are all too aware this summer of the use of time and energy for violence, which might be channeled into the playground.

I would strongly urge this committee to consider adding a sentence to the Act to specify that it is the intent of Congress that funds may be used for this purpose to encourage wherever possible wholesome recreation and help reduce restless and lawless activity in our crowded urban centers.

The second area of concern to me is the matter of programs for senior citizens. One-third of those persons over the age of 65 do not have enough income to escape from being poor. The number of persons in this category is approximately five million. This means that the aged constitute one-seventh of the poor in this country.

A primary emphasis of the programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act is to assist young people in gaining the education and training to enable them to break out of the cycle of poverty and become self-supporting adults. The Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Project Head Start, Upward Bound—all of these focus on children and youth. I would not suggest that these programs assisting young persons are not of prime importance. They must be continued, indeed expanded.

But this concentration on youth tends to let us forget the sizable group of senior citizens who are experiencing want and deprivation.

No one intends to ignore this group. Much has been said about including them in the war on poverty. But the time for talk is over. I think we must come down to some concrete proposals.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am offering three amendments to H.R. 8311 which will encourage greater attention to older Americans and to the role they can and should have in the Economic Opportunity Act programs. My first proposal would earmark a total of $150 million of the funds appropriated for Title II of this Act to be used for programs to assist senior citizens who are poor. This amendment should read:

"Page 76, after line 12, insert the following:

"'(c) Section 610 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Of the funds appropriated to carry out this Act for a fiscal year, not less than $150,000,000 shall be expended on special programs for the elderly poor".'

"And redesignate subsections (c), (d), and (e), as (d), (e), and (f) respectively."

This amendment has not just been pulled out of the air. My reasoning is this. The aged represent one-seventh of the total number of poor Americans, therefore, they should benefit from one-seventh of the programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity has asked for $1 billion $22 million for urban and rural community action programs under Title II. The fair share of this amount that should be allocated to programs for senior citizens is approximately $150 million.

Chairman PERKINS. Just a moment, Mr. Pepper. I want you to summarize the last minute what you have submitted there. You read an amendment to the $150 million being earmarked, but I was busy. What did you say after that? And I will follow you then.

Mr. PEPPER. Just summarize?

Chairman PERKINS. No, just the last paragraph.

Mr. PEPPER. I recommended $150 million. This figure has not just been pulled out of the air. Our reasoning is that the aged represent one-seventh of the total number of poor persons, therefore, they should benefit from one-seventh of the programs for the poor.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has asked for $1 billion $22 million for urban and rural community action programs under Title II. The fair share of this amount which should be allocated to programs for senior citizens would be about one-seventh of that amount, about $150 million.

Chairman PERKINS. I see.

Go ahead.

Mr. PEPPER. During these hearings, you have heard how successful the Foster Grandparents program has been. This program which provides employment for the aged poor, demonstrates what can be done. As of March of 1966, 21 foster grandparent projects had been funded. This number has increased to a current level of 49 projects. However, this represents an expenditure of only $5.5 million. Ten million dollars is planned for funding for fiscal year 1958. I am sure there are other types of programs which could be designed to give senior citizens a chance for part-time work, a chance to earn much-needed income, and at the same time, perform a necessary task to help others who are in need.

Now, this is the second amendment, also, in the field of aid to senior citizens. My second amendment reads:

"Page 76, after line 16, insert the following:

"'(d) Part A of Title VI of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'"USE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES OF SENIOR CITIZENS

"'"SEC. 610–2. The Administrator shall encourage all persons charged with carrying out programs under this Act to make maximum use in administrative and advisory capacities of the volunteer services of persons who, by reason of having retired from their regular employment, may be considered senior citizens".'

"And redesignate subsections (d) and (e) as (e) and (f), respectively."

Chairman PERKINS. Senator Pepper, I agree wholeheartedly with this statement. I met with the Commission of Aged in my office resulting from a walk that I took over the holidays and seeing that which is being done for our elderly people had just made me sick. We were supposed to have VISTA workers, Appalachian volunteers, but the people who were unable to get out of their bed were being completely overlooked and were receiving some public assistance.

We have this elderly group that we know these people and it would be the greatest thing that we could possibly do to see that their time and mind was occupied in this direction, especially in areas where we will not have any trained nurses any time in the future. I am speaking now of the rural areas. You are more likely addressing yourself to urban areas.

I, personally, am going to insist on an amendment of this kind. I think that you are so right where we could so wisely spend some money and we must do something along this line.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, you know how gratified I am to hear you say that. I am advised Mr. Shriver when asked the question testified before the Senate that nothing is being done for senior citizens, there was no program designed, as I understand it, for senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, it is intended to require the maximum use of senior citizens in programs authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act. Section 610 specifies that it is the intent of Congress that whenever feasible the special problems of the elderly poor should be considered in the development, conduct, and administration of programs under this Act. I find no fault with this section, but I do have doubts as to whether it has been implemented to the fullest extent possible.

I am sure that in many cities, counties, towns, and villages, many of our senior citizens are vitally interested in the war on poverty. Not only are they interested, but many of them have had special experience which could be effectively utilized in the many programs in operation. They have worked as teachers, social workers, businessmen, and lawyers, thereby possessing skills which are in great demand in such programs as Head Start, community action, neighborhood legal services, and adult education and training.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt and state in your area that is true but in my particular area here these people who are above 65 years of age in a rural area are just more or less withering on the vine, living on a very little income, so many of them are, and we should put those people to work.

Mr. PEPPER. They are so eager to work.

Chairman PERKINS. They are eager and they want to do it and they are dedicated. They are the type of individual that are dedicated to that community and we should make arrangements for them to participate as so-called VISTAs or whatever they may be to do something for these elderly people that are being overlooked.

Mr. PEPPER. They will bless you forever, Mr. Chairman, for your wonderful leadership of that.

President Johnson, in his January 23rd message to the 90th Congress on Aid for the Aged, requested that the Office of Economic Opportunity "initiate and expand programs to make a wider range of volunteer activities available to older citizens." He mentioned such fields as tutors, classroom aides in Head Start, and greater participation in VISTA.

My proposal would require that some specific regulations be drawn up to encourage the community action agencies and others administering anti-poverty programs to make greater use of senior citizens. I would suggest that when the current contracts come up for renewal and examination, the Office of Economic Opportunity require that the agency show that it has made an effort to hire qualified senior citizens interested in helping in the war against poverty.

By fully utilizing this segment of our population, we will make the war on poverty even more successful, first by securing the services

of skilled employees, and second, by involving still another group in the total community effort to eliminate poverty.

My third amendment is related to the second, but focused on another aspect of the poverty program. It reads:

"Page 76, after line 12, insert the following:

"'(c) Section 610 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Director shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that in carrying out programs under this Act maximum use is made of the services of persons who, by reason of having retired from regular employment, may be considered senior citizens".'

"And redesignate subsections (c), (d), and (e) as (d), (e) and (f)."

Chairman PERKINS. Let me interrupt you.

What do you think about some language directing VISTA workers to make special efforts to provide services for senior citizens, particularly in isolated rural areas, and implementing the law to the extent that local senior citizens who are qualified may participate? Do you think that would be a good amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. The reason I say that to you, Mr. Pepper, we have reached the youngsters so well in many areas of my district but when you get out on one of these towns up the creek as I like to go up and down on occasions, many of these elderly people on public assistance will say to me, "Well, we hear all about this poverty program and we are discouraged. You know, we are supposed to get medical treatment and the red tape is so much that under the medical program as administered by the Economic Opportunity Act they won't even go in and charge the medicine that they must buy. They pay for it out of the old age assistance check."

I ran into three cases of that kind down there in one day and they said to me, "Why can't you help us somewhere along the line?"

It just points up the fact that we need here just what you are talking about and as Chairman of this committee if we don't do something about it, I am going to offer an amendment on the Floor of the House because this just must be done; we cannot neglect these people up and down these creeks where our local Appalachian volunteers and VISTAs have completely forgotten about them.

It is time for us to put some language in the bill to see that we make special efforts to provide services to senior citizens. I know this particularly in the isloated rural areas, and I think the same is true as you say in your area.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I don't think you could do a more commendable thing.

Chairman PERKINS. It just burns me up to see people who profess to know the area and make great headlines and never touch the real needs in the area.

Mr. PEPPER. They don't want to be bothered in many instances, Mr. Chairman, with the senior citizens; they just think they don't want to be bothered with them and yet they are the greatest reservoir of untapped resources I believe in the United States.

Chairman PERKINS. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. PEPPER. I happen to be 66 years old; maybe I should not boast about it, but if anybody told me that I was living in a community and retired and I could not do something to help in one of these programs, as we crackers say, I would want to fight them about it.

Now, there are two categories. One of them is the group where $200, $250 a month would be a bonanza to them, give them a little income, give them something to do. The other group is people well to do who made a business success, retired from their own business but want to do something because they are good Americans; they want to help their country and they got tired of resting and fishing and doing the recreational things.

I have had many of them come to me, bankers and businessmen. One had me to lunch one day across from the bank. He said, "I am one of the boys at the bank; I want to do something. Can't you get me in this OEO program? I have been a successful businessman; I have been healthy."

He was a handsome fellow, well dressed. He would gladly serve for $200 a month or nothing, for that matter, but we cannot find a place for him.

Chairman PERKINS. One other point that I feel I must press myself to in the rural areas. I have been on housing and I know the Housing Administration, I feel, has done a most worthy job but from the standpoint of rural housing it has been practically nil and these people reside in what we may term huts and just want a little better opportunity to know it is no fault of their own, and I am speaking about these senior citizens.

We should utilize these senior citizens who are living on a meager income in my area, many of them, $40 a month, $45 a month, depth of economic security, never were able to take advantage of the Social Security Act. We should utilize this where they have nowhere to work as a fairly good carpenter and knowing a little something about building, put them under some competent supervisor and get some loans even though the Government has to subsidize them which would be small, $500 or $1,000, to winterize the home, put a decent roof over their heads.

There is nothing in this District of Columbia that will compare with some of these rural shacks that prevail in my district. I am just hopeful that our Government is not going to forget about these people because they are not rioting and rising up against the Government and all these things.

We have got to recognize the real needs of the people wherever they are, whether they are in a ghetto in the metropolitan area or in a rural area. It has been my point of view and I have found that I have long supported every piece of legislation to come before the Congress, to help the citizens, to promote the general welfare of the people in those areas, but I likewise feel that the time is long past due that we should do something about these poor people.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer this caution. I think you are going to have to make the language strong in order to get the administrative people to carry out what we have in mind.

Thank you very much.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you so much for your appearance. You have been most helpful.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, may I just add this?

The proposal would amend the Act to encourage the use of senior citizens as volunteers in administrative and advisory capacities. This would not be a mandatory requirement, but would rather be considered as a guideline for those directing the programs. The focus in this proposal would be on making use of the expertise and knowledge of senior citizens in administering programs.

There is an added benefit which will accrue from the increased use of senior citizens as volunteers. This is in the lowering of the costs of administering the programs. In an effort such as the Economic Opportunity Act which is specifically designed to eliminate poverty, we are especially conscious of the sums allocated to administer the programs.

The ideal is to use as much of the budget as possible for direct assistance to the poor themselves, and not siphon off large amounts for overhead. The use of volunteer help at the administrative level can prove to be of great value by securing talented persons with a commitment to the program, who are willing to contribute their time and energy without compensation.

I urge your consideration of these four amendments. I hope that they can be added to the proposal now before you. They will add to the effectiveness of the Economic Opportunity Act in its efforts to eliminate poverty.

THE RATS COME EVERY NIGHT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday—July 20, 1967—the House refused even to debate the Rat Extermination Act of 1967. During consideration of the rule, a number of Members seemed to find the idea of Federal aid to control the proliferation of rats in American cities a subject for humorous remarks.

It would be wonderful if all Americans could join these Members in a good laugh over rats. Unfortunately, they cannot. For many Americans, rats, the diseases they carry, the bites they inflict, are to be dealt with every day. For these Americans the problem of rats cannot be laughed away.

Mr. Jimmy Breslin, the distinguished columnist, has put this matter in its proper perspective and I commend to all Members his article which appeared July 25 in the Washington Post.

The article is as follows:

HARLEM'S ENDLESS BATTLE: THE RATS COME EVERY NIGHT

(By Jimmy Breslin)

NEW YORK.—At eight o'clock at night, the rats come up from the spaces around the sewer pipes under the boiler room where they have slept all day. They cling to the big rusted pipe and come up into the boiler room and then they start up the pipes which are inside the walls of the five-story tenement. The rats come for food and water in the apartments where the people live.

As the rats crawled through the building, many of the people who live at 220 East 111th St. in the part of New York called East Harlem were out on the sidewalk. Many of them talked about the trouble of the night before, when a man with a knife was killed by a cop up at the corner.

The neighborhood made the first motions towards a riot, then stopped when Mayor Lindsay arrived and plunged into the crowd. Now, two games of dice were played by men standing in semi-circles around the bottom of the stoop. Four men sat on milk boxes around a card table playing dominoes. Pedro Perdomo, in a yellow polo shirt and floppy field worker's hat, sat on a car fender and pounded a bongo drum held between his knees.

"Yare, yare," he sang out.

"Caro," four people yelled back.

TAKES OFF SHOE

Upstairs, in apartment three on the third floor, Cathy Marrero shrieked. Her husband Ebro broke in a smile. They had just chased two rats from under the kitchen sink and the rats had run into the bathroom and Ebro had slammed the door on them. Now, Ebro said. Now I have them. The rats always stay in the bathroom, licking water from the tub. They never crawl out of the room. Ebro bent down and took off his left shoe.

"Ha," he said.

"Here," his wife said. She handed him a flatiron. Ebro shook his head no. He held the shoe up in his right hand and opened the bathroom door slowly, and slid inside. He slammed the door behind him. He began shouting, "Ho, ha, ho," while he beat the two rats in the bathtub to death with the shoe. The shoe sounded hollow against the sides of the bathtub.

Ebro opened the door and came out, his face and arms glistening with sweat. He pointed to the rats inside, in the bathtub. They were very small rats for East Harlem. They were much larger than mice, but still very small for East Harlem, where rats are very big.

"You came just in time," Ebro said.

"Do you chase them like this every night?" he was asked.

DOING THE DISHES

"Every night? how could you work in the morning if you do this?" He said, "They just came this time right out under the sink while my wife is doing the dishes. She started chasing them. So I chase too."

His wife came in with a handbrush and a paper bag. She swept the two dead rats into a paper bag. She reached over and emptied the two dead rats out of the paper bag and into the toilet. She flushed the toilet. She put the paper bag into the bathtub. Ebro lit a match and set the bag on fire. After the paper bag burned away, his wife took a bottle of disinfectant from the shelf and poured it all over the bathtub. The disinfectant smelled strong and Ebro left.

He walked out to the living room while his wife scrubbed the bathtub. To get to the living room you go first into the kitchen, then through two rooms that have no doors or windows. A bed, and a crib next to it, was in each room. You come out into a small front room that has a linoleum floor. A broken couch, two rocking chairs and a stuffed chair covered with a plastic filled the small room.

A framed Army discharge certificate and pictures of John F. Kennedy and the Sacred Heart were on the wall over the couch. The two sooty windows were open to the hot air of the street and the sound of the bongo drum.

"The rats come every night?" Ebro was asked.

"All night long," he said. "You see into the kitchen from here? See the refrigerator? I have two by four wood holding it up. That is so we can get underneath it with a broom to chase the rats when they get under it."

"Don't you use a rat trap or poison?"

"The children," he said. "You cannot have traps and poison around with babies. No. Nobody uses traps because everybody has babies. Have you ever smelled a rat when he dies under the floorboards or between the walls? No way to get him out."

"Why don't you try cats?"

CAT DISAPPEARS

He smiled. "The janitor got this big cat and put him in the boiler room. One morning he told me to come and look. There was cat fur all around the boiler room. And no cat. Huh. There are rats in the boiler room bigger than any cat."

A dog then? "Sometimes dogs are good, sometimes they're not. Is more trouble than it's worth anyway. There are so many rats in this neighborhood for anything to work."

Ebro is 27. He works for the Railway Express Agency. His wife came into the room with cans of beer. Ebro and his wife sat and drank from the cans.

"Our baby is only three weeks," she said. "We keep him in bed with us. The other two, we have the crib set up high. No rats come there so far. But you still can't leave a baby alone."

"Has anybody been bitten by them?"

"Who hasn't?" Ebro said.

"What do you do when you get bitten?"

"Nothing," he said. "Oh, some people have had to go to the doctor. But with me, only nips."

"Come into the kitchen and be quiet and you hear them," his wife said.

SOUNDS IN THE WALLS

We went into the kitchen and drank beer from the cans and listened for what seemed like a long time but was only 10 minutes. Then there was this sound in the walls. A scratching sound. The tumbling, scrambling sound when one of the rats moved quickly.

It is a sound by itself. And when you are young, and you sleep on the side of the bed next to the wall and rats scratch against the wall at your ear, you carry the sound with you for the rest of your life. It is something that is heard by people in every poor neighborhood in every city in the Nation. And it is one of the reasons why this is our longest of summers. Last week, the House of Representatives thought it all was a cause for laughter.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON APPLAUDED

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I warmly commend the President for a frank, clear, and compassionate appeal to the Nation to bind up its wounds of recent weeks, restore law and order, and, most important, restore that spirit of American respect which must exist between men if our society is to endure.

I congratulate the President on the excellent panel of leaders he has chosen to make a thorough investigation of the riots.

He made clear the fact that there is a time to analyze riots, and there is a time to halt them and punish the perpetrators.

The Nation, the cities, the States have taken those steps. But order will not be maintained solely by weapons and troops, although the President's proposal to give riot training to the National Guard is an excellent one.

True order must be built on progress.

True order must be built on opportunity.

The President cited many dynamic and imaginative, economic and social opportunity programs his administration has fostered—from health to education, from job training to housing, from model cities to law enforcement assistance.

In the President's phrase, this is not the time to turn away from America's reform programs.

Riots will be put down. Violence will be prosecuted. Economic and social programs must go on.

HAL I. LEYSHON

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 the death of Hal I. Leyshon saddened a far-flung circle of friends who, over the years, had known him both as an exceptionally able public relations consultant and as a fine person.

His professional excellence insured the consistent success of his endeavors—for tourism in the State of Florida, the election of President Harry S. Truman, the American Federation of Musicians and its president, James Petrillo, and the government of the U.S. Virgin Islands, to name a few.

In particular, Hal's relentless efforts for legislation to repeal the cabaret tax, to establish a Federal Council on the Arts and a Foundation for the Arts and Humanities and to insure their quality have benefited the entire Nation.

I am deeply grieved by the death of my close friend, Hal Leyshon. I know his many friends on both sides of the aisle share my feeling of loss.

A profound sense of justice and beauty, personal integrity, and foresight marked Hal as a man and pervaded his work. His spirit was dynamic; his causes, many. After winning the Pulitzer Prize in 1938 for exposing corruption in Miami politics, he founded Leyshon and Associates, a public relations promotion firm which soon achieved professional recognition. During World War II, he served as a public information officer for the Army Air Forces. Discharged as a lieutenant colonel, he conducted the Air Power League's successful national campaign for congressional approval of equal status in the services for the Air Force.

Throughout the next two decades, Leyshon and Associates worked for other such diverse clients as the Kansas State Centennial, the National American Red Cross, Trans World Airlines, the Democratic National Committee, and, his favorite, the American Federation of Musicians. Just recently, Hal finished plans for the National Governors' Conference to be held in the Virgin Islands in October.

Meanwhile he continued to write, drawing from his own experiences. He collaborated with John M. Redding in 1943 on "Skyways to Berlin," a book of vividly recalled Air Force experiences. The year 1950 saw publication of "Front Page Deadline," written with Jack Kofoed, about a Southern newspaper's crusades. Hal also maintained membership in the Overseas Press Club, the Miami Club, the National Press Club, and the Welsh Society of St. David's.

Personally, I will remember Hal for his unstinting devotion to the arts and deep involvement in their national promotion; to him they expressed the finest qualities in humanity and especially in American life. I can think of no more fitting tribute to this honored friend than that we continue to further them in the same spirit of excellence and dedication that he embodied.

In this, as in our other endeavors, Hal will always be missed deeply.

MISLEADING ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM CRITICISM

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been some more criticism of the poverty program based upon what some local group had proposed to do. Under the program as structured by Congress, local agencies and councils made up of volunteer personnel plan and structure and propose programs. The local community must pay 10 percent of the cost but volunteer services can be given credit toward that 10 percent. With thousands of local groups and tens of thousands of ideas of programs, of course, there will be some proposals that are out of line and there are many proposals that are not approved by poverty program officials. It is not surprising that there are still proposals being made that are out of line but it is surprising that anyone would still assume that a proposal by a local agency amounted to some kind of action by poverty program officials. It is also surprising that there would be so much comment manufactured over a misinterpretation of what was a mere local proposal to start with. To further clarify the record, I am submitting for the RECORD a statement by OEO and a letter from its Director, Sargent Shriver, to me.

They are as follows:

[From the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C., July 26, 1967]

OEO STATEMENT ON LOCAL SHARE CONTRIBUTIONS

The policy of the North Central Region of the Office of Economic Opportunity does not and will not allow local share contributions for general news coverage or editorial comment.

In-kind credit has been given for spot announcements contributed by local Iowa stations. The spots have announced recruitment for the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps, an innoculation clinic for small children, and the location and telephone number of newly-established rural outreach offices.

No in-kind arrangement was ever made, nor will be made, pertaining to general news coverage or editorial comment with radio or television stations.

No arrangement of this nature was ever concluded with a newspaper, nor will be. A proposal by a local community action program in Iowa suggested such an arrangement. It was a local proposal to local press. No application containing such a proposal has been approved by the OEO regional office in Kansas City. Should one be received there, no such proposal would be approved.

We naturally hope public communications media throughout the country will continue to aid the War on Poverty by public service announcements of the availability of its programs—and be objective, impartial, factual, and thorough in their reportorial analysis of anti-poverty issues. We feel the press and radio-television must do this of their own volition.

The OEO will not permit local share, in-kind arrangements dealing with public service announcements or statements in any news media.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1967.

Hon. NEAL SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR NEAL: I wanted to write you regarding the concern that has been expressed over an OEO program in Iowa as a result of a July 22 editorial carried by the Des Moines Register.

First, let me say that this matter relates to the local share required of communities in their participation in anti-poverty programs. To qualify for Federal assistance a community must contribute a local share toward the project. This share is evaluated in dollars but often is provided in kind through building space, volunteer services, etc.

What we are talking about, therefore, is a proposal that a community ought to be able to count against its local share the amount of public service time and space local radio stations and newspapers provide for announcements of such things as Head Start and Job Corps recruitment, community meetings, etc.

The inference in the editorial of any form of bribery whatsoever is totally inaccurate. The Community Action Agency has nothing to offer the station or paper in return for the public service announcements carried in the interest of the community.

As you will see in the enclosed statement, the Office of Economic Opportunity has never permitted local in-kind credit for news coverage in the press or on radio-television. The charge that it has is totally incorrect.

The North Central Regional Office and the Southeast Regional Office of OEO did permit in-kind credit for certain services that normally would have been paid for. You will note the specific nature of these notices in the statement.

OEO will not condone local in-kind credit for material of narrative, reportorial or editorial nature. No such credit was ever granted for newspaper coverage. A local agency in Iowa did contact local newspapers without OEO approval or knowledge. As the enclosed statement emphasizes, any arrangement would not have been approved had it been received.

Obviously, any arrangement that would appear to be an approach to communications media for its favor can not be tolerated. And, obviously, it would be rejected by communications media if proposed.

To make our position absolutely clear, a memorandum is being prepared that will prohibit any local in-kind credit provision of any nature for all communications media.

OEO makes every effort to present facts and information on its programs in the public interest. In no way does OEO attempt to induce or angle for special favors.

With every best wish.

Sincerely,

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director.

THE NEED FOR CLOSER MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, several additional newspaper articles and editorials containing information relative to the need for closer meat inspection have appeared, and should be of interest to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially in view of the fact that the bill is under active consideration by the subcommittee this week.

They are as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, July 31, 1967]

LARGE PACKERS TELL VIEWS ON FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

(By Nick Kotz)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Most of the largest national meat packing firms are opposed to legislation which would expand federal meat inspection to cover large intrastate plants now exempt from federal inspection.

The Register interviewed executives of seven large national firms to discover their individual views on legislation which is now reaching a crucial stage in Congress. A few of the firms were found to be more favorable than the official position of the meat industry.

TWO PROPOSALS

A House agriculture subcommittee Wednesday will consider proposals aimed at strengthening federal and state inspection and eliminating abuses which U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) investigators have uncovered in the meat industry.

The American Meat Institute (A.M.I.), which represents the largest packers, is considered to have powerful influence in determining what kind of meat legislation is written by Congress.

One proposal (H.R. 61618), endorsed by the Johnson administration, would provide federal funds and technical assistance to help states improve their now inadequate or non-existent inspection systems. This bill also seeks stronger controls over unwholesome meat.

The Meat Institute originally proposed amendments to H.R. 6168 which supporters considered crippling, and generally testified that the legislation was not needed. However, the institute now may be offering less resistance to this bill as support builds for additional legislation.

The second bill would bring large intrastate packers (with $250,000 gross annual sales) under federal inspection. At present, only plants selling across a state line are subject to federal inspection. The Meat Institute strongly opposes this second bill.

About 15 per cent of meat slaughtering and 25 per cent of meat processing is not under federal inspection.

Representative Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.), sponsor of both bills, and Representative Thomas Foley (Dem., Wash.) are pushing for a combination of the two bills. A close vote is expected in the subcommittee with Representatives Wiley Mayne (Rep., Ia.) and John Zwach (Rep., Minn.) possibly holding the key votes on the issue of expanding federal inspection.

Some of the national firms have opposed the legislation out of fear that an expanded federal system would provide dual standards for large and small plants. Some are simply philosophically opposed to bigger federal government. Some fear the increased costs of inspection will be shifted from general revenue sources to the packers.

Thomas Glaze, public relations director for Swift & Co., the nation's largest firm, said his company supports the meat institute position. Namely, Swift wants H.R. 6168 amended, but doesn't necessarily endorse it, and opposes H.R. 1314 to provide expanded federal inspection.

NINETY-EIGHT PERCENT INSPECTED

Glaze said 98 per cent of Swift slaughtering is under federal inspection, and 90 per cent of processing is federally inspected.

Glaze said it was against company policy to disclose how many Swift plants are not under federal inspection. He said these plants are operated under "standards equal to or superior to state standards."

Armour and Co., the second largest firm, takes a more positive attitude toward H.R. 6168.

John Shell, public relations director for Armour, said his firm positively supports H.R. 6168 with only several minor reservations. Supporters of the bill also consider the Armour reservations would not injure the bill.

Shell said 100 per cent of Armour's slaughtering and 95 per cent of the firm's processing is carried on under federal inspection. He said 11 processing plants in 10 states do not have federal inspection.

SUPPORT INSTITUTE

Harry Barker, vice-president of Wilson & Co., the third largest firm, said his company supports the Meat Institute's position on the legislation.

He said 100 per cent of Wilson slaughtering and about 95 per cent of Wilson processing is under federal inspection. He said fewer than 10 small branch processing plants are not under federal inspection.

The strongest endorsement of the legislation came from Oscar Mayer & Co., which prides itself on having 100 per cent federal inspection of both slaughtering and processing.

Thomas Woit, a Mayer official, said: "We favor legislation to promote the public health. Speaking in a broad sense, we would endorse both of these bills."

Robert Gray, chairman of the board of George A. Hormel Co., said he supports H.R. 6168, by which the federal government would help states improve their own inspection systems.

OPPOSED EXPANSION

"That would probably do a good job," said Gray. "Some of the states need to improve inspection and the federal people have the experience to teach them."

However, Gray said he opposed expanded federal inspection "because I don't think you can scatter federal inspection and do it economically or well."

Gray said 100 per cent of Hormel slaughtering and more than 99 per cent of processing is under federal inspection. He said only one processing plant is not under federal inspection, and it will be replaced by a new federally inspected plant.

John Blankenship, executive vice-president of John Morrell & Co., said he believes the "states should try to have better inspection of their own" without federal aid, and said he opposes expanded federal inspection. He questioned where the federal government will get funds to help states or broaden federal inspection.

ST. PAUL PLANT

Blankenship said 100 per cent of Morrell slaughtering and 99 per cent of processing is under federal inspection. The only processing not under federal inspection is in a small St. Paul, Minn., plant, he said.

Howard Fisher, a vice-president of the Cudahy Packing Co., said 100 per cent of his firm's slaughtering and about 75–80 per cent of processing is under federal inspection. He said the firm has nine small processing plants not under federal inspection.

William Cameron, board chairman of Rath Packing Co., of Waterloo, said all of his firm's plants are under federal inspection.

Cameron said he believes that all meat packing plants should be under adequate government inspection to guarantee wholesomeness of meat products.

The Rath official said he does not know what type of legislation would be best to achieve this objective, but he added:

"If there are plants without adequate inspection, then something should be done about it.

"I'm concerned about the sanitary side—that the whole industry does not get a bad name because of the actions of some uninspected plants."

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, July 18, 1967]

THOSE ABUSES IN THE SLAUGHTERHOUSE

"It makes me sick," was the reaction of a Minneapolis housewife upon reading in the Sunday Tribune about filthy meat slaughtering practices found in some Minnesota plants. She and other consumers have a right to be sickened and shocked over the lack of enough inspections to insure a safe total meat supply in this state.

Minnesota Agriculture Commissioner Russell G. Schwandt says the state does inspect meat plants twice a year or more for sanitary conditions. The state also runs tests of meat products to protect against adulteration. But Minnesota is one of nine states that do not require the crucial before and after slaughter inspections needed to keep out diseased animals, and to maintain a continuous check on slaughtering practices. Only the federal government does this here on meat bound for interstate channels.

In Minnesota, only 46 plants are federally inspected; 401 plants are not. The plant comparison exaggerates the problem because the large federally inspected establishments turn out the bulk of the meat products. The uninspected plants are mostly small operations. But this should not minimize the need for regular inspection of all plants. All meat should be safe.

A U.S. Department of Agriculture investigation showed what can happen from lack of regular inspections. Equipment was found to be unclean; pus, manure and urine had been splashed onto animal carcasses.

The shuddering result of such shoddy practices can be the spread of disease, such as salmonellosis—the increasingly prevalent cause of stomach aches often erroneously attributed to influenza.

The Minnesota Agriculture Department asked the 1967 legislature for $200,000 to increase its meat plant inspection program. It failed to win approval.

Congress and federal officials are prodding the states to act, possibly with the encouragement of federal aid. The Minnesota Legislature dropped the ball this year; it should not repeat the mistake in 1969.

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1967]

PROTECTING CONSUMERS

American consumers now have an additional debt of gratitude to Ralph Nader—this time for letting them know something about the dangers they face from filthy meat plants. Hitherto undisclosed reports to the Agriculture Department, depicting loathsome conditions in small local establishment, cannot fail to induce revulsion in anyone who reads them. They also cannot fail to create a sharp loss of appetite for ground meat products generally.

We should think, therefore, that all responsible meat packers would be among those pressing most vigorously for the strengthened Federal meat inspection measures which Mr. Nader is urging Congress to adopt. Packers whose plants meet fair standards of sanitation have nothing to fear from inspection. They have a great deal to fear, however, from a popular anxiety that the frankfurters, sausages and bolognas offered for sale in public places may be seriously contaminated. In any event, this is a form of protection indispensable to the public health.

[From the Des Moines Register, July 29, 1967]

FOR CLOSER MEAT INSPECTION

Testimony at recent hearings of a U.S. House subcommittee called attention to filthy sanitary conditions and processing of unwholesome meat for human consumption in many packing plants not under federal inspection.

State inspection systems to eliminate these abuses exist in only 23 states, including Iowa. The Iowa meat inspection act, passed in 1965, requires licensing of processing plants and provides for regular inspections. There is mandatory examination of animals before and after slaughter, and inspection of processed meat in "channels of trade."

State officials say, however, that the $250,000 appropriated for inspection has been inadequate for the job to be done. Large and medium-sized plants are not being adequately inspected. Though animal slaughter is effectively regulated, inspection of other processing operations is not as good.

A Johnson Administration bill to remedy this, sponsored by U.S. Representative Neal Smith (Dem., Ia.), would provide a major overhaul of the 60-year-old meat inspection act and would help states improve their programs. It would pay up to 50 per cent of state costs and gives states technical and laboratory assistance.

It also would curtail exemptions from federal inspection giver to plants that sell meat and specialty items to hotels and restaurants in other states. Twelve Iowa firms, in Sioux City, Davenport, Council Bluffs, Conrad, Fort Madison, Homestead, Amana and Cresco, would thus come under federal inspection.

Smith says some large packing plants in Iowa refuse to sell across state lines, in order to escape federal inspection, and he is sponsoring another bill to extend coverage to them. The old law is based on a narrow definition of interstate commerce, and some plants subject to the federal Taft-Hartley Labor Act are not under federal inspection.

To qualify for the federal aid, states must have sanitary requirements "substantially equivalent to and consistent with" federal regulations. This would mean upgrading Iowa standards. However, operators would not have to "go out with blueprints and change their plants to qualify," a federal spokesman said.

Most Iowa plants could qualify with a good cleaning up, he said. It would mean such things as having 180-degree water to sterilize knives and saws, removing wooden tables and benches, putting screens on windows and cleaning equipment better.

L. B. Liddy, Iowa secretary of agriculture, said he has no real objection to the proposed act, except that it means a new "encroachment of the federal government into state matters." This does not seem a valid criticism, in view of the abuses by intrastate packing plants, and especially since the act would be voluntary for states and they would retain control of inspection programs. A rigid "states' rights" position on a matter of public health is absurd. If Iowa can obtain federal help in upholding meat sanitary standards, it should welcome that help.

The proposed legislation would demand essentially the same purity in meat for the dinner table from local, intrastate plants as from those plants now federally inspected. This is a logical, further step in protecting the consumer and assuring wholesome foods.

[From the New York Times, July 23, 1967]

FEDERAL INSPECTION SOUGHT FOR MEAT THAT IS NOT NOW COVERED BY U.S. LAW

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, July 22.—A warning was sounded this week that consumers may have been lulled into a false sense of security because they believe the 60-year-old Federal meat inspection law assures them of wholesome products.

Witnesses at a House hearing testified that, although consumers are protected on most of their meat purchases, there still is a considerable amount beyond the reach of the Federal law that is subject to suspicion.

The meat that escapes Federal inspection is that processed for sale within a state because the law applies only to products in interstate commerce.

Eighty-four per cent of the 126.7 million

livestock slaughtered last year came under Federal scrutiny, but the remaining 20.2 million head were from non-Federally inspected plants. About 25 per cent of all processed meat is sold within state boundaries and is free from Federal inspection.

THE 1966 EXTENSION SOUGHT

The subject of meat inspection arose as a House Agriculture subcommittee held its first hearings on a bill to amend the 1906 meat inspection law to extend Federal inspection standards to plants handling intrastate meat.

Twenty-six states have laws that make inspection mandatory before and after slaughter, and 24 of these have mandatory inspection of meat processing. Thirteen states have voluntary inspection, but with varying degrees of success because of lack of state financial support.

Nine states have no inspection laws. Even in states with mandatory inspection statutes, the subcommittee was told that Federal investigators found filthy plant conditions and unwholesome meat and meat products.

Five years ago, the Department of Agriculture investigated conditions in non-Federally inspected meat plants. It found unhealthy conditions, including slaughter of diseased animals, contamination of meat products through inadequate methods of control, and lack of procedures to detect or control parasites that could be transmitted to man.

REPORT CONVINCING

The department's report convinced some Federal officials and some members of Congress that the Federal meat inspection system should be extended to intrastate slaughtering and processing.

Representative Neal Smith, Democrat of Iowa, a leader in the fight to overhaul the meat inspection law, told the subcommittee that he had introduced bills to amend the law for seven years but that "this is the first time that there has actually been a House hearing."

Mr. Smith and the Administration sought two years ago to amend the law to require states to meet Federal inspection requirements or have the Government move in.

The bill died quietly in the House Agriculture Committee after opposition from the meat industry and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture.

The same opposition has appeared again, coming up with a series of amendments to pending bills that Mr. Smith and other sponsors contend would cripple the proposals to bring all meat under mandatory inspection.

Representative Smith has introduced a new Administration bill and one of his own. The bills are regarded as weaker than the former proposals but are described as at least a start toward more complete meat inspection for consumers.

UNITED STATES WOULD PAY 50 PERCENT

In addition, Representative William J. Green, Democrat of Pennsylvania, has introduced a bill identical to the Administration's proposal. The bills would provide for Federal-state agreements under which the Federal Government would pay 50 per cent of the cost and supply technical assistance to states willing to create and enforce Federal standards.

Mr. Green's statement to the subcommittee backed up what the Federal investigators found five years ago in their report, which only now is being given circulation.

He said that Pennsylvania had 30 inspectors for all food and spends only $200,000 a year specifically for meat inspection.

This means, he said, "that Pennsylvania is operating at the same level it was in 1915 when it passed its present weak voluntary law."

He said that only 132 of 1,263 meat processing or slaughtering plants were Federally inspected in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Smith's bill would make Federal inspection mandatory in large intrastate plants that are covered by the Taft-Hartley Act, a labor law that covers collective bargaining but not meat inspection.

"If they are large enough so that we have a national interest in their labor management problems," he said, "I think we should be interested in the wholesomeness of the product they sell."

"Almost all buyers of retail meats assume that they are buying meat that would be safe to eat and that had been Federally inspected," Mr. Smith said. "But the fact is that there is enough uninspected meat slaughtered in large slaughterhouses each day to feed approximately 30 million people."

Some large packing companies have plants solely for production and sales within a state to meet local competition.

The American Meat Institute, which represents major packers, the National Independent Meat Packers Association, the Western State Meat Packers Association, Inc. and the state agricultural departments group said the Administration was reaching out for more power and was trying to take over activities that they believe are properly those of the states.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 28, 1967]

TAINTED MEAT

The Agriculture Department's reports on meat packing practices, now in the spotlight thanks to Ralph Nader, are shocking documents. The investigations of Maryland and Virginia slaughtering and processing plants, particularly, have uncovered examples of laxity and filth more appropriate to the Middle Ages.

Maryland is one of nine states that have no inspection laws at all; although Attorney General Burch is reported to be drafting a statute patterned on California's strict inspection requirements. Three-fourths of animals slaughtered in Maryland now are not under the Federal Meat Inspection Act. Whether inspections are needed the reader can infer from the following passages, quoted at random about Maryland processing plants:

"The walls, floors and ceilings in rooms where meat was being prepared were dirty . . . One end of a meat hopper on a grinder which appeared to have been recently used had a number of dead flies in it . . . Sheep carcasses in the cooler were soiled due to unsanitary dressing and were hung so low that a portion of each carcass was dragging on the cooler floor which was covered with grossly unclean sawdust . . . Some beef quarters in the cooler which originated from a U.S.-inspected establishment, were grossly contaminated by sawdust and dirt."

Virginia, which has a voluntary inspection program, fared somewhat better—but not much. Some sample comments on its meat plants: "Curing drums were dirty inside and out; curing solution had extraneous matter floating on top indicating contamination of product . . . Buckets of products in the cooler had extensive mold growths on them . . . Ceilings with leaks dripping on exposed meat causing serious contamination . . ."

It was this kind of horror, described in Upton Sinclair's novel, The Jungle, that led to federal meat inspection law in 1906. But huge quantities of meat, being processed and consumed within each state's borders, are escaping such regulations. The public is not being protected. And the situation is an outrage.

Virginia's voluntary system will become mandatory next year. Governor Agnew has promised to press for controls over Maryland's packing plants in January. But as of now, 24 states lack laws providing for mandatory inspection of animals before and after slaughter, and even in those states with laws, lack of funds and equipment handicaps programs.

A House Agriculture subcommittee is now studying the administration's bill to empower federal authorities to intervene where state regulations fail to do the job. The bill should be passed, if only to spur states into action they should have taken years ago.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, July 23, 1967]

INTRASTATE OR INTERSTATE? ORIGIN MAKES DIFFERENCE WITH MEAT

(By John Fialka)

What is the difference between an intrastate and an interstate hamburger?

This was the question before a House Agriculture subcommittee last week. The panel is trying to find ways to protect consumers from a flow of meat from dead, dying, disabled and diseased animals that evade federal inspection laws and avoid a spotty system of state inspection laws.

Meat industry critics, including Rep. Neal Smith, D-Iowa, have charged that while the tainted meat, commonly called "4-D" meat in the trade, is originally sold to renderers and animal food manufacturers, it is often resold and reprocessed for human consumption.

New chemicals that impart fresh color, smell and flavor are used to disguise the tainted meat, so that "unscrupulous operators" can compete favorably against producers of federally inspected meat, by selling the tainted product slightly cheaper, Rep. Smith and the Department of Agriculture have charged.

According to an Agriculture Department estimate, 8.75 billion pounds of meat, or one-fourth of the commercially processed meat products in the nation are not federally inspected. Nineteen million head of cattle are slaughtered in plants solely under state jurisdiction.

Nine states, including Maryland, have no state inspection laws at all. Thirteen, including Virginia, have voluntary inspection programs. The packing house owner who wants inspection orders and pays for it. The remaining states have various types of mandatory inspection programs, which, according to Agriculture, are "generally well below federal standards." (Virginia will switch to a mandatory system next year.)

Gov. Spiro T. Agnew of Maryland said Friday he will ask the General Assembly next January to take action to assure the quality of meat sold in Maryland. He said he was "gravely concerned" over testimony that sanitary conditions are often unsatisfactory at Maryland plants not inspected by the federal government.

Although the Agriculture Department says it will be satisfied with greater powers to help detect and stop the flow of "4-D" meat, Rep. Smith and others charge that they will never get at the source of the tainted meat unless they change the "outmoded" definition of intrastate commerce in the original, 1906, Federal Meat Inspection Act.

Because the powers of the federal government have been greatly expanded in the intervening years, the intrastate vs. the interstate hamburger question has, in cases like Maryland's, led to some striking inconsistencies.

Although almost all Maryland packing houses are governed by federal labor laws, 74.1 percent of the animals slaughtered in the state are not under the federal meat inspection act.

The meat avoids state inspection too, because Maryland has no state law. Only five states rank higher in production of federally uninspected meat, according to Agriculture figures revealed last week.

Rep. Smith wants to give federal meat inspectors the same jurisdiction as the labor laws have. According to Smith, the expanded jurisdiction should reach all but the smallest meat lockers and farm slaughterhouses.

State officials and meat industry spokesmen have been adamant: No new legislation is needed because the present system works fine, they testified.

The differences between meat industry executives, like Aled P. Davies, vice president of the American Meat Institute, and advocates of stronger legislation, such as Rep. Thomas S. Foley, D-Wash., have led to some odd exchanges:

Foley: Do you think that I, traveling as an American citizen coming from some place else, have any complaint if I am injured or made ill by tainted meat in that state? (Referring to a state with no inspection law.)

Davies: No more than the citizens of that state have.

Foley: Can you tell me a good way to determine what is interstate and what is intrastate in a hamburger?

SUGGESTS SEEING PACKAGE

Davies: Ask to see the package from where it came. (Davies here stated that he had done a considerable amount of traveling with his family and never ran across "4-D" meat.)

Foley: But you are a great deal more skilled in knowing what you are doing than most citizens.

Davies: I can smell.

Ralph Nader, the automobile industry critic, charged last week that the Agriculture Department was protecting the meat industry by refusing to release background reports made by federal inspectors, who quietly entered a representative sample of local packing houses in all 50 states in September 1962.

Their resulting reports, many of which outlined shockingly unsanitary conditions, were made at the request of a congressional committee interested in what the states were doing in meat inspection.

However, Agriculture used them as the basis for a relatively mild summary statement made to Congress in 1963. The state-by-state reports were revealed only last week, after Nader's outburst.

"We actually have had them available for some time. It's just that nobody's asked us for them," said one Agriculture official.

Among the reports, few noted as many abuses as the one on Maryland.

"The many infractions of even the most basic rules of good sanitary practices observed in nearly every plant visited indicates that the control exercised is quite inadequate to assure production of clean wholesome meat products intended for human consumption," the report concludes.

Although the report was made in 1962, an Agriculture spokesman noted that the situation in the Free State is "still about the same" because of the lack of a state inspection law. Furthermore, he said, nearly three-fourths of the 320,304 animals slaughtered in Maryland in 1966 did not come under federal inspection.

Although the state polices food processing plants under a sanitary food law and despite a Baltimore meat inspection act, O. J. Schrag, the veterinarian who was in charge of the Maryland inspection, stated, "The human health hazards engendered by the uncontrolled and unscrupulous operator are almost limitless."

A sample of conditions described in the report, conditions which Schrag reported were leading to "gross bacterial contamination" including danger from tuberculosis and trichinosis, follows:

"There were a great number of live (and dead flies) in the department which were swarming on exposed meat and equipment. One end of a meat hopper on a grinder which appeared to have been recently used had a number of dead flies in it."

"Processing operations including cutting, grinding and mixing of meat products were conducted in a room which was not only very unclean as described above, but had many flies which were lighting on exposed meat. A tubful of meat which was being ground into sausage was unclean."

". . . partially skinned cattle heads pending removal of the edible portions, were placed on a filthy floor and collectively stored thus subjecting the edible portions to gross bacterial contamination."

Although Schrag found similar abuses in Virginia, he concluded in his report on that state than "generally, plant sanitation was satisfactory."

A Department of Agriculture spokesman said that while meat brought into the District is federally inspected, there is no federal inspection for meat processing plants in Washington. The inclusion of the District under the jurisdiction of the Federal Meat Inspection Act, he said, is provided for in a bill now before a House Agriculture subcommittee.

VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY DID NOT SAY CONGRESS HAS ABETTED RIOTS—HE SAID FAILURE TO ACT ON URBAN PROGRAMS HAS ABETTED FRUSTRATION AND DENIED GOVERNMENT URGENTLY NEEDED TOOLS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Vice President HUMPHREY addressed the convention of the League of Cities in Boston yesterday on our urban crisis.

I am concerned that some of the headlines in the newspapers and some of the television coverage gave the impression that the Vice President said the Congress is abetting riots.

The Vice President did not make this charge—and I think all of us know him too well to believe that he would make so simplistic an analysis of this complex and serious situation. He said to the mayors that the reluctance of the Congress to act on pending urban measures is one of the factors that abets frustration and denies to all levels of government the tools that they urgently need to do the job.

In his speech to these leaders of more than 1,500 local governments, the Vice President primarily stressed his belief and the Federal Government's determination that violence and riots cannot be tolerated.

Indeed, a principal theme of the Vice President's speech was that the riots will be stopped and order will be restored, and that the "malicious individuals who spark disorders will be found and prosecuted."

He went on to say that there should be no ill-founded compassion for the rioters because, "there can be no freedom, no equal opportunity, no social justice in an environment of mob rule and criminal behavior."

Second, the Vice President pointed out that the administration and the Congress have made substantial efforts to make our cities more livable. In effect, he said the Congress has done much but that there is still much more to be done. He said, and from all reports the mayors vigorously agreed, that action on pending measures such as model cities, rent supplements, and the Crime Control Act is urgently needed.

I repeat, the Vice President said that the apparent reluctance of the Congress to act on pending measures abets the frustration in the ghettos and denies to State and local governments the tools they need to improve the conditions of life there. He did not say that Congress has abetted the riots.

Further, the Vice President listed for the mayors actions which they can take such as expanding their youth opportunity programs, and recruiting additional leadership from business and industry.

The full transcript of the Vice President's address to the League of Cities shows that he made a careful analysis. He emphasized two key responses in this crisis. These are, according to the Vice President, firm action to crush the riots and enforce the law, and second, firm action by all levels of government to cure the fundamental economic, educational, and social ills which exist in our urban slums and which create frustration and hopelessness.

I insert in the RECORD the full transcript of the Vice President's address:

ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES CONVENTION BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, BOSTON, MASS., JULY 31, 1967

I think most of you know that when I come to you at gatherings such as this, I generally am in a rather effervescent spirit and all too often regale you with a certain amount of Midwestern humor, some of which is not always apropos to the occasion. But today I feel the times and circumstances necessitate a much more sober and reflective posture, and so I am going to forgo the pleasure of the joy and the frivolity and the light touch, and get right down to business.

I am in Boston, Massachusetts, Boston of Bunker Hill and Boston of the Tea Party, Boston that means so much to the history of this Republic. It is a great city of industry, of culture and of learning. I am in the presence of Mayors and city officials who have conducted themselves with honor and distinction. Some of these Mayors of great cities will address you later—Mayor Lindsay of New York, our friend Mayor Tate of Philadelphia, and others. And may I just for a moment in this public forum pay my respects to the Mayor of New York for his leadership, for his willingness to serve his country at the call of his President. May I also say, Mayor, what I have wanted to say for some time, that I consider your "Summer Youth Program" one of the finest, if not the finest, in the nation. I salute you for it, sir.

Today I speak to you not as a former Mayor, even though on other occasions I have surely used that fulcrum for my position of strength with you, if any. I speak to you not as a former United States Senator or even as your Vice President. But I come to you not as a partisan either, but as a concerned American, a fellow citizen. The simple truth is that our nation is in trouble, serious trouble. We meet today at a time when the fabric of American democracy is strained and torn in many places. And that strain is greatest in our cities, which means that we face nothing less than a grave national crisis.

Why? Because we are an urban nation. Seventy per cent of our people now live in cities, and the figures indicate that by the year 1977, eighty per cent of our people will be living in cities. So what happens in our cities happens to America. And it is by the quality of life in our cities that the character of our civilization must be judged. It is in

our cities, in your cities, in your towns that American democracy representative government, will either succeed or fail, survive or perish. And the picture before us this morning in the cities of America gives us little cause for rejoicing. This is a time in our history when we must squarely face up to the responsibilities of American citizenship. Oh, we all jealously guard our rights as Americans, and we talk of those rights. We point with great pride to our abundance of our national economy. But let me underscore at this moment that every right carries with it a commensurate responsibility. There is no freedom without duty. There is no role of leadership without responsibility. And as our rights expand, and our material wealth increases, so also do the responsibilities and the duties, not just of the Mayors or the governmental officials, but of every American.

Abraham Lincoln put it well when he spoke at a time of another crisis. He said, "No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation. . . ." And then those immortal words that every school child remembers, "We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth." Ladies and gentlemen, those are not words of mere sentimentality; they are words of prophecy. The fact of the matter is that our democratic institutions public or private, federal government, city governments, state governments, county governments, are constantly being tested, and today are being tested in the refiner's fire.

The question is bluntly posed: Do these institutions that we cherish so much really serve the interests of the people? Can they cope with the fundamental problems of American society today? Now unless we can answer with a resounding "yes," history will and must record that we did not nobly save, but rather meanly lost our democratic heritage.

Now, the challenge before American cities is in two parts, as I see it. There is, of course, the immediate, critical problem of lawlessness—looting, arson, violence, riots. And then there is the fundamental problem of what has brought us to our present state, and what must be done about it.

Now, with regard to the former, let me read to you once again this forceful and courageous statement by the nation's foremost responsible Civil Rights leaders. "Killing, arson, looting are criminal acts, and should be dealt with as such. Equally guilty are those who incite, provoke and call specifically for such action." Listen to these words. "There is no injustice which justifies the present destruction of the Negro community and its people." I think those words well describe the situation.

Now you know and I know and the rioters themselves need to know that riots will be crushed, if not by local police alone, or by the combination of local and state police, then if need be by the National Guard or by Federal troops. Order will be restored in this land, and those malicious individuals who spark and incite riots and violence will be found and will be prosecuted. Rioters and riots must not be rewarded by misplaced compassion, but rather suffer the stern judgment of an outraged community and the law.

Now the fundamental responsibility of government at all levels is the maintenance of public order, and that responsibility will be met. You will help meet it. The Governors will help meet it. The President and the Government of the United States will help meet it.

Now the cost may be high, and it is. The price in human suffering may be great, and it is. But that price will have to be paid, for there can be no freedom, no representative government, no equal opportunity, no social justice, in an environment of mob rule and criminal behavior. Where the law of the jungle rules, the ninety-nine per cent of our citizens who are innocent victims of the violent few can enjoy no protection. You have your responsibility to that ninety-nine per cent for their protection.

The injured can have no avenue of appeal where mob rule prevails. Under these conditions the society itself dissolves and representative government is in peril. Let's not underestimate what is happening in our country. These are times that try men's souls.

Now what I have said is true, but my fellow Americans, I am ashamed to have to say it. My words, and I think they are true words, are themselves a symptom of the crisis which has now been reached in urban America. This crisis consists of much more than lawlessness, violence and looting. Perhaps it can best be described with simple words, like hopelessness and despair. It expresses a widespread pattern of inadequate opportunity, of frustrated ambitions.

It is, in fact, a feature of the revolution of rising expectations which we so readily acclaim and proclaim in other nations, and so slowly accommodate in our own. And, paradoxically, the troubles in some ways are a result of the progress, because as things seem to get better, there is always a period of restlessness and turbulence.

My fellow Americans, I have used an analogy which I want to share with you about this situation. I travel a great deal by plane as many of you do. But my granddaughter, whenever she sees a plane go by, she says, "That's Papa." She thinks I live up there. And to some degree she is quite an accurate observer.

But every time that I plan to travel on that plane, I turn on the "Today" show in the morning and look at that weather map and its record of the low pressure systems and the high pressure systems. And it will show, for example, a new high pressure system coming in from our neighbor to the North, Canada. It sweeps across the country meeting as the weatherman says that static low pressure system which seems to hang over the mountains.

Ladies and gentlemen, you and I know that that means turbulence. You and I pray for the fact that we have a good aircraft in which to fly, that the pilot knows his business, that the co-pilot is tending to his business, that the navigator is a competent man, and that the entire apparatus, personnel and all, is in tip top shape. We know just as surely as we board the plane that, with all that we may do, with radar and so forth to avoid it, we are going to go through a period of turbulence.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a great change taking place in America. A new high pressure system of social opportunity and social justice is beginning to move across America, and the low pressure system, stagnant, weighted down with smog and fog, is hanging over the mountains. And as the new system passes through it, there is turbulence. Ladies and gentlemen, that is what is happening in America.

This is not to be looked upon with despair, but with hope. But we must also make sure that the craft in which we fly, the ship of state, in this instance the plane, to use the analogy, is strong and worthy, and that we chart our course the best we can for a safe landing.

We are building a new America, and in the building of a new America, old things must give way. So what I speak of then is progress.

For the last fifteen years the United States has made unprecedented progress in the whole area of human rights and civil rights. The legal right of every American to vote has been assured by Federal law. Segregated schools have been declared unconstitutional and outlawed. Public accommodations have been made legally available to all. That's the law. But do these liberties really have substance? Or should I put it this way? Do these liberties really have substance for all of our citizens? Do they guarantee real individual opportunity which is the starting point of the great American dream?

Remember, that coupled with this precious freedom there must be the opportunity to make something of that freedom. Far too often the promise of legal rights which bewitches those of us in government has only made the lack of real opportunity more bitter and more frustrating.

What do Fair Employment Practices mean to a man who can't get a job or who lacks the skills to even hold a decent job? What does school desegregation mean when education in many of our cities, without regard to region, is inadequate? What does the promise of open housing mean when a poor family can't even find decent low income housing in most of our cities? And, my fellow Americans, we are not much better along in providing low income housing for our needy people today than we were ten years ago. Oh, we've made progress, but we have more people.

These rights when they yield no practical benefits, these legal rights, can mean more frustration, less sense of personal dignity, more hostility, and less identification with the values of the larger and richer society. You see, there was a time when the poor suffered quietly. They were out of sight, out of mind, many of them lost, in a sense, in rural America. But those were the days before television.

Television has changed America. You can no longer hide the good or the bad. We are going through a period when, for the first time, Americans are seeing a war fought on television. And the same television that brings the war news also brings the vivid portrayal of what goes on in this country. So the child of the slums knows how you live, how I live, where we live, the fun that we have, the jobs that we have, the incomes that we have, and the dreams that we have.

Today every slum child who ever watches television is forcefully reminded that there is another America, different from his own, a different society, and to him it is an America from which he is practically excluded.

Now we do not need riots, however, to tell us what is wrong in our urban slums. Nor do the conditions in urban slums justify violence. We all know these things, and I talk to you now as just a fellow citizen that has traveled around the country. You know as much about it or more than I. We all know that in the slums, gentlemen, the garbage pick up is at best infrequent if it occurs at all. I said to a group of my colleagues in government only two days ago in Washington, "Get in your car and go to Southeast Washington, and then go to Northwest Washington. They are both in the federal city. Take a look. Take a look at the streets. Take a look at the sidewalks. Take a look at the garbage. Why is it that in Northwest Washington you can have receptacles for scrap papers and in Southeast Washington none? Why is it in Northwest Washington the streets can be clean and the sidewalks can be solid and stable, and in Southeast Washington the streets are in havoc? There are people living in both places." So I emphasize my point.

You know that in the slums the streets are dirtier than anywhere else in the city, and less frequently swept. And in these areas in the Northern cities the snow is often plowed away the last. The incidence of crime there is the highest; and the vigor of law enforcement there the least. Housing is decrepit, obsolete, broken down. And I am going to say to you what I have said before. If we were as interested in enforcing our building codes as we are in our traffic laws, if you would

put out as many tickets on the landlord who refuses to take care of his house as required by the law as you do for the fellow that overparks his car downtown, you'd have a different city. Make no mistake about it.

You see, the people themselves tell us what is needed. They know that sometimes public transportation is not adequate. I see my good friend here, Mayor Naftalin of Minneapolis, who I think has done one of the most creditable jobs of any Mayor and I salute him. Mayor Naftalin met last week with some of the residents of the North Side, and those residents adopted a list of what they called demands which were presented to him, and this is what they asked for: an expanded human relations course for city policemen, along with expanded employment opportunities for minority groups in the police and fire departments; increased job training and greater employment opportunities; a policy of recruiting school teachers from minority groups; and the teaching of minority group history in the schools.

That last point, by the way, is rather important. History lends dignity.

Fair rents, better housing; better parks and street lighting were also listed. Now these were put in the form of demands, but they are really not unreasonable requests. Some of them have already been met. They apply in nearly every one of our major cities today, and a host of reports have cited these points.

These needs, however, in no way justify riots, looting and arson. I think we have to be clear in our thinking about this. But there can be no doubt that they provide a combustible environment in which a spark, an act of criminal violence, can burst into the flame of social disorder and social disaster.

I think it would be very interesting to get from this great assemblage of top grade public officials what it is you think the cause of the riots is. I have so many things that run through my mind. I know so much and yet so little. And a man's judgment is no better than his information. Everybody seems to have their own point of view. But we need to somehow or another to catalog it, bring it together, which I will mention to you in a moment.

There can be no question that if the fundamental economic, educational and social ills which undeniably exist in some of our urban slums were cured, the agony of frustration and hopelessness which now exists for some would be largely eliminated.

May I say once again at this point, the American Negro family over the years has been a very patient family, and the individual has been a very patient individual. I do not want this fine assembly of public officials to put together the handful—and a very small handful it is—of those who lead and precipitate violence in one package with those who are fearful, who are the victims of that violence, who are trying to do a good job, and who are trying to be good citizens. These riots are not racial. These riots are injuring Americans, some of whom happen to be of a different color. No group of people in the world needs and wants better police protection, more law and order, than the poor and needy, and many of these happen to be our Negro families, our Negro Americans.

Now I don't mean to suggest that nothing has been done to meet this crisis. To the contrary, you've done a great deal. The Federal government has initiated large and comprehensive programs of urban renewal, aid to education, manpower training, war on poverty, health services and community development. As I said to a group this morning, we have in our present fiscal year budget approximately $25½ billion for Federal aid to the poor. We have $10 billion, identified that will go into our cities and urban in an analysis by the Bureau of the Budget counties. Much has been done. More than ever before. And you who are leading these cities are giving greater leadership than ever before.

The Job Corps, VISTA, Head Start for the pre-schoolers, aid to education—these and many other federal programs, in cooperation with state and local government, are designed specifically to alleviate the poverty in our cities and are now in operation. But I must say again that what has been done and is being done is clearly not enough. At best it is only a beginning on which to build, on which to grow. But we must proceed with what we have.

I'd like to suggest that the first thing that we can do to build further is to make sure that the legislation now before the Congress—and there is, friends, a long list of it—be promptly enacted, and that the outstanding requests for Federal funds to be shared with cities and states be promptly enacted.

This isn't politics. This isn't partisanship. Many of you Mayors are elected on a nonpartisan basis. When your city is poor, you're poor. When your city is wracked with violence, it doesn't make any difference about your politics. Violence has taken place in cities with Democratic Mayors and Republican Mayors and Democratic Governors and Republican Governors. Politics has no place in this, unless you want to be a demagogue. This is an American problem. It belongs to all of us.

I feel that a sense of urgency is lacking on Capitol Hill. And what I say here, I have said there. I appeal to you, the vanguard of this great urban life, to join us now in insisting that this sense of urgency be paramount in the hearts and the minds of every single member of the Congress of the United States.

I happen to believe that this delay, this go-slow, take-it-easy and hold-off-and-take-another-look attitude aids and abets frustration in our urban slums. It denies to you, it denies to every level of government, the tools and the resources required to combat slumism. And my fellow Americans, if we can get as excited about the curse and the evil of slumism as we do about Communism, then we are going to start to make progress.

Slumism is the number one challenging problem in America today. It aids and abets all of our problems. The children of slumism are crime and ignorance, unemployment, disease and poverty.

Let's look at crime now for just a minute. Is there anything we can do about it? Well, law enforcement is essentially a local responsibility, but it is the responsibility of all of us. The police power rests with the States under our Constitution, but that doesn't exonerate anyone from ultimate responsibility. The President of the United States proposed months ago what we call The Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. This was a Presidential proposal, but it came from the report of the National Crime Commission itself, a nonpartisan Commission.

Now this bill is designed to help you, Mr. Mayor. It will provide federal grants to support local programs of crime prevention, police training, improved correctional facilities. You are the one that is responsible for local law enforcement. I remember when things went wrong when I was Mayor, they didn't look around at Washington too much. They got at me first. And you'll be right there. You won't be forgotten. Don't worry.

This bill is designed to help you extend adequate police coverage to all of the neighborhoods in your city, so that the law will be both adequately enforced and worthy of respect.

The President has also proposed a sale of firearms control bill, and narcotic control legislation. What kind of nonsense is this that anyone is able to go out and buy automatic weapons? I like to hunt pheasants, but I've never known a submachine gun to get one. Our firearms controls are totally inadequate. And narcotics legislation needs to be strengthened in light of the surge of dope peddling and addiction in this country. I doubt if there is one Mayor in this room who considers this legislation unnecessary. These bills must be enacted, and we need your help.

And then there are key existing programs which need to be funded, which could make substantial contributions. Take the sad case of rent supplements. We asked for a modest program and we got nothing. And what do rent supplements do? Well, first of all, for those of you who think that public housing is not what you want, it permits private housing for the poor, worthy of human dignity. But Congress has refused to appropriate a penny.

Take the case of Metropolitan Development Grants. Congress gave not a cent. The request for Urban Research funds was chopped off by 75 percent. Now if you know all of the answers for your city, we don't need any urban research funds. But we just don't know all the answers.

The request for urban information and technical assistance funds was reduced by two-thirds, and that is money for the smaller cities where you can't afford to buy the high priced talent that is frequently required for urban planning.

The President requested an extension of the Economic Opportunity Act, but neither House has acted on the Bill at all. You'd think there were no poor.

Open housing, whatever your views may be, is entitled to a hearing.

The House of Representatives just 11 days ago had an opportunity to do something that would be of pragmatic and practical importance. Oh you know, you've heard about it, the rat extermination measure. And it was laughed out of the House of Representatives. Well, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you something, we see to it that we have a program for rodent control in graineries, in grain bins. Oh yes, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture and the Congress see to it that we don't have too many mice and rats in our grain. But that same Congress was unwilling to appropriate one nickel to see to it that rats would be kept out of the tenements and the slums, when we know that we know how to do it. I think it is time that you became somewhat righteously indignant.

We appropriate millions of dollars for the screw worm and boll weevil, but when did calves and cotton become more important than children? And to the Mayors of the smaller communities where the rat problem is not significant, let me tell you that it is a problem in Chicago, Detroit and Washington, and in Philadelphia and New York and Los Angeles and San Francisco. And when you start to demolish many buildings under urban renewal the rats spread even to your house, so don't be too fussy. You may have a visitor.

Well, we've got a chance. The Senate is going to consider this bill, and I want you to be heard. A nation that prides itself on deodorants and toothpaste and cigarettes ought to be able to do a little something about rat legislation. I've never been for rats of any kind in any way. You can take a strong stand against rats.

Now let's take a look at another measure, called the Model Cities Act. Oh I know that everybody says, well this is old hat. It isn't old hat. You haven't tried it on yet. You've heard a lot about it. And there are 193 applications right now pending in Washington and more to come. What I think, though, is that very few people seem to realize what this Model Cities Act is all about. It offers a framework within which we can create the grand design for a totally new urban America. It's like a basic structure, a constitution for a new city.

I'd like to call it the New America Act, because most Americans are going to live in cities.

It provides for a working partnership between all levels of government and private enterprise. We can't really do anything in this country unless we put everybody together on the same team. Government can't do it. The Federal government, state or city government can't do it alone. You know that. And private enterprise is unable to do it alone many times because what we're asking them to do is not profitable. And you know when you run a corporation, it is a little bit different than running a social welfare agency. The people that run these businesses have a fiduciary responsibility. They have a responsibility to the stockholders, and you can't expect them to go in and work and clean up your slums and do what needs to be done unless there is some possibility of a modest reward for effort and material.

Well, the Model Cities Act says let's work together. This Act does for the cities, my dear friends, what the National Aeronautics and Space Act did for the space program, if you'll go to work at it. And I notice that some of you were a little bit unhappy about the amount we spent in space. Listen, accentuate the positive. This is your Act. Go to work on it. You'll make the space program look like it is lost in space, if you'll get going on Model Cities. It can provide for the rebirth of our cities, their physical structure and human structure.

Well, in this session of Congress we've had a host of proposals made to help restore the slums, for a major private enterprise effort for housing of the poor, for genuine participation of the neighborhood residents in community rebuilding, for comprehensive planning for the blending of physical and social development. All of this is in this Congress, bill after bill, and also the unique breakthroughs for applying space technology to our cities. Now all of these things are part and parcel of the Model Cities Program, and it is all there. We don't need new legislation, dear friends, any more than you need a new Constitution of the United States. The Model Cities Program is for the cities what the Constitution of the United States is for the basic fundamental law of this nation. You can build with it; you can work with it. But you've got to put it to work. And I want to tell you a 200-pound man that hopes to be an athlete cannot afford to be anemic. And the Model Cities Program's hemoglobin count is mighty low. It is at a dangerous level. Pernicious anemia has set in.

The House of Representatives cut two-thirds of the funds requested by the President for this unique national program—two-thirds. And by the way, the program wasn't funded too big in the first place. The budget request was bare bones minimum. Two-thirds of it has been cut out. I want to know if you're going to do something about getting it restored. Any nation that can afford to put a man on the moon can afford to put a man on his feet right here on earth, and you know it. I don't want to be misunderstood. I think we can do both. And if I can get as much enthusiasm out of our Mayors and our people for a Model Cities Program as we have for the lunar program, we'll have things moving.

We're in competition with the Russians to get to the moon. What about being in competition with the whole world to make the finest society that mankind ever dreamed of right here on the face of this earth? Right here in the United States of America. What makes you think we can lead the rest of the world to a better life if we can't lead our own people? What makes you think we can combat poverty in Asia if we can't combat it right here in the United States of America?

Well, I know that progress is going to be slow. It never goes as fast as we want. Maybe there is good reason for it, because we need to take a good hard look. Jobs, schools, housing, hospitals—these things can't be accomplished overnight. But we need to dream big dreams and we need to get excited about them. We can't be deterred by the size and the complexity of the task. There is always somebody telling you, "Oh, it is just too much for me." Tell him to move over. Get him a ticket to the ball game. Just say, "Look, we've got work to do."

We cannot allow public revulsion against the lawlessness of the few to impede our efforts for the many. And I know there are going to be many people who will say, "Well we're not going to do a thing, because look, they've got riots." Those are the same ones before that didn't want to do anything. They've just got a new argument.

I wish to make this prediction, that if we stop now, we can look forward to nothing but catastrophe. There are some things, however, that all of us can do and we can do quickly to produce some immediate results. During the last few months many of you have received from me as the Chairman of the President's Council on Youth Opportunity, bulletin after bulletin about your appointing a Youth Opportunity Council. I hope you have. If you haven't, do so. The young people of your city—the needy young people—need you. And by the way, you need them. They'll make you feel better. Whenever I get thoroughly disgusted and discouraged in Washington, I go out and meet some of the young people of this land. They make you feel good, because they are the hope.

We have suggested ways in which public facilities, such as National Guard armories and other facilities, can be used by you. The National Guard has restated its rules and regulations. That armory in your town is available to you for a recreation program. The parks are available to you to be used for your youth program. Mr. Mayor, don't ask the Federal Government to do something until you've tried it yourself.

If you really believe in local government—and most of us mouth it day in and day out, and I've done a fair share of it, bowing down in reverence to local government and local responsibility and individual responsibility—I ask this question: What have we done back home? Schools can be pressed into service. What makes you think that schools ought to be a nine months proposition? Schools ought to be in service twelve months a year. My dear friends, I predict there will be a whole lot less vandalism and property destruction of a school that is put to use than one that is padlocked. Talk to your school board. Oh, I know it costs a little more money. It costs some money to stay well. It costs some money to see a good doctor. It just costs some money to be a good citizen.

We have reported to you imaginative programs which are working well across the cities, and you have received those bulletins. I hope you haven't filed them away. I know you get a lot of mail. I realize that. But take a look at them.

We have strongly urged that your youth councils continue to function throughout the year, that a summertime program be expanded into a year round program. Now these successful youth programs require plenty of imagination and not much money.

I want you to ask your newspapers back home to help you. If they'll be as busy reporting what you are doing for youths as what the youth are doing when they get in trouble, you'll have a well balanced presentation. And you ought to talk to the Editor, you ought to talk to the TV producer, the radio man. Talk to them; talk to the disc jockeys and get them in. Ask them, "What are you doing to help here?"

Everybody has a public responsibility today. And I say it from this platform that the media has a responsibility with the Mayors to accentuate the positive, to help rebuild America, not just to report its inadequacies. If the American people knew as much about the Reverend Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia as they do about some of these other persons that are out causing trouble, then you would have a different picture. This one man alone, as Mayor Tate can tell you, has helped save the lives of literally thousands of people through job training. And you've got to search and search to find out much about Reverend Leon Sullivan. But Rap Brown and Stokely, they get the news. By the way, if you don't have an OIC in your community, that ingenious concept of training and retraining for the young hard core, unemployed, you write to the Reverend Leon Sullivan in Philadelphia or to Hubert Humphrey.

These programs are doing things, and this is the good news of our day. They need your encouragement.

Now what else can you do? I said that if you don't have the material that you think that you need on this youth program, write to me. I'm deeply involved in it.

You can and you must make sure that your police and fire departments hire and train as many people as possible from the disadvantaged sections of your cities. Oh, I know it is a problem to recruit, but I'm going to be honest with you. If you're half as ingenious hiring people from minority groups as we were in discriminating against them for years, you'll find them. You'll find them.

Let me say a word about Civil Service regulations. They're not handed down from Heaven. They're written by some lawyer. They can be rewritten. Everybody doesn't need a high school diploma. Everybody need a high school degree. There are some people that have done quite well even without them. I'm not advocating it, but you can search them out. My father didn't graduate from college. He has done almost better than anybody that I have ever met. He had character. He had sense. There is a difference between education and good sense. Some people are just under educated, but still have a lot of sense. I repeat. Look for these people. Recruit them. Find them. And bring them in to your services.

You can reeducate, too, your present police force in community relations. Tie your university and your college in with your police department. And if you don't have one available right there at hand go to your state university. Ask them to set up a police training course. It doesn't need to be the special province of a half dozen colleges or universities across the country. Every state university in America could have a training course for police officers as a part of a good community life for the American people. Put our universities to work. They ought not to be meadows of meditation. That's not in the script. These are all paid for by you and the other taxpayers. The men on those campuses are experts, many of them. They want to help. Get in touch with them. Ask them. You can request—and I might add in a very plaintive voice, you can demand—from your community more police and more support for your police.

I call upon every Mayor in this audience to go home now and have an honor day for your police department.

Let's start to respect this police officer. Let's ask the American community to respect this police officer. He has the toughest job in the world. And let's train this police officer. Let's give him a sense of dignity and self-respect. Let him know that the community is behind him. Let's try to build conditions in our community so that he doesn't always have to be the law enforcement man, but rather one that helps promote law observance.

Can I just get rid of another little old prejudice of mine? We put most of our police

officers in automobiles and they cruise and cruise and cruise, and the only time anybody ever sees them is when somebody is in real trouble. I know it takes more men; I know it is going to cost more money. But it will be a wise investment. There is no way to have better policing than to have a man on the beat that gets to know what is going on in that community. Oh, I know it is old fashioned, but it still makes sense.

I have drawn my fair share of public administration charts in my lifetime. They are good to teach from, but seldom do you use them as you should. You need people in contact with people. You need that police officer out there on that beat, who can go talk to the priest or the minister or the rabbi or the community worker or to the parents before the trouble sets in, rather than just waiting until the cars come roaring in, sirens shrieking, red light ablaze and two officers jumping out. Then you've got trouble. This is just my suggestion. Many of you have already taken it. But I know of no better way than direct communication.

You can adopt the Crime Commission recommendation that community service officers be added to your urban police forces. You can and should recruit returning Negro veterans into your community services. They are fine men, well trained. I mean recruit them into the whole spectrum of community services, not just police services. Look for them. They're there. When your cousin wants a job, tell him to wait awhile. Take a look for the other fellow. And by the way, we all have that problem.

You can improve cooperation with regional and local offices of the Federal government agencies, and they have been instructed to work with you. If they are not, write me. They are supposed to be working with you.

You can urge business and labor to work in cooperation with city officials to establish job training programs, and job training programs that have relevance to the industry in your area. How many of these programs are now in operation? Are their lists full? We know there are training positions, under Federal government today, programs which are not fully occupied. Make a note right now to check on these programs, your Neighborhood Youth Corps, your industrial training programs, your On-The-Job Training Program. Are the positions filled? Are the programs running smoothly?

If you find problems, I ask you once again, if you don't know where else to call, call the general practitioner of the Federal government, the Vice President of the United States. I don't claim to be an expert, but I do know how to open letters, and do know how to read the mail and answer the telephone, and I do know where the government is and where it operates and how it operates. I want to help you. I want to be your business agent in the National Government. And I think I can help you if you'll work with me.

Well, I've kept you long. But this is a message that I've wanted to get to you. You can establish realistic lines of communication, and you must, with the minority leadership in your cities. I think I am about to utter a profound truth to you, that in many cases we have aided and abetted men of violence by our reluctance to deal with men of reason. All too often we have ignored the patient counsel of those leaders who know most about the conditions that we are trying to correct, and then trouble comes. We need their help, these men of reason, and we need their guidance. And it is up to you to ask for it, to look for them, to find out who they are, and to work with them.

You also can make sure that you are fully utilizing the human resources of the antipoverty programs. Contrary to the ridiculous charges that this program has encouraged violence, the truth of the matter is that in city after city, with almost no exception, members of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA, the neighborhood center programs, and the police cadet programs have done a magnificent job in preventing outbreaks and in calming them after they have started.

These disadvantaged young men and women can serve as special patrols, as special emissaries or special aides in a wide variety of ways. In all of the dozens of cities that have been wracked with violence this summer, there has hardly been a single incident in which a Head Start center, a health center, a community action headquarters, a neighborhood center, or a youth opportunity center has been vandalized or burned. I think that tells us something.

One of the most important actions that you can take is checking on the effectiveness of these programs. Needless to say, sometimes they are not as effective as we would want them. At all levels of government, we must be sure that we do not continue to rely on old remedies when new and better ones are available.

I am originally a pharmacist, and there used to be a period of time years back that the old folks would have up there on the shelf what they called the Quassia Cup. That was the Quassia bark filled with a lot of stagnant water. When it started to taste bad enough, you drank it. It was supposed to cure your ills. It didn't. It killed many people. But it didn't cure any ills.

We're away from that day. We are away from the day when you poured turpentine on every wound. Now you start to use Penicillin and the myecin drugs and the new vaccines. Mayors, my fellow local officials, we must also apply all the new techniques of community development and government to our problems.

WORKING GROUP ON COMMUNITY SECURITY

I'd like to suggest to the League of Cities, therefore, this proposition. Will you consider in this Convention establishing a special working group on community security to identify those programs and approaches which have proven particularly useful in other cities or in your city in calming tensions and in quelling violence?

Let's start to communicate with each other and pool our information together, but not just in Washington where Mayor Lindsay and Governor Kerner will be heading up this fine Commission. I ask you to do this and have a group that can work with the Federal agencies, with the Justice Department, the FBI, and all the other law enforcement instrumentalities, as well as with the community agencies.

When I think about the responsibilities of city government, I can't help but be reminded of the words of the late President Franklin Roosevelt, who said these words. "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have too much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

Now that philosophy applied very well today. We want all of our neighborhoods to be wholesome and healthful, to have good public services, public schools and hospitals and community agencies. But where there are poor people living in poor housing and in poor neighborhoods, that is where the greatest effort must be concentrated. It is they who need the best schools, the best public transport, the best housing code and sanitation enforcement, and the best street lighting. It is they who have been most deprived of opportunity, and who require our greatest efforts.

The crisis we face is a crisis for all America. Responsibility for it and the obligation to overcome it bears equally on every citizen in these fifty States, black or white, Republican or Democrat, rich or poor. For whose fault is it when our cities bleed and burn? Whose fault is it when the American child drops out of school? Whose fault is it when a willing and able bodied man doesn't get work? The answer, my friends, is that it is the fault of every one of us. It is the fault of the racial extremist who incites to riot. It is the fault of the looter and the sniper, the criminal who denies his neighbors the right to live in peace. And it is the fault of governments who do too little and too late.

Edmund Burke, the great British statesman, once said, "Evil triumphs where good men fail to act." We need to act. Ghettoes—I hate the word—ghettoes have no place in America. They are the very antithesis of this nation, of an open society, of freedom of choice, of freedom of movement. Ghettoes are prisons. They make democracy a frail pretense.

So let us solemnly resolve in this Convention assembled to abolish ghettoes from our cities. Indeed I would like to banish the word from the English language. It is repulsive, repugnant, ugly. In a broader sense, the ghettoes, however, are only an extension of the blight which affects our total urban life, or affects at least a terribly critical part of it: the blight of congestion, of dirt, of polluted water and air, tensions, crime and slums, the blight from which the affluent seek escape by running away to the suburbs. Are we going to turn over these great cities to mob rule by running away? Are these choking and dying cities an adequate expression of American civilization in the last third of the Twentieth Century? I think not. And let's resolve to say no, to mobilize the necessary resources to create the parks, the transport, the housing, and all the other facilities needed to provide every American a promise of this good America.

My good friend, Governor Otto Kerner of Illinois, wisely said last Friday night what I leave for you as a message of hope and promise. "America does not seek separatism, segregation or spiritual secession. Any man who preaches these doctrines is an enemy of freedom." America does not seek separatism, segregation or spiritual secession. Any man who preaches these doctrines is an enemy of freedom. The Governor spoke profound truth.

At this time we need to recognize more than ever before that we are one people. We must work not with black power or white power, but with citizens' moral power. We must work together as Americans to create a society where there is not a white suburb or a black ghetto, where economic fear and irrational tensions and racial prejudice do not exist, where there is one citizenship—not Negro American, not white American, not Catholic American, Protestant American, Jewish American—but where there is one citizenship, citizen of the United States of America.

Thank you very much.

PROPOSED ORGANIZATION OF EMERGENCY ARMED FORCES INFORMATION CENTER

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of a tragedy which stunned America and caused grave anxiety for the families and friends of 5,200 officers and men aboard the U.S.S. *Forrestal* this past weekend, I have written today to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, urging the organization of an emergency armed services information center.

Undoubtedly, virtually every Member of Congress was contacted this past weekend by parents, wives, or other relatives of the officers and men aboard the *Forrestal*, seeking information about their safety.

Perhaps other Members experienced, as I did, a great deal of difficulty in securing information until the start of office hours Monday morning.

I believe the answer is to plan an armed services information center which can become operational almost instantly upon word of some major tragedy affecting U.S. military personnel. Information about casualties from the tragedy scene could be channeled to the information center as quickly as it is received. To be fully functional, the center should be staffed around the clock for several days after the tragedy.

Such an information center could serve as a receiving center for inquiries from every congressional district. Constituents could then contact congressional offices in their own district to request information. These inquiries in turn could be directed to the emergency information center.

In the wake of the *Forrestal* tragedy, I began receiving inquiries Saturday. They continued through Sunday and Monday. But until offices opened Monday morning it was virtually impossible to get information to calm distraught families.

I do want to commend the press and radio, particularly in my district, for their efforts. Many of the names of men aboard the *Forrestal* from my district were relayed to me by local newsmen. We were able to work together to allay the fears of family and friends in the shortest time possible.

THE U.S.S. "FORRESTAL"

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday America learned the full gravity of the tragic mishap which struck the U.S.S. *Forrestal* as it was about to launch an air mission over North Vietnam Saturday. We now know that this accident has taken a toll of 136 dead and missing and 64 injured among the officers and men aboard the *Forrestal*.

The dollar loss was $135 million. The loss of aircraft totaled 21 destroyed and 42 damaged, accounting for $85 million of the overall dollar cost of this mishap.

The price of this accident has grown to fantastic proportions, making clear, I believe, the need for a congressional investigation of this and other types of mishaps which have taken a high toll of American lives and property in the Southeast Asian zone of conflict.

This morning's press reported that flames shooting from a jet being started for takeoff ignited a missile mounted on a plane behind. One of the ship's officers described this as one of the hazards of war. I contend it is not a hazard of war but an accident which possibly could have been prevented by nothing more than a slightly different formation of planes awaiting takeoff on the flight deck of the carrier. I say possibly it could have been prevented. It is just a possibility, but one which should be considered. Certainly, we can not permit such a possibility to go unchecked until another carrier preparing to launch its aircraft experiences a similarly tragic accident.

We now know that there was a very real possibility that the entire ship would sink. With some 5,000 men aboard, this could have been the most tragic accident in all naval history. The raw courage and determination of the *Forrestal's* officers and men prevented such a fate.

I hope my colleagues will join with me in supporting House Resolution 836 to authorize an investigation—a broad investigation of mishaps involving our Armed Forces—by the House Armed Services Committee. We must find ways to prevent further tragedies due to mishaps.

SUPPORTING THE DOMESTIC TRAWL FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the 54th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon has memorialized the Congress of the United States to support the domestic trawl fishing industry.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I place this in the body of the RECORD. Joining with me is Congressman AL ULLMAN:

[Oregon Legislative Assembly—1967 regular session]

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled, the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Fifty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the importance and nutritional value of fish and shellfish in the world (fish protein concentrate) and the American diet are becoming increasingly more important as a protein resource; and

Whereas our federal agencies involved have found on three occasions since 1953–54 that our domestic trawl fish industry was being hurt or injured by importations, and yet executive administrative action has not been forthcoming to provide this needed protection; and

Whereas the United States domestic fishery production has decreased and diminished consistently since 1954 to the point of having dropped in world production from second place to fifth place (1964) with Norway overtaking the United States in 1966; and

Whereas the domestic fishing industry, having been severely criticized for not having upgraded itself, has found so doing impossible as long as any and all foreign nations can so conveniently ship fishery products into the United States; and

Whereas the United States production of these species in 1966 was only 19.2 percent of the total United States supply and that from imports was 80.8 percent (U.S.D.I. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries Annual Summary, "Packaged Fishery Products—1966," C. F. S. No. 4343); and

Whereas foreign fishing on our coasts and importations are one and the same problem and are destroying the domestic trawl industry; and

Whereas the processing plants of Oregon are limiting the landings of other trawled seafoods due to the heavy and steadily increasing imports of similar species; now, therefore,

Be It Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

(1) The Congress of the United States is memorialized to take appropriate action to ensure and provide a sound and healthy domestic trawl fishery through quota protection on such imported products.

(2) A copy of this memorial shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior and to each member of the Oregon Congressional Delegation.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Secretary of Senate.
E. D. DOBBS PITTS,
President of Senate.
F. F. MONTGOMERY,
Speaker of House.

WAR, RIOT, AND PRIORITIES

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following is the full text of a statement on "War, Riot, and Priorities" issued today by the following 10 Democratic Congressmen:

Hon. PHILLIP BURTON, of California.
Hon. JOHN CONYERS, JR., of Michigan.
Hon. JOHN G. DOW, of New York.
Hon. DON EDWARDS, of California.
Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, of California.
Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey.
Hon. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin.
Hon. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York.
Hon. EDWARD R. ROYBAL, of California.
Hon. WILLIAM F. RYAN, of New York.

The statement follows:

WAR, RIOT, AND PRIORITIES

Our nation is in crisis. We fight a stalemated war 10,000 miles from our shores, there is no immediate prospect for peace. We face despair and disruption in our cities; there is no immediate prospect for solution.

Never before, in modern American history, have our national priorities seemed more seriously unbalanced. Never before have we Americans been more distracted from our basic responsibilities. Never before has national sentiment been more confused. And never before has enlightened opinion been more frustrated and paralyzed.

This vacuum of vision and leadership, in turn, is being filled by a movement of hostility and reaction. Faced with the despair of the oppressed, the response of this movement is to demand more force, more punish-

ment. The deprived, whether in Vietnam or the ghetto, cry out for redress and independence; but their call is not understood. And so their violent rebellion is attributed to external conspiracy, to scapegoats. Thus, even in desperate violence, the oppressed are ignored.

America, then, is threatened not only by overwhelming problems, but by the dangerous consequences of our response, a cycle of vigilantism and repression, in domestic and foreign policy alike, which may ultimately tear apart the soul of this nation.

Never since we have been in Congress have we been more alarmed for the future of our country. Each of us is willing to accept some measure of responsibility for the imbalance of American national priorities and the inadequacy of our national response to crisis. We are sure others in Congress who think as we do will join in so admitting.

And so we must be frank about who we are, how we feel, and what we expect. Confronted by continued stalemate in Vietnam, greater violence in the cities, and an increasingly reactionary response to that twin prospect, we have little confidence that progressive forces in Congress will of themselves succeed in redefining American priorities and redirecting American energies.

We seek, therefore, a national movement for social reconstruction to help reverse the dangerous drift to reaction currently threatening our public life.

Such a project must acknowledge the great lesson of Summer 1967; *the crisis of our ghettos is more urgent than the war in Vietnam.* To bring real and lasting peace to our cities, we must end war in Asia.

First, then, the war must end . . . now. America must reject the present course of escalation and instead offer our adversaries a compromise peace, which accepts a coalition government for South Vietnam, and the eventual withdrawal of American troops.

Second, we must begin, in effect, a Marshall Plan for the cities, a redistribution of American affluence and a new plan for the full participation of this nation's deprived in reconstructing every ghetto in every city of this country. Our public resources must be stretcthed to their limits, and supplemented by funds currently spent for War. And from the affluent and the comfortable of this nation—an enormous and unprecedented majority—we must require personal commitment and material sacrifice.

This country, then, must turn about. It must limit its unwarranted preoccupation with other continents—and face itself. This historic task is no longer a matter of simple choice. At stake is our self-preservation.

We ten Congressmen are only a few. We will devote all our energies, and all the leadership we can exercise in the constituencies we represent. But the effort must be national. It must rise from the people and the neighborhoods of America. It must find representation and power in Congress. And it must have leadership. Thus, finally, we appeal to our President to chart a new course for this nation, to apply his great energy and political skill to a redefined national agenda, and to regain an initiative and momentum for progress which has been gradually surrendered over the past several years.

STATEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the city of New York, and as the chairman of the Special Inquiry on Consumer Representation in the Federal Government—a subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee—I was extremely happy to receive the statement of the New York City Council on Consumer Affairs, which will be placed in the record of the hearings being held by that subcommittee.

However, in addition to being made a part of those hearings, the statement was, in my judgment, one which should be widely disseminated, and given maximum publicity. It demonstrates that the city of New York felt that the consumer was important enough to warrant the establishment of an agency for the express purpose of protecting his interests.

The council has taken a firm stand in favor of expanded consumer information services on the part of Government, and has endorsed my bill, H.R. 7114, to create a Department of Consumer Affairs and a National Consumer Information Foundation.

I commend Mayor John V. Lindsay for his recognition of the importance of the consuming public, and in his desire to involve the local city government in activities which will benefit the citizens of New York City. And I commend the council for giving the consumer the representation he warrants, and for performing a necessary and important role in protecting the bewildered buyer who, for so many years, has been the victim in today's complex marketplace.

I set forth at this point the statement from the New York City Council on Consumer Affairs:

STATEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CITY COUNCIL ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS TO THE SPECIAL INQUIRY ON CONSUMER REPRESENTATION IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

The New York City Council on Consumer Affairs was set up on April 23, 1967 by Executive Order of Mayor John V. Lindsay "to take affirmative action to protect the consumer interests of the citizens of New York." It is composed of commissioners of major City departments with special responsibilities in the consumer field. The Council is concerned with all matters affecting the interest of the citizens of New York City as consumers.

The Council favors efforts to obtain and disseminate full information to consumers. Federal government purchasing standards, formulated at taxpayer expense, surely should be available to aid him shop knowledgeably in an increasingly complex market. One Federal agency, perhaps the General Services Administratation, should be responsible for organizing and publishing all existing standards in a form useful to consumers. A system, such as the "Info-Tag" proposal of H.R. 7114 (90th Congress, first session), which will let manufacturers tell the consumer whether their products meet Federal standards, would also be highly desirable.

The need for more consumer information is beyond dispute. The Truth-in-Packaging Act and the pending Truth-in-Lending bill demonstrate the concern of Congress and of the nation for the bewildered buyer. American business has succeeded in producing a wide range of high quality consumer goods, but the poor and uneducated shopper—and especially the welfare recipient—is often deceived by inferior goods sold at inflated prices by some unscrupulous merchants. If manufacturers and merchants could advertise that their products met Federal standards, even the unsophisticated shopper would have concrete information about the products he is offered.

The New York City Council on Consumer Affairs urges that Federal purchasing standards be made public. We support appropriate administrative action or legislation to accomplish this objective.

KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations, concluded this past May, has been characterized as the most ambitious attempt ever made to achieve the liberalization of international trade. After 4 years of negotiations, 50 nations accounting for about 80 percent of world trade, agreed to cut tariffs an average of 35 percent on industrial goods over the next 5 years and to liberalize trade in farm products. I think it important to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that the successful conclusion of these negotiations continues a trend dating back more than three decades. In 1931–35 the average U.S. tariff was 50 percent of an item's imported value. At the outset of the Kennedy round, this figure had shrunk to about 11 percent. While it is much too early to measure the total effect of Kennedy round negotiations on all segments of American industry, it seems quite clear as a general proposition that the Kennedy round and, indeed, the entire trend toward a freer world marketplace, promises the opening of vast new markets for U.S. industrial and agricultural products, and, of great interest to me, substantially lower prices and increased product variety for America's 200 million consumers.

It is because an effort is currently underway in the House and in the Senate to reverse this trend, good for all of the people of the United States and the rest of the world, that I report today to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The instruments of this attempted reversal are H.R. 9475, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS], and companion bills in the Senate. These bills seek to amend the Meat Import Act of 1964, enacted by the 88th Congress. In the same spirit and tradition of "commercial partnership" between the United States and its neighbors around the world that produced the successful Kennedy round tariff agreements.

The Meat Import Act of 1964 authorized, among other things, the importation into the United States of rather substantial quantities of inexpensive lean beef, used extensively by millions of consumers in hamburgers, frankfurters, and other low-cost convenience foods. H.R. 9475, if enacted, would curtail signifi-

cantly the amount of inexpensive lean beef now permitted to be imported into the United States. Because there are inadequate amounts of this lean beef produced by cattlemen here, limiting its importation would necessitate the use of more costly grain-fed cattle meats for hamburgers and frankfurters and raise their cost dramatically to the consumer. It has been estimated by some that such a curtailment would raise the cost as must as 30 percent.

It seems clear that this imported beef poses little if any threat to America's cattle industry which concentrates on "fat" cattle of higher grades and cost destined for steaks, chops, and other high-priced meat cuts. Equally clear is that enactment of H.R. 9475 would fly in the face of this promising trend toward the liberalization of international trade and would damage the economic interests of the consumer, particularly the poor consumer, whose hamburger consumption exceeds the 33 pounds per capita average.

It is noteworthy, Mr. Speaker, that only last month the entire membership of the President's National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber called for further liberalization of world trade, particularly in farm products, and suggested that the United States should eliminate its import quotas for meat.

It is my view that the welfare of 200 million American consumers requires the defeat of this legislation. A sensible and convincing argument against enactment has been prepared by the Meat Importers Council of America. They have prepared a "Clout the Consumer" letter to Members of Congress and a "Statement of Points in Opposition" to H.R. 9475. I urge all those Members of Congress interested in the plight of the consumer—a plight which has received too little attention from us all—to read the material which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

MEAT IMPORTERS' COUNCIL, INC.,
New York, N.Y., June 6, 1967.

Re H.R. 9475.

A number of bills deserving the label *"Clout The Consumer"* have recently been introduced, apparently in good faith, in both the Senate and House, seeking to revise the present Meat Import Law (P.L. 88-482) with new, unnecessary quotas.

Hasty consideration of these proposals would deprive the Congress of its prerogative to inquire into all of the facts in order to determine if such legislation would really help the cattle and livestock feeder industries. Furthermore, Congress should know what effect such proposals would have on consumers by increasing the cost of hamburger, frankfurters and other convenience foods upon which millions of Americans depend.

It is hard to believe that the Congress, in this day of inflationary consumer prices, will allow passage of a *"Clout The Consumer"* Bill without: (1) considering *all* of the facts; (2) hearing both sides; (3) checking into claims of cattlemen; (4) checking into the effect on millions of American families; (5) listening to major consumer organizations; and (6) consultation with the Executive Branch.

Since this is a complex and technical subject, we enclose a statement covering certain points which, we believe, merit your consideration and respectfully urge you ask for full and open hearings.

Sincerely,

KENNETH ROBERSON,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF POINTS IN OPPOSITION TO S. 1588, H.R. 9475, ETC.

JUNE 6, 1967.

"Clout The Consumer"?: Why do we term this an attempt at *"Clout The Consumer"* legislation?

Millions of American families rely on hamburgers, frankfurters and other convenience foods for their basic meals. Any proposal that would tend to increase the cost of these important, reasonably-priced food items is a *"Clout The Consumer"* Bill.

Hamburgers, Frankfurters and Other Convenience Foods: These low-cost popular food products, so important to the vast number of American consumers, are made of so-called manufacturing meat—a lean meat, produced by grass-fed cattle. Imports of such meat are primarily from Australia, New Zealand and Ireland.

U.S. Production: The U.S. cattle industry concentrates on sending its animals to feedlots to be grain-fed and to become "fat" cattle of higher grade and cost, destined for steaks, chops and other high-priced cuts. Use of this more costly grain-fed cattle meat for hamburgers and frankfurters would raise the prices of these foods so drastically as to price them out of the economic reach of the lower-income families.

Purpose of Proposed Legislation: The sponsors of this legislation, the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Livestock Feeders Association, readily admit that their main purpose in seeking further to limit these imports is sharply to raise consumer prices. They do not deny that the price of the low-cost hamburgers and frankfurters will be the most harshly affected. They cannot deny that the overproduction of U.S. grain-fed fat cattle for steaks, chops and the higher-priced cuts is in no way related to the need for imported lean meat for hamburgers and frankfurters, or that a sufficient supply of this manufacturing meat is not produced within the U.S. to fulfill needs.

If a "subsidy" is the true objective, would it not be more forthright to ask the Congress for that help without resorting to subterfuge in the form of a *"Clout The Consumer"* Bill?

Over the years, the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Livestock Feeders Association have prided themselves on rejecting any thought of Federal subsidies. This new campaign to *"Clout The Consumer"* seems to be an effort to obtain another type of "subsidy" through a "tax"—but one levied only against the American consumer who depends on hamburger and frankfurters at a reasonable cost.

If the U.S. cattle and livestock feeder industries are indeed in trouble, as they claim, we favor doing everything practical to assist them. But this isolated attack on meat imports, without first having *all* the facts, seems hardly a practical or sound way to solve the problem.

When the facts are brought to light, they will clearly disclose these relevant points: (1) Imports consist of entirely different types of meat than are produced in sufficient quantity within the United States; (2) they are not competitive with the vast amount of grain-fed U.S.-produced meat; (3) further meat import limitations will in no way solve the real economic problems of the U.S. cattle and feeder industries but will result only in penalizing the vast number of families who eat hamburger and frankfurters, etc., at their main meals since such meat imports are used for these basic nutritious consumer products; (4) further import limitations will mean sharp and severe price rises, making the cost of hamburger and frankfurters prohibitive for millions of lower-income U.S. consumers; (5) proponents readily admit that consumer price rises are their primary purpose.

Our Position: We stand ready to rely on the facts.

The cattle and livestock feeder industries deserve to be helped *if* they have serious economic troubles. An objective effort to diagnose and to isolate the real cause of the cattlemen's "ailment" seems to be a reasonable request.

Therefore, we urge the Congress to order a full and objective inquiry into *all* of the facts, including realistic reasons for the current plight of the U.S. cattlemen and livestock feeders. The appropriate method is to order public hearings, conducted by appropriate Committees of both Chambers of the Congress and by the U.S. Tariff Commission. Both sides deserve a chance to be heard. Major consumer organizations of the nation should be given an opportunity to know the true facts and to present their views.

THE MEAT IMPORTERS COUNCIL.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

REPORT ON RURAL-URBAN DAY IN INDIANA

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, recently Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH, of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, and I sponsored in Indiana a Rural-Urban Day. We invited three of our "big city" colleagues to the Hoosier State to learn firsthand, some of the problems facing Indiana farmers.

Our visitors, Congressmen FRANK ANNUNZIO, JONATHAN BINGHAM, and JAMES CORMAN toured Indiana farms and talked to farmers and farm leaders during their 1-day stay in Indiana.

We were assisted in our day of tours and talks by two distinguished Purdue University staff members, Prof. N. S. Hadley and Dr. J. O. Dunbar. These two experts on Indiana agriculture accompanied us every step of the way, supplying statistics and other information when it was needed.

Professor Hadley and Dr. Dunbar subsequently reported to President Frederick Hovde of Purdue, dean of agriculture Earl L. Butz and Dr. Howard G. Diesslin, director of extension service at Purdue, on the outcome of the trip. Their report is as follows:

On Friday, July 21, 1967, we accompanied a tour of Indiana Agriculture, led by Congressman J. Edward Roush of the 5th District and Lee H. Hamilton of the 9th District. Guests on the tour were three congressmen from the three largest cities in the United States: Jonathan Bingham, of New York, Frank Annunzio, Chicago and James Corman of Los Angeles. (These three cities have 46 congressmen). On this tour the congressmen inspected the farms of Max Townsend and Ronald Smith in Grant county and the Elk Creek Watershed and the farm of Roscoe Walker in Washington county. These farmers had capital investments of about $250,000 each and are representative of the 25 percent of the farmers who produce 75 percent of Indiana's farm output. The congressmen also visited with farm leaders from both the 5th and 9th districts. At the invitation of the congress-

men, we served as consultants throughout the day.

The following are our impressions of the day:

We believe the urban congressmen's understanding of agricultural problems was greatly improved. They were genuinely impressed by the large capital outlays associated with farming. They were likewise impressed by the evident high caliber of the managerial capacities of the farmers visited. They commented on the relatively meager return to capital and management in farming, compared to urban businesses. They recognized the necessity for continued improvements in scientific and technical know-how, as a guarantee for an abundant and economical source of food for urban people. They were astounded by the rapid rate of technical advancement in agriculture. One of the urban congressmen said, "now I know what a County Agent does."

It was evident that they were sympathetic to the problems of all farmers; that they recognized the role of commercial farmers in providing food for the nation and that programs designed to help low income farmers must be of a different nature than those for commercial agriculture.

Congressmen Roush and Hamilton are to be commended for recognizing the importance of having urban congressmen acquainted with agriculture and for doing something about it. Both of these men recognize that farming is becoming more strictly a business and much less a way of life. That the farmer business man is like any other business man but does have special problems. And that the political potence of American agriculture is declining. They recognize that the interests of farmers can be best served by acquainting city people and their representatives with their stake in an efficient, productive and progressive agriculture.

Farmers contacted on the tour did an excellent job of pointing out major problems faced by farmers. Their concerns can be generally classified as follows:

1. Large and growing capital requirements in modern farming.
2. The pressure to substitute capital for labor.
3. The need for abundant, stable and reasonably priced credit.
4. The pressure to increase efficiency.
5. The importance of continuing research and education.
6. The cost-price squeeze.
7. The importance of governmental action in maintaining a reasonable balance between production and effective demand.
8. The pressures generated by agricultural imports.
9. The need to insulate the domestic market from strategic reserves of feed and food.
10. The farmers declining share of the consumers dollar.
11. The importance of resource development and conservation.

The County Agents in both Grant and Washington counties gave valuable assistance in helping to arrange and conduct the visits. George (Mac) Adams received special praise from Congressman Hamilton and his staff for his tireless, imaginative, practical and enthusiastic assistance.

Meanwhile, newspaper accounts of the day in Indiana continue to appear in Indiana publications and I submit the following excellent article "A Congressional Turnabout" by Miss Marguerite Davis which appeared in a recent issue of the Louisville, Ky., Times:

A CONGRESSIONAL TURNABOUT—CITY REPRESENTATIVES PROPOSE URBAN TOURS FOR THEIR RURAL COLLEAGUES

(By Marguerite Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Big-city congressmen, impressed by their one-day tour of Indiana farms for a first-hand study of the farmer's problems, are thinking of returning the compliment.

Rep. Frank Annunzio, D-Ill., whose district is comprised of downtown Chicago, said he discussed the idea with two other "city slickers" who made the July 21 trip with him—Democratic Reps. Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York City, and James C. Corman, of suburban Los Angeles.

The plan would be to take rural-area congressmen on a tour of the cities, show them the slums, the dilapidated housing, the overcrowded, under-equipped schools.

TRIP CALLED BIG SUCCESS

Reps. J. Edward Roush and Lee H. Hamilton, Indiana Democrats who sponsored the farm tour of their districts, endorsed the idea. They said that if they were invited, they would accept.

Meanwhile, all concerned agree the Indiana trip was an outstanding success.

"My principal impression was the size of the investment required for a farm, the difficulty and complexity of the operation, the fact that so much equipment is needed," Bingham said. "Farmers have to be highly educated people . . . in management, planning finance—and these are just family farms."

Annunzio said he planned to confer with Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz about the possibility of assigning unemployed persons to farm work.

"Something has to be done to get labor for the farmers," he said. "Someone has to use imagination to sell people on going to work on farms . . . to romanticize farm life, if necessary.

A MUCH HARDER LIFE

He conceded the need for better returns for the farmers, but said their plight could be worse.

"These people are getting 4.5 to 5 per cent return on their money and it's not enough," he said. "They're small-business men, and that's the problem of all small-business men.

"But with all their problems, they at least have clear air to breath and good food to eat. The small-business men in the city have a much harder life."

FLOOD INSURANCE NEEDED

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago during the Christmas season, Oregon was suddenly struck by a series of crippling floods which ravaged virtually the entire State and led President Johnson to declare a disaster area.

The individuals whose houses and places of business were damaged or destroyed generally had no insurance to protect them from such an eventuality.

Even now, tens of thousands of American families living in flood-danger areas are unable to obtain insurance policies which cover these natural disasters.

For a number of years, various Federal programs to create a system of flood insurance have been discussed. Earlier in this session, I was pleased to introduce H.R. 3264. I am now happy to join with my colleague from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in introducing an improved version of my earlier bill. This measure, prepared by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, will not only help to protect citizens but will also discourage future unwise construction in flood plain areas. As Mr. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, one of the Senate sponsors, has pointed out, it should reduce the needs for Federal relief expenditures for flood-stricken regions by leading to more prudent use of these lands.

Numerous insurance companies have indicated their support for this bill and have agreed that for the first time, it will be economically feasible for them to offer protection against floods. As designed, the proposed system will serve as another example of cooperation between the private and public sectors of American life.

WARSAW UPRISING

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, I should like to join my countrymen in paying tribute and respect to the Polish nation and in particular to the people of Warsaw who on August 1, 1943, joined their compatriots in other parts of the country in a brave uprising against the German occupying army.

Polish histories almost invariably begin with descriptions of Poland's geographic situation. Whether or not it is explicitly noted, it becomes immediately apparent to the reader that Poland, lying on the great central European plain, is unprotected by natural barriers from her two powerful neighbors, Germany and Russia. Historically, her geographic environment has been the bane of Polish independence.

When Germany and the Soviet Union, after invading Poland in September 1939, across her eastern and western boundaries, signed the Ribbentrop-Molotov "Treaty of Friendship and Frontiers," Poland was being partitioned by foreign powers for the fifth time in her history. On October 6, Hitler proclaimed the end of the Polish State. This reckless disregard for the territorial sovereignty of Poland was the immediate cause for a declaration of war on Germany by the West European nations.

Poland suffered incomparable losses throughout the war. In the German-occupied area, S.S. leader Himmler carried out a ruthless program of Germanization under his newly acquired title of "Commissioner for the Consolidation of German Nationality." Polish inhabitants of western Poland were driven away, murdered, or deported as forced labor to central Germany. Polish schools were closed, libraries and archives destroyed, newspapers suppressed. The entire teaching staff of Jagellon University in Cracow, one of the oldest and finest universities in Europe, was arrested and many were killed at Sachsenhausen camp. Similarly, in eastern Poland, large

numbers of Poles were deported to Russia.

After the German invasion of Russia and eastern Poland in June 1941, the Poles found themselves allied with the Soviet Union against Germany.

Though Polish divisions abroad fought bravely against the axis in Africa, in air battles over Western Europe, in the Italian campaign, and in the invasion of France, their homeland was a victim of treachery. When the Red Army approached Warsaw in 1943, ostensibly to liberate the capital, the Polish underground, encouraged by broadcasts from the Soviet Union, rebelled against the Nazi troops in the city. While the Germans sent reinforcements from their retreating army to crush the revolt, the Soviet Army waited across the Vistula River a few miles from the city for 5 weeks. This delay enabled the Germans to conduct an unprecedented campaign of murder and systematic demolition. The citizens of Warsaw had expected immediate aid.

Nevertheless, when support was not forthcoming, they fought dauntlessly against insuperable odds. The Russians arrived after the entire city was razed. One cannot fail to be deeply moved by this tragedy of betrayed hope and needless destruction.

Twenty-four years later, Warsaw stands as vital testimony to the determination and courage of the Polish citizens. Conquering tremendous hardship, the Poles have rebuilt their cities on fields of rubble, restoring entire old sections stone by stone to their former beauty. Today in Warsaw, it is possible to turn a corner and walk down a narrow street that holds shimmering memories of the past and then to turn again into the modern city to see proud promise for the future. Despite a continuing foreign presence on Poland's political stage, it cannot be said that the Poles of Warsaw fought to no avail. Their traditional spirit and courage will never be defeated.

LETTER FROM MRS. ERNESTINE ROSSANO

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues will be interested to hear about a letter written to Sargent Shriver, on July 13, 1967, by Mrs. Ernestine Rossano, one of my constituents. She writes to commend the Job Corps program for what it has done for her grandson, who joined the Job Corps in February 1967.

When he joined the Job Corps, she writes, he couldn't read a second-grade book. He was first sent to Trapper Creek Job Corps Center in Montana and, after accomplishing the necessary basic education skills, he transferred to the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey. He came home on leave between these assignments, and his grandmother noticed a decided improvement. He was more of a man now. He had learned to read in just a few months and the moment he arrived home he took a book to read and proudly display his accomplishment.

Mrs. Rossano feels that the Job Corps is something to be proud of, and I am sure many of my constituents would agree with her. I am sure that letters of application like Mrs. Rossano's give a great deal of satisfaction to all those associated with the Job Corps program and can be multiplied by many thousands.

I commend her letter to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD.

JULY 13, 1967.

DEAR SARGENT SHRIVER: I am writting in reference of my grandson who lived with me, and has joined the Job Corp Center in Feb of 67. What I want to say when he joined he couldn't read a second grade book. He came home on leave when he was transfered from Trapper Creek Montana to Kilmer JCC Eddison, N.J.

I am very happy for the big improvement, he is more of a man then the boy that jo ned, he was so proud to think he has learned to read, he just could'nt wait for the moment he got home he took a book out and started to read. To think he could'nt read at all a few months ago. The JCC is something to be real proud of what can be done for boys a job well done. May God Bless you and keep up the JCC.

Thank You.

A proud Grandmother,

MRS. ERNESTINE ROSSANO,
Philadelphia, Pa.

P.S.—Please answer this letter.

Thank You.

A MATTER OF ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry Fluegel Silver of my State, a public spirited citizen and highly successful chartered life underwriter, recently wrote to me about the importance of developing multilateral assistance for the developing nations.

For the benefit of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert his letter herewith:

NEW YORK, N.Y.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BINGHAM: The mass poverty of the underdeveloped countries is almost beyond the grasp of our understanding. As a result, we have found it easier to pay lip service to our moral obligations than to take the practical and hard steps necessary to attack this problem meaningfully.

No country can hope to offer, indefinitely, food surpluses to the starving of the world on a unilateral basis. Even food aid organized on an international basis cannot be regarded as a permanent solution. The food surpluses of the high productivity nations will shortly be exhausted. Putting back into production their entire idle acreage will not begin to take up the slack in this race between need and available resources.

The financial and material aid needed by the developing nations over the next 15–25 years cannot be provided by any single nation. On the other hand, for the rich nations to simply increase their share of the aid required without consideration of the larger economic issues involved, is to throw good money after bad. The poor nations cannot profitably use this aid in a logical and well-planned development program if they continue to suffer under the burdens of an increasing debt-service, unfavorable foreign trade arrangements, and a shortage of foreign exchange.

The long-range planning now required can only be accomplished on an intergovernmental basis. Agencies within the United Nations are the obvious channels for the aid resources now required. If the United States were to initiate this step it could begin to erase the unfortunate and unfair image is has acquired as a neo-colonial and imperialist power. It would gain the confidence of the ordinary people of the world through two steps: its support of the United Nations, and its willingness to take action that implies some form of economic sacrifice. It is a matter of enlightened self-interest to embark on this path. Herbert Waters, the assistant administrator of the Agency for International Development put it cogently when he said: Hunger used to be the silent enemy of man. Starvation used to be the silent way of death. Not any more. Instead of silence, it can mean a resounding roar of violence."

As the most powerful nation on earth it behooves us to utilize our affluence and influence for the international general welfare. By so doing we ensure a decent world for our posterity to inhabit.

Sincerely,

HENRY FLUEGEL SILVER.

FEDERAL MAGISTRATES ACT

Mr. TIERNAN. 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to address this body in support of the Federal Magistrates Act, S. 945, as amended, which passed the Senate on June 29. S. 945 would abolish the office of the U.S. commissioner and establish in its place in the judicial branch of our Government a system of U.S. magistrates.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation, having introduced H.R. 8520. I heartily endorse its purpose of revamping our system of commissioners which has changed little for over a century. On the level where many of our citizens have their first contact with the Federal judiciary, it would require that magistrates be attorneys whenever possible, it would afford secure terms of office to magistrates, it would compensate magistrates with salaries not case fees, and it would establish uniform procedures. Further, this legislation would relieve our overburdened U.S. district courts from certain cases which could more desirably be decided on a lower level, and the magistrates could be assigned various other duties to assist the courts.

The magistrate would assume the duties of the present commissioner, such as issuing warrants and setting bail at

preliminary hearings. In addition, the trial jurisdiction of a magistrate would extend to those accused of misdemeanors that are punishable by imprisonment for not more than 1 year of a fine of not more than $1,000 or both, providing the accused waives his right to trial before a U.S. district court and waives any right to a trial by jury. A magistrate's decision can be appealed to the district court.

I have sounded out several officials in my district on the Federal Magistrates Act. The Honorable Adrian A. Spears, the distinguished and energetic chief judge of the western district of Texas, U.S. District Court, has said this legislation would be a tremendous step forward. Attorney James L. M. Miller, a commissioner himself, writes me:

As you know the bill has the support of all the judges, the American Bar Association, and that extensive hearings were had before the Senate Subcommittee clearly showed the need for the reform as set out in your bill. . . . the Commissioner system, based on a fee system (and in many cases the Commissioners are not lawyers) is archaic, inefficient, and a detriment to the administration of justice in the Federal System. The bill in the Senate passed without a dissenting vote! It is hoped that the bill would pass in the House this month.

Mr. Speaker, a judicial system cannot be said to deliver justice unless its decisions are swift and sure. I believe the Federal Magistrates Act would significantly improve the quality and dispatch of justice. I commend to my colleagues' attention to Senate Report No. 357 on S. 945, and the hearings before the Tydings Subcommittee on Improvement in Judicial Machinery of the Senate Judiciary Committee entitled "Federal Magistrates Act"—90th Congress—and "U.S. Commissioner System"—89th Congress. S. 945 is pending before the House Judiciary Committee, and I urge my colleagues to join me in requesting prompt consideration of this legislation as soon as the press of committee business allows.

FREEDOM AND THE RISING CRIME WAVE—SPEECH BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE I. BEVERLY LAKE

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, Associate Justice I. Beverly Lake recently spoke before the American Legion post at Dunn, N.C., which is in the district I have the honor to represent, on the subject "Freedom and the Rising Crime Wave."

Justice Lake is an outstanding public servant, having distinguished himself as a practicing lawyer, a law professor at Wake Forest College, assistant attorney general of the State of North Carolina, and now as a member of the supreme court of his native State.

His speech has attracted widespread interest, and several of our colleagues in the House of Representatives have indicated their appreciation and interest in his expression.

With this in mind I am including the text of the referred-to speech in the RECORD:

FREEDOM AND THE RISING CRIME WAVE

(Speech to Dunn, N.C., post of the American Legion, July 7, 1967, by I. Beverly Lake)

One of the many satisfactions I get from being a grandfather is that now I get invited to birthday parties again. A birthday celebration is a wonderful time of pleasure—recollection, pleasant companionship and anticipation of nice things to come. We had a birthday celebration this week—the birthday of our country.

In order that their fellow Americans and all the world of their time, and we who were to come after them upon this great land, might know the reason for their decision to embark upon the desperate course of revolution against the greatest military power in the world, Thomas Jefferson and his associates set down in the Declaration of Independence the more serious abuses of power by the King and his ministers. It is a catalogue of the evil fruit which grows upon the tree of tyranny—a picture of the conditions which our fathers found so intolerable they joined the signers of the Declaration in pledging their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor to destroy. Since those conditions were the result of acts of their government, there were many who, in good conscience, said, "This Declaration is treason; we must obey the law; we may properly ask the Government to do better but we must have law and order."

The Book of Judges in the Holy Scriptures recounts a dark and dismal century in the history of Israel. It closes with this descriptive and thought provoking sentence: "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." That is a picture of anarchy—no law, no courts, no police. It is a picture of a desperate time of struggle for a hand-to-mouth existence in a community filled with fear and anxiety whenever the sun went down.

Through these two windows of history we see the extremes—lawless anarchy and blind obedience to an all powerful government. Both have been tried by mankind over and over and over again. The results of each are well known. The results of each are inevitable. The results of each are insecurity, anxiety, fear, the denial of opportunity and the destruction of ambition. Somewhere between the two lies the happy land of freedom of opportunity, of freedom from fear, and of the responsibility of the individual for his own welfare which must always accompany freedom if freedom is to live and grow.

Here in this country of ours, and especially in this State of ours, we have not reached that Promised Land, but we have been given glimpses of it. We know that it is real, and we are nearer to it than any other people on earth. We have been brought in sight of it by the wisdom of men, whom I believe to have been guided by God, in conceiving the idea of a government limited in its powers by a written Constitution, interpreted and applied by judges, administrators and legislators committed to a faith in such a government. We have been brought in sight of this Promised Land by the plodding footsteps of men and women, unknown to the historian, unacquainted with the niceties of constitutional law, but aware of the opportunities of freedom, conscious of their own responsibility for themselves and their families, and aware that they and their children could not prosper, materially or spiritually, if either their government controlled their lives or lawlessness roamed their streets. We stand upon the borders of this Promised Land. Some day History will write an appraisal of our America. Will it be like that of the early Israelites? Will History say of us also: "These people were brought to the borders of the Promised Land, but they were too stupid, too lazy, too fearful to go on and possess it, so they died in the wilderness?"

You members of the American Legion have demonstrated your faith in and your love for this country of ours in many ways. Some of you have heard the sound of enemy shells and bullets, some have flown in combat, some have sailed the cold, dark ocean wondering if you would see the sun rise again. You have seen your friends die. Some of you carry in your own bodies reminders of the battlefield. You know, far better than I, what your boys, and the sons of your neighbors, are experiencing at this hour in the hills and swamps of Vietnam while the Peaceniks parade and burn their draft cards, while the government in Washington holds back our field commanders lest they go all out and win a victory comparable to that of General Dayan in the Sinai Desert, while the federal courts, which we have seen move so quickly upon an appeal in order to destroy the constitutional powers of the states, dawdle and delay in the case of Cassius Clay. For what you have done in training camp and in battle I am garteful. I am also grateful for what you are doing in holding meetings like this, for all that you and the American fighting men before you have done for our country on the battlefield and on the seas and in the skies will be wasted if we lose our freedom here at home either to an increasingly powerful and arrogant federal government or to the rising tide of lawlessness and crime.

It is heartening to see occasions like this here in Harnett County, and in place after place elsewhere throughout our State, in which the people of the community gather to express appreciation to their police officers. In a few weeks I shall have lived 61 years in North Carolina and will finish my 39th year as a North Carolina lawyer, observing and participating in the work of our courts. In all of that time I cannot remember a single instance in which a police officer anywhere in this State was discourteous to me or mistreated me. I have had one or two stop me and tell me things that I was doing which I shouldn't do in my automobile, and I am a better driver today because they did, but never have I personally experienced any police brutality or police arrogance. When I was practicing law in the courts of this county and elsewhere and especially so since I have been a Justice of the Supreme Court, I have been impressed with the efficiency of our police officers and their basic fairness. Undoubtedly there are some officers who are both cruel and stupid. Unquestionably there are some who are subject to corruption, graft and improper influence. The ideal police officer does not exist in human form in North Carolina any more than does the ideal judge or the ideal preacher, but we can say proudly and truthfully that in North Carolina the law abiding citizen has no basis for fear of police brutality and we must be swift to denounce that slanderous charge by the agitators of criminal violence whenever it is raised as a smoke screen for their own unlawful conduct.

Fearless Fosdick is one of Al Capp's contributions to our Sunday morning pleasure because he is so far from being a true picture of our American policeman. But what if he were not? What if he were just a slight exaggeration? Then we should be living in a police state. I wonder if Fearless Fosdick would be as amusing to the people of Warsaw or Budapest or East Berlin as he is to the children of Dunn and Wake Forest. The people of those cities know what police brutality really means. You see they live in a country which has a government not limited by a constitution like ours. They can tell

you all about life in a Welfare State. They can tell you what it is like to live in a community where the police are supreme and the greatest crime is to advocate a change in the government. I am glad you police officers do not represent a government like that. You and we share the responsibility for seeing to it that you never do.

It must be galling to you to see a man you know to be guilty of a crime go free because his guilt could not be proved within the rules of evidence. It is to judges also—at least to those in this State. The rules of evidence are not Divinely inspired, but if police officers and judges throw them aside, we shall find that we have paid too big a price for the convictions of a handful of criminals, for those rules help to prevent a police state from being fastened upon our country. The acquittal of the innocent is as important in the building of a law abiding, peaceful and prosperous community as is the conviction of the criminal.

A few days ago there came to my desk a publication containing a letter from a Congressman from another state. He was advising his constituents not to travel with their families to Washington this summer because it is not a safe place for them to visit. Can you imagine that! The capital of our country so riddled by lawlessness and violent crime that a man cannot safely carry his children there to see the Washington Monument, the Capitol, the White House, the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution! Why?

You do not have to look far to find the answer. It lies on the doorstep of the Supreme Court of the United States, on the portico of the White House and all along that beautiful avenue which runs between them. Washington is an unsafe place for the American people to visit this summer because the police of Washington have been hamstrung by a series of Federal Administrations concerned more with political victory than with law and order in the capital city of America. It is time that we, the American people, bring home to all would be rulers of our country that political victory and law and order must go hand in hand, that we will not stand for the coddling of criminals for political expediency, and if they can't do something about it we can and we will on election day.

I hope there will never come a time when in the heart of the typical American there is not a feeling of pity and concern for the man or woman charged with crime, when we, individually and as a community, will not be determined that no innocent person be punished, that no guilty person be punished with undue severity, when we, individually and as a community, will not be ready to grant to the person who has offended and repented the mercy and the forgiveness which some day we shall seek for ourselves, but there is a difference between concern and indulgence, between mercy and mush, between justice and sentimentality.

All over America there is a rising wave of crime—all sorts of crime. While it rises and sweeps on, we are floundering in a swamp of mush about the guilt of society. There has never been anywhere on earth a society which offers more hope, opportunity and assistance to the oppressed and handicapped than America. Yet it is here in our country that we have the highest rate of major crime of any civilized country on earth.

To some extent that crime rate is attributable, it is true, to our traditional love of freedom from governmental control, which is our strength and which must not be allowed to be lost, but the recent rise in crime in America is not due to that. It is due to the coddling of criminals, the hamstringing of our police with textbook sociology, the constant drumfire from television and from pulpit that Society is responsble for the misdeeds of the dope-peddler, the kidnapper, the rapist, the arsonist and the gangster. That is utter nonsense and the sooner we start saying so the sooner we shall have our people back on the road to the Promised Land of freedom and of law and order.

We must recognize and act upon the truth that there are in this world of ours men who are cold-blooded, cruel and merciless beasts. To them the only thing of importance is the satisfaction of their desires. They did not get that way through mistreatment in the kindergarten. But if they did, what of it? That is the way they are and they must be dealt with on that basis. A rattlesnake just cannot help being venomous, but you cannot cure him of it by kindness. I do not pretend to know enough about the intricate workings of the human mind to know whether a man, who knows the difference between right and wrong, can by reason of a mental defect, have a truly irresistable urge to kidnap and torture a child to death just for the satisfaction of seeing the child suffer, but, assuming he does have that kind of mentality, should we not be more concerned with protecting the remaining children of our communities than with his comfort and welfare? Should we not so deal with him as to discourage others from pretending they have a like disease?

If our country is to go forward into the Promised Land which lies before us we must stop and then turn back this rising wave of crime. It is no light task, but one which will require much time and the efforts of us all. The government, the church, the school, the home all have important roles to play if we are to conquer this lawlessness and free our country from its power.

Of course, slum conditions and lack of economic opportunity provide a breeding place for crime and lawlessness. By no means are poverty and lack of hope for economic improvement the only source of crime. It is, however, a matter of plain common sense that we work hard to get rid of such conditions wherever they exist. It is equally important that, while we are so engaged we do not condone lawlessness in the slums on the ground that things are excusable there which cannot be tolerated elsewhere. Crime, like disease, does not stop at area boundary lines.

The real breeding place of crime, however, is not in the city slum or in rural poverty. Its real breeding place is in the human mind and the human heart. Here the school, the church, the home are our chief sources of strength and our chief and most costly failures. Increasingly, our schools are being beset with the evils we foresaw would result from the tragic blunder and disregard of law by the Supreme Court of the United States thirteen years ago. They are beset by troubles far more serious than mere inadequate salaries for teachers. One of our American shortcomings is the belief that an abundance of money will solve everything. It will not solve the problems of our schools. Our educational program in the elementary grades continues to be inadequate for the same reasons it was inadequate when I first talked to you about it seven years ago. Not only does it act as a drag on the efficiency of our schools for higher education, but the elementary school continues to be the only school ever attended by many who come from environments most likely to serve as breeding places of lawlessness. To train the mind of a child to think clearly and to know the truth and to appreciate the beautiful, is no guaranty that he or she will become a law-abiding citizen, but it greatly increases the probability, and that is a good enough reason to improve our elementary schools.

The condition facing our country calls upon the church to turn its attention once more from street demonstrations, economics and sociology to that breeding place of crime and lawlessness, the human heart, bearing in mind that our Lord, during His ministry on earth, was more concerned with the heart than with the stomach. Our country needs very badly slum clearance and full employment, but she needs far more the therapy which comes from an application of His Gospel to the hearts of men and women, the inspiration to goodness and clean living which comes to the mind filled with His practical rules of life, the hope which comes to one who knows the cleansing power of His love. Why should a church which has these things in its arsenal go forth to battle against crime armed only with the latest books on Sociology, Economics and Psychiatry?

We are properly concerned about the threat of the rising tide of crime to those we love in our homes. We think quite rightly about the danger of the burglar in the night for it is an increasing danger, but how much more terrible it is if Crime, itself, reaches into our home and takes one of our own. I had a long distance call the other night from the mother of a man in one of our prisons. She wanted me to tell her how to get a post-conviction hearing for her son. Of course, I told her that since I am on the Court I could not advise her about that. She would have to employ a lawyer. But as I hung up the phone I thought what a terrible thing it must be for a parent to have a child who is a criminal by choice. It is not necessarily the parent's fault, for we know that children frequently wander far from the path pointed out to them at home and in which their parents walk, but the writer of the Book of Proverbs was not indulging in idle talk when he said, "Train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old he will not depart from it." The changes in our home life and economic conditions resulting in so many mothers working away from home and leaving their little ones to a nursery or to their own devices after school have put a great strain upon the most important years of character building. When this is unavoidable, greater, not less effort is required to build into the child those principles of right and wrong which are the foundation of the law-abiding life, and which are built into the child by the happy combination of patience, love and discipline.

When all these forces are at work to clean up the breeding places of crime we shall still have with us the true, hardened criminal. We shall still have with us the crafty ones who incite their less intelligent associates to riot and disorder, to burning and pillaging and senseless destruction of a city. So we shall always need the strong hand of government—the police and the courts. As we who are charged, particularly, with this responsibility, move to meet it, let us remember that a government of free people depends for its strength upon their respect, and let us so conduct the arrest, investigation and trial procedures that we shall merit the respect we ask of our fellow citizens. The trial of a man or woman accused of a crime is a serious matter, not an entertainment, and should never be taken lightly. It should be conducted with dignity in order that the accused may be acquitted if innocent, convicted if guilty.

We desperately need in this country a simple, clear statement of policy from the government in Washington that it is the intent of our government to have in our national capital, and in every other city and town of our land, a community which is safe for law-abiding people to live in and to visit and move about in as they see fit. We need now a clear statement from Washington that to that end the federal government is going to provide the areas lawfully under its control with police protection and is going to leave the governments of the states and cities free to exercise the powers which the

Constitution of the United States guarantees they shall have.

The time has come to stop pussy-footing around the problem of crime and lawlessness. We need to have it made clear to all from one end of America to the other that this may or may not be a long, hot summer, but it is going to be a law-abiding one. We also need to make it clear to Washington that our determination to have our States and our cities law-abiding communities does not mean that we intend to sit quietly by, accepting everything which comes out of Washington, while a growing federal government encroaches more and more upon the powers of our State and upon our freedom as individuals. Obedience to law includes obedience by the federal government, including its courts, to the supreme law of our land—the Constitution of our country. The remedy for lawlessness by the government, itself, is in the ballot box.

Once more let me say to you police officers, "Thank you" and express again my appreciation to all of you who have made this occasion possible. In a few minutes I shall be on my way home, traveling many miles along dark and somewhat lonely roads without a gun and without a thought of danger except from a careless driver. That is a wonderful privilege which we have in this land of free, law-abiding North Carolinians. It is something worth keeping.

This evening I have had the great pleasure of renewing association with you friends who have built here in Harnett County a true Great Society, not a make believe one. You cannot have a true Great Society without great people. You cannot have great people without building into them a great faith. To that great faith in freedom within the law under the guidance of the Author of Liberty, which has given us this State we love, let us continue to commit our fortunes, our lives and our sacred honor.

A SPEECH BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE I. BEVERLY LAKE—MESSAGE FOR ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague and friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman HENDERSON, for making available to the Members of the Congress the speech of Associate Justice I. Beverly Lake of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

I trust it will be read and seriously considered by all Members of the Congress. In Justice Lake's speech there is a message for all American citizens who believe in justice with law and order.

POVERTY IN THE RURAL SOUTH: I—THE PROBLEM EXPOSED

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for vigorous application of the Office of Economic Opportunity rural poverty program has been underlined in a series of recent articles which I would like to call to my colleagues' attention.

They point out the human story behind the many discouraging and confusing statistics which we see daily. They explain what it means to say that as total number of white farm residents declines 4 percent, the number of Negro farm residents declines 10 percent. They show what happens to the people "lost" in the census, the 68,085 Negroes who disappeared from agricultural census of owners, part owners, and tenants between the years 1959 and 1964 in eight Southern States.

In general they show what happens to these "invisible men" who are too poor even to take advantage of the Federal farm programs or the various economic development and assistance efforts of the Federal Government. Hopefully, such articles mean that these people will no longer be invisible.

[From the Washington Post, July 9, 1967]

THE WASHINGTON POST EXPLORES HUNGER IN MISSISSIPPI—CHANCE DETERMINES DIET ON LADY BIRD AVENUE

(By William Chapman)

BELZONI, MISS., July 8.—Gussie Shaw and her fatherless brood of four had bologna sandwiches for breakfast—the squarest meal of the day.

The alternatives were rice or grits or beans or one of the five cans of meat that the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the State of Mississippi allot them each month.

There is never any milk or fresh meat or fruit. The drinking water comes from a community faucet that drips slowly by the side of an alley renamed, in a now-forgotten enthusiasm for beautification, "Lady Bird Avenue."

The absurd question is asked, and Gussie Shaw explodes:

"Of course the kids are hungry! Vernora, come here and show the man."

She lifts the blouse on the skinny 5-year-old girl and exposes, along with the frail chest, a stomach blotched with sores—"risings," Mrs. Shaw explains, "and the home remedy never did no good."

The Shaws of Lady Bird Avenue and their counterparts throughout rural Mississippi have become, to their surprise, symbols of a growing national concern—one that harks back to the shocked public discovery of American rural poverty during the early New Deal era.

Negroes in Mississippi are starving, a team of distinguished doctors declared recently—starving in the sense that acute malnutrition shortens their life span, dying young from an accumulation of hunger-induced diseases that go untreated for years.

The doctors, who will present their story to a Senate subcommittee Tuesday in Washington, found children suffering from parasitic diseases—trichinosis and hookworm; children with skin shrunk by malnutrition; children with ulcerating sores, boils, abscesses, rat bites; children who could not undergo even minor operations without first receiving blood transfusions.

The nonmedical observer touring Mississippi can find with ease what the doctors discovered.

In Belzoni, self-proclaimed "heart of the Delta," many Negro children get up hungry and go to bed hungry.

"They come in the morning and don't even stop at the classroom," observed Willie Mae Burns, director of a voluntary Head Start program for preschoolers.

"They just walk right to the kitchen and ask for something to eat. We give them some bread to hold them until they get the hot lunch."

Virtually all the children of Lady Bird Avenue are visibly underweight. Sores left from untreated infections spot their bodies. Most have runny noses, the observable signs of never-ending summer colds.

Raw sores cover the chin and mouth of Sharon Pearson, age 22 months. Her mother, Odessa, said that a doctor diagnosed the case two months ago as chicken pox and gave her a cheap salve that healed nothing.

"You don't go to the doctor unless it's life or death," said Bessie Thurman. "You do what you can at home. You fight the fever with everything you've got. I waited too late for one of mine. He died."

The staple diet on Lady Bird Avenue is determined by what the commodity food distribution center downtown is handing out.

Usually it is beans, rice, margarine, lard, meal, peanut butter, raisins, powdered milk, and one can of meat for each person in the family.

"I get it once a month and it lasts a week and a half," Mrs. Shaw said. The rest of the month she charges at a neighborhood grocery and tries to pay the bill when her $43 welfare check comes in.

"The commodities are just no good," interposed another Belzoni mother.

"They give you this rolled wheat and the kids won't eat it—all it does in my house is draw the roaches. You eat the commodities when there's nothing else, and sometimes not even then."

What the doctors found is nothing new for Mississippi, nor is it limited to this State. Poverty-induced hunger can be found throughout the rural South, in the dark corners of Appalachia and in Northern city slums.

It has been spotlighted in Mississippi because the physicians toured on behalf of a voluntary Head Start program, Friends of the Children of Mississippi, and as a result of a visiting Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.). Yesterday, Walter P. Reuther's Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty launched a survey to determine the extent of hunger and malnutrition in America.

Whether hunger is more widespread in Mississippi than in other Southern states is debatable. Welfare checks are smaller here; State appropriations are sufficient to pay only 27 per cent of what is considered the standard needs of people on welfare.

Furthermore, women with dependent children recently received notice that their checks will be smaller next time because the State's 2-year appropriation is running out.

Another factor is the uneven transition Mississippi is making from one type of Federal food aid to another. Most counties have had the commodity food distributions, free bags of foodstuffs that the Department of Agriculture wants to get rid of.

However, this year county after county has been switching to the food stamp program, which allows the poor to buy coupons worth more money for regular foods bought in commercial markets.

Midway in the transition it was discovered that many Negroes could not afford the minimum purchase requirement for food stamps. Their free commodity foods were taken away but nothing replaced them.

In Leflore County in the Delta, for example, more than 20,000 persons were picking up their bags of commodities when food stamps came in. But in the next two months, only 8300 had shifted to food stamps.

Nearly 12,000 persons so poor that they had needed free foods suddenly were getting nothing.

The Department of Agriculture, finally sensing the crisis, changed its Mississippi food stamp program this summer to lower

the prices. The Office of Economic Opportunity started a loan program in several counties to help the poorest poor borrow money to buy their first stamps.

But Mississippi is by no means at the bottom in Government food-aid programs. Every county in the State offers either commodity foods or food stamps. Many Southern counties offer neither.

About 35 per cent of Mississippi's poor receive one or the other—the highest rate in the Nation. By contrast, only 1.5 per cent of South Carolina's poor receive either.

While most Mississippi newspapers belittled the hunger reports, the State government, prodded and encouraged by Federal agencies, moved this summer to help some of the poorest. It is hiring dieticians, beginning to expand nutrition classes, and instructing county officials who have the real power over food programs to act reasonably in getting food to the poor.

Evelyn Gandy, director of welfare for the State, admits "there are problems" but denies that a new and alarming crisis has arisen.

The same assessment comes from Martin Fraley, director of Mississippi's OEO office and a long-time political friend of Gov. Paul B. Johnson.

"The State agencies are doing all they can," he says. "We are all working together."

A bleaker account comes from Marian Wright, Jackson Negro attorney for the NAACP's Legal Defense and Education Fund. She has made extensive investigations of welfare programs and the operations of commodity foods and food stamps.

Neither, she says, will ever provide a minimal healthy diet for people like the Shaws of Lady Bird Avenue.

"What Mississippi needs," she said, "is an emergency distribution of the kind of food other people eat. Mississippi is a disaster area and it ought to be declared one."

[From the New York Times]

THE NEW YORK TIMES FINDS POVERTY IS A WAY OF LIFE IN MISSISSIPPI—THE DELTA: POVERTY IS A WAY OF LIFE

(By Walter Rugaber)

GREENVILLE, MISS., July 27.—Government officials have quietly gathered new evidence of widespread unemployment and hunger among unskilled farm workers in the Delta region of Mississippi.

The picture that emerges is neither as bright as some Mississippians have implied nor as dark as the state's most outspoken critics have charged. But the information does suggest a serious economic dislocation among Negroes.

As examples, nearly 55,000 people are living on farms this year with practically no hope of employment there.

Sixty per cent of the poor families in two Delta counties get less than two-thirds of a recommended "minimum" diet.

And the state fails to take advantage of programs yielding at least $75-million a year in Federal welfare funds intended to help relieve the problem.

The national implications of rural poverty, which has caused thousands of Negroes to move into big-city ghettos over the last 20 years, have received renewed attention in recent months.

Furthermore, the growing problems of the agricultural South, as they were reflected in a series of interviews in the Delta, may send new waves of Negroes to the Northern slums.

Senators Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania and Robert F. Kennedy of New York, both Democrats toured the Delta in April. Mr. Clark is chairman and Mr. Kennedy a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty. The panel held hearings in Washington earlier this month and heard more testimony on conditions in Mississippi.

A team of physicians examined between 600 and 700 Negro children in the state last May and reported the discovery of substantial hunger and disease among them. One of the most pointed charges came from Dr. Raymond M. Wheeler of Charlotte, N.C.

Dr. Wheeler said what he had seen made him more and more inclined to believe reports that "those who control the state" hope to eliminate Negroes by driving them out of the area or starving them to death.

However, one of Dr. Wheeler's colleagues disagreed. Dr. Cyril Walwyn, a Negro member of the team who regularly practices in the Delta, said in a recent interview that he could find no evidence of a conscious conspiracy to force Negroes out.

"They [the whites] don't need them [the Negroes] any more and it is no matter to them if they leave," Dr. Walwyn said. "But I don't think they've taken any active measures to drive them away."

Most observers believe that poverty in the Delta—and in other areas of the South as well—cannot be easily attributed to any single factor. This is an innocent-looking land, but it is far too complex for that.

The Delta is a flat alluvial plain, 200 miles long and about 65 miles wide, created during countless floods by the two major river systems that nearly surround it: the Lower Mississippi and the Coldwater-Tallahatchie-Yazoo.

The rivers embrace six million acres of the richest land in America. Large but generally unpretentious plantations still dominate the region, and cotton, as William Faulkner once observed, "grows man-tall in the very cracks of the sidewalk."

NOTHING NEW IN HUNGER

But Negroes encountered hunger and hardship in the Delta a long time ago. Frank E. Smith, a former Congressman from the area, who is now a director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has written that pellagra, a chronic skin disease, and other ills resulting from dietary deficiencies were commonplace "in the floodtime of the old plantation system."

W. C. Handy, an obscure musician in the Delta, heard Negroes picking out songs about their existence more than 60 years ago. He took the music to Memphis, and some of the first blue notes on Beale Street carried these lines:

"Money don't zactly grow
on trees—
On cotton stalks it grows
with ease . . ."

In 1933, a group of Delta farmers watched in amazement as a strange new device picked as much cotton in an hour as a man could pick in a week. It was the first successful demonstration of an early cotton-picking machine.

The threat was immediately apparent to some. A fearful newspaper editor suggested dumping the contraption in a nearby creek, and a civic group warned of "the heavy menace hanging over the Negroes of the South."

Still, the change at first seemed gentle. In 1953, Mississippi farmers planted 2,554,000 acres of cotton and only 14 per cent of the Delta's crop was picked by machine. But in 10 years the revolution was in full stride.

Last year, the Government cut the state's cotton allotment by 30 per cent, and only 1,032,000 acres were planted. Moreover, the peak work season dropped to less than 50 days from more than 120 days in the 1950's.

EFFECTS OF MECHANIZATION

Mechanization last year cut the required man-hours per acre to fewer than 35, far below the 165 once needed by men and mules. More than 90 per cent of the crop was picked by machine, and chemical fertilizers made hand weeding obsolete.

Between 1960 and 1965, more than 60,000 Negroes between the ages of 15 and 44 left the state. The change was already susbtantial, but the Federal Government added another factor that made this the year of a final shakeout.

Under the new minimum wage law, which took effect last Feb. 1, a farmer who had hired more than 500 man-days of labor during any calendar quarter of 1966 must pay his workers $1 an hour. The average rate last year was $3 a day.

The demand for seasonal labor promptly collapsed. A Negro woman still living on a farm in Bolivar County glanced at the fields surrounding her home and said: "They'll burn this cotton down before they'll pay that dollar-an-hour."

James Thompson, a 45-year-old farm worker from Bolivar County, said he had obtained nothing but an occasional odd-job so far this year. At one time he had two children in a Head Start program, but the youngest, a son, was withdrawn. "The boy done wore out his shoes," Mr. Thompson explained.

The child played barefoot in the dirt nearby. "I wouldn't want him to go without shoes," Mr. Thompson said. "It don't look proper. You wouldn't want your children to go up there without shoes."

THOUSANDS CAUGHT IN CRASH

Despite the earlier upheavals, thousands have—been caught in the current crash. They had lingered on the farms for many reasons—loyalty to paternal white employers, the hope that some other kind of work might turn up, the simple human reluctance to find a new home.

The Mississippi Employment Security Commission and the Delta Council, a regional organization of planners, found after an intensive survey of the area's farms this year that 54,830 people had been "affected" by the cutback in employment.

The figures include 24,658 persons of "work age," between 16 and 64. Of the remaining 30,172, 5,416 were over 65 and 24,756 were youngsters under 16.

The problem is especially acute in some areas. In Bolivar County, for example, this year's farm unemployment involved 25 per cent of the estimated Negro population in 1965. In Sharkey County it involves 32 per cent of the Negroes.

The employment service reported that about one-third of the jobless were between the ages of 46 and 64. In addition to the higher age level, it said, the group generally has no more than simple farm experience and limited education.

NO EASY SOLUTION SEEN

These characteristics, the report concluded, "pose a serious employment problem for which there is no easy solution."

Women make up more than half the group, which is also true of the other categories.

Negroes now comprise about 62 per cent of the Delta's population, but many whites believe that continued migration will drive the Negro proportion to 40 per cent or less in the next 15 or 20 years.

In 1950, the employment service and the Delta Council began sending Negro farm workers into other states for off-season agricultural jobs. About 7,000 people were dispatched last year, but officials said most of them had returned to Mississippi.

The virtual obliteration of unskilled labor has left some Negroes in an improved position. Plantation owners must now maintain a force of semi-skilled employes to drive the tractors and operate the machines.

There are perhaps 27,000 working at these jobs. The farmers, who need steady men for this work, appear to be willing in many cases to pay the minimum wage and to provide work all year long. Some progressive employers have done even more.

As many as 25 families once worked on the land now owned by Monty Payne, a farmer in Washington County. There were six last year, but now Mr. Payne has three.

For these full-time workers he has built two new homes and plans to construct a third soon.

HOUSES DESCRIBED

Each of the houses, Mr. Payne said, are three-bedroom brick structures with tile floors, central heating, insulation, washing machines, built-in kitchen cabinets and carports. He said there was no rent for families earning less than $3,000 a year.

Mr. Payne is unusual. In fact, informed observers say that many planters have raised rents even on their older houses to help offset the pay increases for semi-skilled workers required by the new minimum wage regulations.

In addition to the agricultural jobs that remain, the Delta Council hopes that industrial expansion will help take up some of the slack in employment. The organization said factories had provided more than 21,000 new jobs over the last 10 years.

A Negro factory worker in Rolling Fork, who asked not to be named, earns $1.40 an hour after 12 years at the Delta Implement Company there. But he is relatively affluent: his home boasts an air conditioner, a television set, and a telephone.

But even the whole decade's increase in industrial employment would be insufficient to absorb this year's dislocation on the land, and for thousands of Negroes public welfare has become an immensely important question.

Officials at the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare recently conducted a confidential study on the amount of Federal welfare funds that would be available to Mississippi in standard circumstances.

COULD OBTAIN EXTRA AID

Informed sources said the study showed that the state, by raising an extra $15 million in matching funds and by meeting other requirements, could obtain at least $75 million in additional Federal welfare aid.

This is an enormous sum by Mississippi standards. The sources said the state received about $100 million in welfare money from Washington. The figures do not include poverty program funds.

The study included a series of complicated estimates for Federal programs, such as medical aid to the indigent, which Mississippi does not have at all. Precise statistics in such instances are not available.

Mississippi currently devotes about 8 per cent of its budget to welfare, but there have been widespread charges that the programs are arbitrarily administered and heavily tinged with racial discrimination.

Miss Marian Wright, Jackson attorney for the N.A.A.C.P. Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., believes that the Federal Government could produce "many, many easy solutions to the kinds of problems we're bogged down in now."

"The Federal agencies are just in the habit of working through state agencies and going along with the traditional programs," Miss Wright said. "They have given very little imaginative thought to these problems."

A Washington source who is outside the Government agrees. For one thing, he said, extra Federal money can be obtained by the state with "demonstration program" funds, provided by Washington without strings.

But, he noted, last year's appropriation was only $2 million for the entire nation.

Another possibility, he said, is to permit the payment of matching funds in kind. In effect, he explained, this is a bookkeeping procedure such as the one used by the poverty program to permit poor people to donate work to a government.

Other observers cited additional oversights. A state official noted that although agricultural mechanization has been easily discernible for 20 years, no provision has been made to help the people hurt by it.

"The agricultural establishment has done a good job of raising productivity," the official said, "but it hasn't done anything to prepare for the displacement. I guess what the workers needed was a John L. Lewis."

Many of the Negroes themselves are unprepared to take full advantage of the aid that is available. They are poorly educated at home as well as at school and, one Negro said, "they need someone to lead them to the water so they can drink."

Unemployment and welfare problems show up at meal time. Last May, the Department of Agriculture made an intensive survey among 509 representative poor families in two Delta counties, Washington and Sunflower. Both are relatively wealthy.

SIXTY PERCENT BELOW MINIMUM DIET

Preliminary results of the study indicate that 60 per cent of the families received less than two-thirds of the "minimum" dietary allowances recommended by the National Research Council. Nationally, only 13 per cent are as poorly nourished.

The diets of those involved in the study were especially short of fresh fruits, vegetables, and milk, a nutritional expert reported. But there were fewer shortages of proteins, fats, and sweets.

The department found that the value of all food consumed by the average individual was only $4 a week, or about 57 cents a day. This included any free food aid distributed by the Federal Government.

The physicians who toured Mississippi in May reported extensively on the secondary effects of hunger. But James H. Christenberry, the prosecuting attorney for Sharkey County, said he did not need a doctor's appraisal.

"You sit right here in this doorway," said Mr. Christenberry, whose office faces the courthouse, "and watch people go by and look at their legs. The Negroes' legs are little bitty things."

"See that girl there" he asked, pointing out a Negro teen-ager with spindly legs. "That's what I'm talking about. Now I don't know whether that's slow starvation or not, but the whites' legs are sure bigger."

OTHER DIFFERENCES

There are other differences, too. In 1965, the last year for which figures are available, nearly 40 per cent of the Negro children born in Mississippi were delivered by midwives. Only two-tenths of 1 per cent of the white children were thus delivered.

The state's infant mortality rate is the highest in the nation. Beginning in 1941, the number of Negro children who died before reaching their first birthday declined dramatically. But in 1946 the rate reversed and began climbing almost as sharply.

It moved from 40.8 deaths per 1,000 live births in 1946 to 42.6 in 1950, 46.4 in 1955, 54.4 in 1960, and 55.1 in 1965—higher than the rate in 1942. The number has declined steadily for whites and is now less than half that for Negroes.

The death rate among white babies declines with age, but among Negroes, it increases. Between the ages of 28 days and one year, Negro children die in Mississippi at a rate five times greater than that for whites.

Negroes in Mississippi generally die younger than whites. Less than 48 per cent of the Negroes who died in 1965 had reached age 65. The median age at death was 63.5 for Negroes and 70.4 for whites.

Negroes frequently live in dilapidated houses. Current statistics are unavailable, but the Delta Council is asking farmers to tear down abandoned shacks, some occupied only recently, on the ground that they are eyesores.

MORE THAN EYESORES

Negroes still living in the same type of structures consider them somewhat more than eyesores. A visitor stopping at random often finds gloomy interiors, empty windows, leaking roofs, and substantial cracks in the walls and floors.

"I wouldn't stay here another winter for anything in the world," said a Negro in Bolivar County whose windows have no glass. "I promised the good Lord that if He'd keep me alive another year I'd get my family somewhere else."

Mrs. Mary Dixon Kennedy, whose 18-year-old daughter is recovering from acute pneumonia and tuberculosis, is without running water. She must carry whatever water she needs a substantial distance. A bath, she said, requires two trips.

Mrs. Edna Earl, 27, expects her ninth child in August. Her husband, a tractor driver, was shot and killed last month while trying to stop a brawl at a rustic hangout that Mrs. Earl described as a "country juke."

She and the eight children sleep on three beds and a cot. When it rains, she said, the water runs onto one of the beds. There is a hydrant outside and a privy in the back. The rent is $10 a month.

Mrs. Earl said her family lived mainly on surplus food distributed by the Government but that she was able to charge some items at a nearby grocery. Her credit is good because she expects to begin receiving $80 a month in welfare payments soon.

"I'm just not going to be able to get to a hospital to have the baby," she said in a high-pitched voice. "I guess I'll have to get me a granny lady (midwife). Then, with an embarrassed laugh, she added:

"I don't have a penny to my name right now."

POVERTY IN THE RURAL SOUTH—II: KOTZ OF THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE GRAPHICALLY DESCRIBES THE PROBLEM AND ONE TENTATIVE ATTEMPT AT SOLUTION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, rarely has the tragedy of a whole community of the desperately poor been translated from a statistical to a human account with as much success as in a striking series of articles by Mr. Nick Kotz of the Minneapolis Tribune. Both Mr. Kotz and the Cowles Publications are to be commended for it.

I think one can see here the immediacy of the problems of poverty in many parts of the rural South—health, education, unemployment, hunger, inadequate housing, utter anonymity of the poor in our society, and the creeping disintegration of individual hopes and community action which these conditions promote. But one can also see reason for hope. Vigorous application of Office of Economic Opportunity rural poverty programs shows that we can start to attack these problems with some success. So far we have, unfortunately, only acted on a small scale with demonstration projects. Mr. Kotz tells us the story of one such project which started in July 1966.

Two programs were announced by OEO in July 1966 to provide basic education and limited vocational training

for migrant and seasonal workers in Lowndes and Wilcox Counties, Ala., and in Coahoma County, Miss. In Lowndes and Wilcox Counties, 24,436 out of 27,-037 Negroes earn less than $3,000 per year. In Coahoma County, in the delta area of Mississippi, the site of the other project, thousands live in primitive wooden shacks Others, having been forced off plantations, unemployed, and with little hope of finding a job, search for housing where there is none. These are the "invisible" poor, many not even on the census rolls and, therefore, not even counted as members of our society, and most below the educational or financial status to be reached by Federal or State aid. Ordinarily, they would go on to live out 20 years, or maybe 40 years, as transients. Their families might disintegrate. They would have no community to which to go for aid, or hope. Their invisible lives would slide into invisible deaths.

Mr. Kotz tells the important story of the hundreds of Negro Americans who are learning to read and write, to build their own houses, to set up cooperative programs to fulfill their economic needs, to do all these things as a community. Most important of all they are learning to hope. "These rural Negro poor," related Mr. Kotz, adding significantly, I think, "they also show the determination to make something of this chance."

In Hayneville, 30 to 70 workers are, for the first time, learning to read and to write. "Things are finally happening in Wilcox County," one Negro minister puts it. In Coahoma County, Mr. Kotz found the OEO officials and the 277 enrollees enthusiastic about the new self-help housing program. People now paying up to $40 a month for shacks unfit for habitation are given an opportunity to learn, to get jobs, and to own decent homes. And in Clarksdale, Miss., the Coahoma County seat, the author found OEO officials were "knifing through red-tape and bypassing State and local government resistance, and working with willing local leaders to improve the education and raise the hopes of thousands of rural Negroes."

These programs, of course, met with much resistance, as have other OEO projects in the South. The Alabama project was vetoed by Gov. Lurleen Wallace, but Sargent Shriver, Director of the OEO, overrode the veto.

While these programs offer hope, we all know that hope is not enough. Job discrimination is a reality and jobs are scarce enough for everyone in the South today. Many hopeful graduates of job training programs drop by the wayside. Aaron Henry, president of the Mississippi State NAACP, and a druggist in Coahoma County, calls this problem the "casualty rate," among those who have gained new hope, but are faced with the same old lack of opportunity.

The problems of the rural South are brought forth accurately but forcefully in the Kotz series. The tragedy of the poor there needs no rhetoric to magnify its existence. At the same time, the situation described calls out for increased community action by showing that it can succeed. The publisher, editor, and the author of this fine series of articles are to be congratulated. I would like to include it in the RECORD:

IN THE DEEP SOUTH, THE ENEMY IS POVERTY

"YOU'VE GOT A DREAM"—"AND YOU'VE GOT A NIGHTMARE, BABY!"

(By Nick Kotz)

HAYNEVILLE, ALA.—Former Gov. George Wallace temporarily blocked the first rural poverty program here by charging it would be run by black-power racists. White extremists slowed the program by burning its headquarters and intimidating white supporters.

Yet several hundred adult Negroes have started learning to write, read—and hope.

This is Lowndes County, the original base of Stokely Carmichael and the Freedom party, better known by its voting ballot symbol—the black panther.

Lowndes and neighboring Wilcox County are also home for 34,156 people, including 27,037 Negroes. The people are desperately poor, with 24,436 Negroes and 2,411 whites from families earning less than $3,000 per year.

Yet statistics alone alone cannot tell the story of the thousands of illiterate, underfed Negroes living in the flimsiest wooden shacks—and working irregularly, if at all, as farm hands at $4 a day.

Nor can abstract white fears of "black power" explain adequately:

How these programs became all-Negro;

How the local power structure fought tooth and nail to stop the programs, and

How these programs—insufficient as they are—got started only because a few Negro leaders and federal officials resisted terror and enormous political pressure.

In July 1966, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) announced two programs to provide basic education and limited vocational training for migrant and seasonal workers in Lowndes and Wilcox.

The programs—they would involve $302,000 in Wilcox and $241,000 in Lowndes—applied if the household head earned less than $1,000 annually and had less than a sixth-grade education. The 550 families involved would receive stipends of about $30 a week during the 36-week course.

Several thousand persons clamored eagerly to join, and several hundred of these are taking the courses without pay.

Black Panthers Wallace cries

After the initial OEO announcement, Wallace loudly and dramatically protested that the Lowndes program was dominated by Black Panther politicians and that the board chairman was a convicted murderer.

He complained that the Wilcox leadership came from the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

OEO suspended the grants. It conducted an investigation in which it found Wallace's charges without base. It reinstated the programs after the November election—in which the Wallace family triumphed and the Black Panther party fizzled.

Wallace, joined by the state's congressional delegation, then complained that the governing boards were all-Negro instead of being integrated.

(Gov. Lurleen Wallace and most of the Alabama congressional delegation last week claimed black-power domination in protesting a new $390,000 OEO grant to help the farmers in Lowndes, Wilcox and eight neighboring counties improve their farm income through use of a cooperative. Again, OEO said the Wallace charges are without foundation.)

What about Wallace's charges? And what about the facts of life here in the Black Belt?

Robert Strickland, the Lowndes poverty board president, did—in fact—serve five years in prison for murdering a white man. But he also received a full pardon—after his lawyer finally convinced state officials that he was provoked by the murdered man and two companions, who had hounded and threatened him for weeks.

Strickland and John Hulett, another board member, were—in fact—actively involved in Black Panther politics. They rose as tough, natural leaders from a down-trodden Negro majority that had got nothing from local white officials.

But Strickland resigned from the party when he was appointed chairman, and young Hulett now is learning how to administer rural poverty programs in a federally supported school at the University of Wisconsin.

A most parliamentary panther

These former Black Panthers appeared neither racist nor dangerous as they conducted a poverty board meeting recently in a house trailer in a middle-class white neighborhood.

Strickland, a bricklayer, presided over the meeting with elaborate dignity and attention to Robert's Rules of Order.

The meeting's agenda:

Hiring a doctor to give medical exams;

Arranging for the summer visit of an integrated group of VISTA volunteers;

Urging program employees to keep better records and hold down nonessential expenses.

Hulett, on a practical-training trip from his Wisconsin school, offered suggestions about improving training programs, bookkeeping and leadership.

Why did whites, with two exceptions, refuse to serve on the Lowndes board, and why did white appointees to the Wilcox board suddenly decide they had made no commitment to serve?

The first program headquarters was an abandoned church at the present site of the house trailer. The church was burned to the ground after the group met there.

The organization met the next day at another church. It also was burned.

Several days later a white church burned.

The first church was owned by a white cafe owner who was warned about what would happen if he rented to the poverty group. The lease had been arranged by a county probate judge who soon found his cattle poisoned. In the white church congregation was a doctor who had been bold enough to suggest that a federal health program should be initiated for the poor.

There are a few whites who have not been afraid to help, particularly the Rev. Francis Walters, a softspoken, steel-willed Southerner who is on four poverty boards in the area.

"Francis integrates all our boards," said one Negro admirer of the young minister, who serves as director of the Selma interreligious project.

These embryonic poverty programs in action show the sorry state of the rural Negro poor. They also show their determination to make something of this chance.

"Some of our pupils have even learned to count a little," Strickland commented wryly. "Some have started figuring their debts to the landowners—and discovered they didn't really have any."

What about a vacation in Finland?

Down the road from Hayneville, there's a Wilcox County training center. It's in a ramshackle house in the Negro section of Camden.

The two young Negro teachers are late, but the 20 pupils—weather-beaten farm hands aged 30 to 70—have started the class without them. You can hear them pray and then sing, off key, "We Shall Overcome."

The crowded room has crudely hung wallpaper. A bright yellow poster advertises vacations in Finland.

The reading lesson, like most, involves Negro history and is designed not only to improve reading skills but also to stimulate interest. Its aim is to build pride, to whet the

students' appetites to learn—about themselves, about civics, about the vast world outside the Black Belt.

Today's lesson is the story of how Toussaint l'Ouverture freed Haitian Negroes from French rule and set up an independent republic.

The text is accurate, but it would make a Southern segregationist squirm.

Some of the pupils read haltingly, others with obviously little comprehension, and a few with considerable fluency. The teachers help them along line by line and then ask each student to summarize the story.

"The planters thought those slaves were just having a big time, but they was planning a revolution."

"The planters made a lot of money on those crops. Those slaves came from Africa. The cry of those poor people was liberty, equality and brotherhood."

Earlier in the day, there was another class, conducted for mothers and young children. In one room, the mothers learned reading, writing, home economics, and child rearing. In the other, the children played with watercolors and blocks.

In the evening, several hundred teenagers meet at the program centers to discuss their problems, their schooling and their aspirations for the future.

That future is uncertain. The power structure still rigidly rejects all change. Local government will not request programs for housing or vocational education. Farm jobs are disappearing in the wake of machinery, weed-control chemicals and the $1-an-hour minimum wage.

But there is potential for industry in a new dam and new paper mill—and therefore for jobs, if Negroes can get trained for them—and hired. And there is the ultimate potential of the Negro vote.

The poverty program students have registered to vote.

As one Negro minister puts it: "Things are finally happening in Wilcox County."

PRIMITIVE SHACKS ABOUND AMONG THE MANSIONS

LEXINGTON, MISS.—"Relocation is a dirty word to Negroes here in the Delta," said Joseph Wheatley, education director of a Coahoma County poverty program. "The white politicians think it is the social remedy," he said. "Our people want to build decent homes and stay here."

"The jack rabbits have stopped running," said Robert Strickland, president of the poverty board in Lowndes County, Ala. It was his way of saying that frightened Negroes have left, that those remaining intend to stay put and fight for a better life.

Poor Negroes in the Deep South have so far been thwarted in their desire for better housing.

As one travels across the Black Belt of Alabama and the Delta of Mississippi, the housing picture unfolds dramatically:

Thousands of Negroes (and some whites) live in primitive wooden shacks;

A number of middle-class white families live in neat white bungalows;

A few wealthy white landowners and businessmen live in neo-colonial mansions that match the most glamorized versions of life in the Old South.

The Negroes have additional problems. Many thousands are being forced off plantations where they are no longer needed. Hundreds remaining on plantations have discovered that their tenancy rights are endangered if they register to vote, support civil rights activities or express dissatisfaction with 50-cents-an-hour wages.

The basic housing problem is how to finance even the most modest dwellings for Negroes who have little if any income.

The Agriculture Department briefly operated a small grant program. It helped several thousand families. But congressional appropriations subcommittees, dominated by Southern segregationists, have adamantly refused to fund this program for several years.

Is self-help romantic?

Now, the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) is attempting to get the rural poor into brick houses under a self-help concept. Poverty workers would provide building supervision while enrollees in training courses would work together to build their new homes.

OEO officials are fighting desperately for this plan as the only one that, at the moment, is feasible. Agriculture Department officials brand the plan romantic and have fought against making necessary loans because they regard the concept as financially unsound.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Robert C. Weaver told a presidential commission that the self-help idea was impractical. Weaver quickly added that his department doesn't have any programs to help the rural poor into housing.

Impractical and romantic or not, several hundred Negro farm hands are eagerly constructing a model home at the OEO migrant training school on the Saints College campus in Lexington.

The Lexington plan is simple enough in theory. The trainees use a mold to make special interlocking, air-dried bricks that fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. OEO officials say the homes can be built for $2,500—if the Negroes make their own bricks and perform the labor.

Warren Booker, vocational teacher at the project said:

"We have about 15 who would start building tomorrow if they could get their hands on the brick molds.

"One fellow is so excited he has already started collecting sand from a creek to make the bricks. All he needs is the cement and brick molds and he's ready to go."

If the project fails, many will be sadly disappointed, said the Rev. R. M. Stevens, assistant director of the training program.

"These men had chopped a little cotton and loafed the rest of the year. Now they are learning they have abilities and skills they never dreamed of," Mr. Stevens said. "They are having the thrill of putting up a floodlight, of holding a skil saw for the first time, of wearing a white carpenter's uniform instead of blue overalls."

The 277 enrollees receive $30 a week during the 36-week program. They spend two-thirds of their time in basic education courses, the rest in vocational training.

Tom Karter, national director of the OEO migrant division, says the plan will work if the Farmers Home Administration will grant the trainees $2,500 loans, repayable at $20 or $25 a month.

Karter and his projects officer, Kenneth Vallis, have journeyed to the South almost weekly in an effort to make their training and self-help housing programs work. They are advising local program directors in Lexington, in Wilcox County, Ala., and elsewhere to have their trainees apply for the loans.

Agriculture or social service?

As matters now stand, OEO is supplying training funds for a self-help housing program the Farmers Home Administration will not approve.

"The Agriculture Department simply is not a social service agency," commented Joseph Doherty, the administration's special assistant for economic opportunity programs established under the antipoverty law.

"Thirty-six weeks of guaranteed income is just not enough to justify a loan," Doherty said of the OEO plan. "At the end of the 36 weeks, they might not get jobs. If they do, they generally will be located somewhere else. Loans must be repaid. These are a lot of romantic notions—making your own bricks."

Doherty said his office might approve loans if OEO or another agency established a program entirely devoted to building the homes and welfare agencies guaranteed that the home buyer could use welfare funds to make repayment.

Doherty's suggestion would eliminate any possibility of homes for several hundred able-bodied male family heads now in the training program, since they are not eligible for welfare payments in either Mississippi or Alabama.

"These people are now paying $10 to $40 per month rent for shacks unfit for human habitation," said Karter. "Now they finally have the opportunity to learn, to get the opportunity to learn, to get jobs, and to own decent homes. The government should give them that chance."

Aside from federal financing problems, poverty program officials here say that the white resistance to the possibility of Negroes' building permanent, brick homes is increasing.

These whites fear that Negroes—who make up two-thirds of the Delta population and are registering to vote—now may remain permanently and keep voting.

Sue Geiger, a poverty worker at Freedom City located outside Greenville, criticized a plan to move 300 Negro families to the predominantly white Gulf Coast area.

"We see this as a plan to move Negroes to an area where they will have no political power," she said.

"This is their home. We say they have a right to jobs and homes here."

AFTER A MAN LEARNS, WHAT HAPPENS TO HIM?

CLARKSDALE, MISS.—It was an unusual graduation ceremony. The 450 graduates ranged in age from 25 to 65. Almost all were poor Negroes from the cotton fields of the Mississippi Delta.

An overflow audience in the city auditorium listened intently as the graduates delivered short speeches about what school meant to them:

"Many of us couldn't read or write when we entered the program. Now we don't have to make an X to sign our names."

"I used to go to the back room when the children had company. Now I stay and take part in the conversation."

"Forty-eight of 52 in our group have registered to vote. Our ideas about citizenship have improved."

The proud graduates had raised their average educational level by 3½ grades during the 36-week basic education course financed by an Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) program for migrant and seasonal farm workers.

Board members of Coahoma Opportunities, Inc., the sponsoring community action agency, listened proudly—and momentarily forgot their deep worries.

But the next morning the board met federal and state officials and once again banged head-on into the realities of poverty programs in the Deep South.

The big question: What next?

OEO's Migrant Division—knifing through red tape and bypassing state and local government resistance—has worked with willing local leaders to improve the education and raise the hopes of thousands of rural Negroes.

Most need further vocational training before they can qualify for even semiskilled jobs. Job discrimination is still a reality and jobs in the rural South are scarce enough for anyone.

Federally sponsored but state-operated vocational training programs are accepting few of them. Low-cost homes are not available for Negroes who now believe life owes them something better than a plantation shack.

The Coahoma board meeting was typical—federal and local poverty program officials allied on one side, federal and state labor department representatives on the other.

Dr. Aaron Henry, a Negro Coahoma board member and Mississippi president of the Na-

tional Association for the Advancement of Colored People, got to the point quickly. Directing his comments to a U.S. Labor Department official, Henry asked:

"What are you going to do about the guy who is dumb and the guy who needs more education? I'm concerned about the casualty rate."

Andrew Carr, white board member and plantation owner, chimed in: "OEO has done its job. What's the Labor Department going to do?"

Specifically, the board wanted the Labor Department to offer a year of basic education in its manpower training program, so that more graduates of the OEO migrant school might qualify for vocational training.

Dreams and open doors

After Henry made an impassioned appeal for federal aid in bringing jobs to Clarksdale, Carr smiled and said: "You've got a dream, too." He referred to the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King's famous speech in which he chanted repeatedly: "I have a dream."

Henry smiled back: "And you've got a nightmare, baby."

Bennie Gooden, assistant director of the poverty program, analyzed Carr's contribution:

"He opened doors of the power structure. We couldn't get the Board of Supervisors or any local officials to meet with us.

"He's rich enough, and influential enough, and brave enough not to have to give in to the pressure."

It was pressure against the program that brought Carr into it.

"I didn't even know what community action was until 1965, when Henry asked me to serve on a Head Start board to help little children," he related. "Then, the 14 white segregationists on the board resigned, and he asked me whether I could get 11 white members in four days."

Carr said he thought the job an easy one until he was turned down by one friend after another. When a prominent minister refused to serve, Carr's deep commitment began.

"If you as a minister won't serve," Carr told him, "that gives me all the more inspiration to make this program work."

Carr finally rounded up 10 new white board members by the deadline the project faced to get federal funding.

Carr does not speak like a zealot and he discourages any notion that he is one.

"I've always believed personally in equal rights, but I probably wouldn't be interested if there weren't such gross injustice against Negroes," he said.

Adding another motive, he said: "I've got five children. I want peace here."

He said his family has not suffered repercussions from his poverty work.

"As a matter of fact," he said, "our 10-year-old daughter worked last summer as a volunteer in the Head Start program.

"We haven't been harmed because 95 per cent of our people here are sheep, 4 per cent are bigots and 1 per cent are with us. The bigots are cowards, like most gangsters."

"Literacy is your job," replied a state labor official, H. A. (Sawdust) Sanders, a heavy-set former football star who is typical of Mississippi officials who are finally but slowly accepting change.

"Congress says it's your job, too," shot back Tom Karter, national director of OEO's Migrant Division. "Your job doesn't just consist of teaching a man to turn a bolt one way. We're dealing with the hard-core unemployed."

Carr and Henry said 150 of the previous night's graduates could meet present education requirements for manpower training, and asked: "How many will you take?"

Sanders replied skeptically: "I've seen them. I'll wait for their applications with a great deal of interest. I'm here to serve, but I'm here on a businesslike basis."

The Carrs, Henrys and Karters don't believe that any neat businesslike solutions exist for the multiple problems that have grown out of 300 years of slavery and stark poverty.

James Townsend, the U.S. Labor Department representative, stated repeatedly that he could make no commitments.

The meeting ended inconclusively, as have countless similar discussions held in Washington and in the Deep South.

Fallen crowd the wayside

Wherever one looks at rural poverty programs in Alabama and Mississippi, the problems and complaints are the same: OEO programs provide a start, but programs of the labor, agriculture and education departments move slowly, if at all, through rigid federal-state-local channels—channels dominated in the South by the established white power structure.

Scores of available federal programs administered by the Departments of Labor, Agriculture and Health, Education and Welfare have never been approved by Southern state and local officials for the rural Negro poor.

In Clarksdale, Lexington and Greenville, Miss., poverty directors express concern about what Aaron Henry calls the casualty rate:

At a converted bowling alley in Clarksdale, a Negro instructor teaches 20 OEO trainees how to operate woodworking machines but asks: "Where are we going to get them jobs?"

At Lexington, Robert Clark, director of the OEO basic education program, comments: "Seventy-seven of our last 300 graduates got jobs. Only 13 were accepted into manpower training programs. I guess the rest will try farming and finding whatever odd jobs they can."

Also at Lexington, 10 Negro women, attractive in starched blue-and-white uniforms, busily study the duties of a nurse's aide, but their teacher says: "Only one is assured of a job."

At a poverty meeting in Greenville, board secretary Thelma Barnes asks indignantly: "Just what are these people supposed to do after they become auto mechanics?"

At Freedom City—home of displaced Negro farm workers outside Greenville—Walter Abney, neatly attired .n his first suit, struts proudly about, smiling and shaking hands with everyone in sight.

Abney, who is enrolled in a 12-week church-operated and state-approved literacy program, tells how he earned $2.50 a day chopping cotton—until the plantation owner booted him out for asking for food during the workless and payless winter.

"I couldn't read or write my own name when I started school," says Abney. "I want to be a carpenter. They talk like there's going to be jobs for us."

A local poverty worker expresses doubt whether Abney will make it and notes acidly: "Walter is one of those instant new men they're turning out in a 12-week course that is much too short to accomplish much."

What are the answers?

One obvious need expressed everywhere is for longer, more comprehensive federal programs in which the various departments pool their programs and funds.

Relocation is no answer. No one thinks semiliterate rural Negroes can improve themselves in already overcrowded northern city slums.

Ship men out or bring work in?

The Rev. R. M. Stevens, Negro assistant director of the Lexington literacy program, commented on two other suggested solutions:

"The power structure's idea is to ship 5,000 Negroes out of the Delta and cut down that 2–1 Negro population ratio. Our idea is to bring in more industry and have the federal government supply public works jobs."

Then Stevens turned to lesser objectives, also unfulfilled:

"Right now, we're reduced to such ideas as forming co-ops to rework used furniture and sell it in Jackson. That might not work either. But at the least, the upholstery class students are improving their own furniture and can teach their neighbors how to do it."

Sue Geiger, a young white woman from Davenport, Iowa, working in the Freedom City program, took the discussion one step further:

"Some of these people will never get jobs. That's why we're so concerned about the inadequate food-stamp and welfare programs. Our real hope is in the next generation, if we don't starve them to death first."

And what of civil rights?

"The federal government is not moving fast enough. Only when the government becomes truly resolute can we effect change. People in Washington make a lot of pretty plans but they either backtrack on them or they get lost in the bureaucratic shuffle."

These words, radical for Mississippi, were spoken by Carr, the rich white plantation owner.

Carr and Henry are twin forces propelling a poverty program that may some day change the face of conservative, segregationist Clarksdale.

They are the most unlikely pair one could find in Mississippi.

Henry, a dentist and pharmacist, formal and reserved, probably is the most skilled, pragmatic Negro leader in the state.

Carr, 40, owner of a 2,500-acre plantation and part owner of a bank, looks every inch the Southern aristocrat. He is a handsome man with clear blue eyes and wavy brown hair. He speaks in the relaxed soft drawl of a well-bred Southern gentleman.

President of a poverty program violently opposed by the local white power structure, Carr looks instead like the golf chairman from the local country club.

In a sporty multicolored sweater, regimental necktie and white button-down shirt, he lounges easily in a hard metal chair at a meeting of Coahoma Opportunities, Inc.

But when he starts to speak, he projects a different picture—the first white man to come to the aid of the poverty program when it was being systematically boycotted by every white leader in Clarksdale.

Carr and Henry, the program vice-president, speak almost with one voice in protesting that the federal government isn't doing enough to help the local poverty program.

They also kid each other in a camaraderie shared by few Negroes and whites in the Deep South.

"Nothing Could Be Worse"

Smoothly and quietly, Carr gave his views on various issues involved in civil rights and the poverty program.

On housing: "Nothing could be worse here than housing. It's so horrible it's not fit for animals." (Carr is building brick, air-conditioned housing for his 10 permanent plantation workers.)

On city government: "Our mayor has a fifth-grade education. I can't get him to apply for a federal work experience program."

On the school system: "There's not a single Negro in our schools. No one has a workable plan for integration. The schools have turned down federal school aid."

On the need for strong federal support: "The Negro vote will eventually take care of these problems. But what do you want us to do now—solve these things through our own little riots?"

On solving the housing problem: "I would cut off all Farmers Home Administration and Federal Housing Authority loans. The builders would decide immediately they support integration and poverty programs. Aside from OEO, Farmers Home Administra-

tion has the greatest potential for helping the poor. But it doesn't. The Agriculture Department is just helping the commercial farmer.

On politics: "Things are never really going to change until Sens. Eastland and Stennis and the governor are changed."

But Carr and Henry already are leading the way toward change.

They are creating a series of services for the poor—education, job training, a credit union, recreation—which rival functions of the official government.

And other white men are coming forward to serve.

The county board of education is slowly starting to help the program.

Gustav (Gus) Roessler, a former stockbroker and member of the White Citizens Council, is the director of the program. He, too, is respected by the Negro participants.

Dr. Frank Marascalco, obstetrician, serves on the poverty board. Commenting on the first poverty trainees, he said:

"Two or three hundred of those people were barely breathing when they came through the door. These people had never received any major treatment. Some had hernias in their stomachs as large as footballs, others had severe prostate trouble."

"We (the Coahoma poverty organization) are the only representative body of democracy in the whole State of Mississippi," Carr stated matter-of-factly.

But he quickly added that individual white leaders are fighting for justice elsewhere in the state.

One finds them in newspaper editors like Hodding Carter III at Greenville and Hazel Brannon Smith at Lexington, and attorney Jimmy Christenberry in Rolling Fork.

But for a Northerner, the most lasting impressions of the Delta—the flat, rich cotton country—are of the pathetic Negro poor, of their rising determination to overcome and of the white leaders who have chosen to stand beside them.

POVERTY IN THE RURAL SOUTH: III. SWAFCA PROGRAM IS SMALL STEP BUT IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, a most encouraging and valuable attack against rural poverty in the South has recently been taken by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, is to be commended for reaffirming the program's commitment dealing with the problems of rural poverty in his overriding of Alabama Gov. Lurleen Wallace's veto of the Southwest Alabama Farmer's Cooperative Association grant. This particular program is designed to strike at the roots of poverty by encouraging community action to deal with the basic economic problems which plague low-income farm operators. The SWAFCA program is a small but important step because it is in the right direction.

The cooperative program of SWAFCA covers 10 of the poorest counties in Alabama. More than 30 percent of the farms in the 10-county area produce income under $500 per year. Most of the farm families involved earn less than $1,000 per year, while the average farm family in America makes over $4,700 per year.

The SWAFCA program seeks to test the hypothesis that low-income farm operators can develop the social and economic foundation which will enable them to remain on their land. At present, many farm families are forced to migrate to the already overcrowded slums in big cities. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman estimates that 40,000 to 60,000 people may migrate from the South this summer. Hopefully, this program will pave the way for broad measures to halt this massive dislocation of persons by providing incentive and opportunity to remain on the land.

The project seeks to aid community action by:

First, promoting the development of cooperative management, marketing, and supply organizations.

Second, encouraging the use of modern technological resources.

Third, aiding the development of insurance programs to lower interest rates for farm loans, and

Fourth, calling for democratic self-determination of the development of the program.

I join the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, the National Council of Churches' Anti-Poverty Task Force, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the Cooperative League of the USA, the Southern Regional Council, and the National Sharecroppers Fund in support of the SWAFCA project. By teaching farmers to diversify their crops it serves to broaden their hopes by offering a real alternative to the age-old pattern of migration to city slums.

By affirming this Nation's commitment to wiping out poverty, OEO has shown the kind of leadership and imagination that have been too often lacking in other departments of the Government. Mr. Shriver and his staff are to be congratulated for their handling of this program.

The story behind the grant and its eventual victory over the massed and powerful opposition brought against it is both interesting and instructive. In order to report the full story in some detail I would like to include in the RECORD at this point various newspaper articles and statements from the Office of Economic Opportunity:

A. THE BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSY

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, April 12, 1967]

OEO FACES CONTROVERSY OVER ALABAMA CO-OP

(By Robert Walters)

The Office of Economic Opportunity is facing a major new controversy over the funding of an Alabama antipoverty program designed to assist a farm cooperative farmer by low-income Negroes in 10 Black Belt counties.

Battle lines already have been drawn in the simmering dispute. Virtually all the state's leading politicians oppose the program and a wide variety of civil rights, labor and religious groups support it.

If their differences are not resolved, the dispute threatens to involve Alabama Gov. Lurleen Wallace in her third direct confrontation with the federal government since she stook office earlier this year.

Approximately 20 Alabama farmers planned to meet today with top OEO officials to make a direct appeal for approval of a one-year, $503,540 federal grant to their organization, the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association.

Federal officials at the Agriculture Department and Economic Development Administration as well as OEO view the project as an important experiment to help determine the future of much of the rural South.

Low-income Negro farmers are increasingly being forced to leave their land because of mechanization, reduced cotton acreage allotments, minimum wage laws, lack of education and racial discrimination.

The Agriculture Department estimates that in the next three years more than 1.5 million impoverished Southern farmers, most of them Negroes, will be forced to relocate—and the great bulk will move into Northern and Western big-city ghettoes.

The Alabama project is intended to "reverse this trend" by building "a mechanism of social and economic development which will keep these farmers in rural America, where they choose to stay, and out of the city slum," according to OEO officials.

The first phase of the program is aimed at establishing a supply and marketing cooperative to enable the farmers to produce and sell a variety of crops, starting with field peas, okra and cucumbers.

In its second phase, the program will seek to aid the nonfarm residents of the area through establishment of health, self-help housing, education and recreation projects as well as a variety of self-supporting business enterprises.

The virtually all-Negro cooperative has promised to seek white members, but its leaders say the absence of many low-income white farmers in the area, coupled with "the fear of Klan terrorism," will make the task a difficult one.

Mrs. Wallace has hinted that she will exercise her power to veto the program if the grant is approved by OEO.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 13, 1967]

LEADERS OF NEGRO FARM CO-OP IN ALABAMA GO TO WASHINGTON TO SEEK FUNDS

(By Roy Reed)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—A dozen leaders of a Negro farmers' cooperative in Alabama came to Washington today to try to shake loose a Federal grant that is being opposed by the concerted political power of their state.

The farmers drove here in two cars to try to put over their new organization, the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association, as a practical way for low-income farmers to save on the purchase of supplies and get higher prices for their peas, okra and cucumbers.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is considering a $503,540 demonstration grant to the cooperative as part of its effort to find new ways of fighting poverty.

The grant reportedly was almost ready for approval until Alabama's two Senators and four of its eight Representatives descended on the Office of Economic Opportunity last week and, for three hours, expressed opposition to it.

EARLY DECISION PLEDGED

Spokesmen for the antipoverty agency declined to speculate today on the status of the proposed grant except to say that a decision would be made shortly. One said the proposal was on the desk of Sargent Shriver, the director, and was being closely studied by the agency's economic advisers.

The cooperative is being opposed not only in Washington but also by powerful white leaders in Alabama. The opposition there includes many of the county and city officials in the 10 Black Belt counties that the cooperative covers, as well as the owners of at least one packing company, a pickle man-

ufacturer who stands to pay higher prices for cucumbers if the cooperative succeeds.

Fears of a Negro political take-over are being aroused as the opposition campaign is pressed in the Black Belt, a region that contains rich, dark soil and is dominated by a white minority that is outnumbered in some counties by as much as four to one.

A spokesman for one of the Congressmen said today that the cooperative was controlled by "Black Panther people." Black Panther is a name applied to certain militant Negro political groups that were organized in a few Alabama counties prior to the 1966 elections in Alabama. The organizations showed little electoral strength and some have disintegrated since then.

LINK DENIED BY MODERATES

Moderate civil rights leaders in Alabama deny that the Panthers control the cooperative or have any substantial connection with it.

Joe R. Johnson, leader of the delegation of farmers, said today at the antipoverty agency that the cooperative needed the Federal money now, during spring planting, if it was to do any good.

"I'd like to take it home with me today," he said.

Mr. Johnson's group met with half a dozen antipoverty officials led by Bertrand Harding, deputy director.

The farmers brought with them several nonfarmer friends, including representatives of two well-known Negro schools, Tuskegee Institute at Tuskegee, Ala., and Southern University at Baton Rouge, La.

Dr. Asa C. Sims, professor of horticulture at Southern, and the Rev. Robert Smith, director of religious extension service at Tuskegee, told the Federal officials that the cooperative was needed an was feasible.

The white political leaders who met with the Federal officials last week argued, along with white business leaders from Alabama, that the cooperative would duplicate services already provided by Federal, state and local agencies.

About 850 families belong to the cooperative. Mr. Johnson said they formed it more than a year ago but had not yet begun full operation.

An 80,000-pound purchase of fertilizer this year demonstrated that the cooperative can save money for the farmers, a spokesman for the antipoverty agency said. The spokesman did not know the amount saved but it had been substantial.

The cooperative hopes to get higher prices for its vegetables by controlling the time of selling and by bargaining with packers.

The members live in 10 counties once dominated by cotton but now well down the road toward agricultural diversification. The counties are Choctaw, Dallas (Selma), Greene, Hale, Lowndes (where Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, the civil rights worker, was murdered in 1965), Marengo, Monroe, Perry, Sumter and Wilcox.

Jack Venable, administrative assistant to Representative Bill Nichols of Alabama, said the cooperative had been organized mainly by Miss Shirley Mesher, a 37-year-old white civil rights worker. Miss Mesher first went to Alabama in 1965 to help manage the Selma-to-Montgomery march headed by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

She helped organize the militant Negro political organization in Selma and Dallas County last year. The group is referred to as "Black Panther" by whites in Selma.

Miss Mesher now is an unpaid, volunteer coordinator for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Her efforts for the farmers' cooperative coupled with her past political work are the basis for the charge that the cooperative is controlled by Black Panthers. Mr. Venable said that Miss Mesher's hand-picked candidates were elected to the governing board of the cooperative in each of the 10 counties.

Mrs. Albert Turner of Marion, Ala., the wife of the Alabama director of Dr. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, said today in a telephone interview that she and her husband were members of the cooperative and that she knew of no Black Panthers connected with it in their county. The Turners have steered clear of the Panther organizations.

Fred Gray, a lawyer in Tuskegee, is the cooperative's lawyer. He accompanied the delegation to Washington and helped argue its case. Mr. Gray is influential in the moderate element of Negro politics in Alabama.

The grant would be for one year. The money would be used mainly to hire a staff and buy equipment, such as 10 small trucks for carrying produce.

Mr. Venable said the budget included money for two-way radio communications systems in the trucks. He said the assumption among white Alabamians was that radios would be used to help organize Black Panther political groups.

B. THE ORIGINAL GRANT TO SWAFCA IS ANNOUNCED

FARM COOPERATIVE GRANT TO 10 ALABAMA COUNTIES

The Office of Economic Opportunity today announced a comprehensive demonstration grant of $399,967 to the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association (SWAFCA), a 10-county cooperative in one of the Nation's most depressed rural areas.

The grant is designed to test ways by which poor farmers can significantly raise their income, become self-sufficient and develop farm-related programs.

The Cooperative originally requested $503,460, but it was determined by OEO that a lesser amount would be adequate to successfully implement the proposed program. The project has been endorsed as economically feasible by the Department of Agriculture and the Economic Development Agency, both of whom will provide expert assistance to the Cooperative. Both agencies have agreed that SWAFCA is an innovative demonstration program which will not in any way duplicate existing services and programs.

The Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association cooperative will initially include 800 farm families in 10 Blackbelt counties of Alabama. It is anticipated that the co-op's membership will expand to 1,500 families during the first year of production. Membership is open to all low-income farmers in the 10-county area. Nine of these counties are among the poorest in the country. Most of the farm families involved earn less than $1,000 per year.

Because of mechanization, reduced cotton allotments, falling farm prices, and other factors, more than 300 former local farmers have been identified by SWAFCA as ready to leave the land. Without alternatives, these farmers and their families, and many others will also find it necessary to relocate into cities, thus repeating the pattern of migration to city slums that has continued over recent years.

The grant announced today aims at reversing this trend, and better the plight of these farmers with a self-help program of economic development, crop and livestock diversification, and experimentation with higher profit and yield farming.

The project will test new concepts in OEO's programs of assistance to low-income farm families in the Southern blackbelt. There is no equivalent in the existing OEO programs in the area. A large part of the grant will be allocated for agricultural, marketing and business specialists to provide necessary technical assistance, and insure sound management practices.

The first crops that will be marketed through the co-op will be okra, peas, cucumbers and corn. Additional crops and farm products are to be added in the fall season and during the next year. A special feature of this grant is a provision for a "loan insurance" fund which will enable the cooperative to provide security for loans from private sources for basic farm supplies and equipment.

Questions raised concerning the SWAFCA proposal have been answered by a thorough investigation and re-evaluation by OEO in consultation with other Federal agencies. The examination showed that the program is structurally and economically sound, that SWAFCA's Board has been democratically elected by its member farmers, and that the potential staff members are fully competent. As in the original proposal, OEO will provide a liaison project manager and on-going evaluations of the project.

Joseph Johnson, of Dallas County, is President of SWAFCA. Calvin S. Orsborn, a businessman in Selma, has been named as Co-op (business) Manager. SWAFCA will employ a comptroller and an accountant. Additionally, periodic audits will be performed by an independent firm. OEO must approve the Co-op's appointment of all key personnel.

Among those supporting the project are the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., the Souther Regional Council, the National Sharecroppers Fund, and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. Dr. B. D. Mayberry, Dean of the School of Agriculture, Tuskegee Institute; James Patton, Past President of the National Farmers' Union; John Baker, Assistant Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, and Ross Davis, Director of the Economic Development Agency are among those who have reviewed the proposal and believe it to be an economically sound and promising pilot program.

SWAFCA will operate in the Southwest Alabama counties of Dallas, Lowndes, Wilcox, Perry, Hale, Greene, Monroe, Marengo, Choctaw, and Sumter.

C. OPPOSITION TO THE ORIGINAL SWAFCA GRANT

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1967]

OEO GRANT TO CO-OP IN ALABAMA STIRS CLASH

(By Robert E. Baker)

The Office of Economic Opportunity granted $400,000 to a Negro farmers' cooperative in Alabama yesterday—and immediately precipitated another confrontation between that State and the Federal Government.

"I can assure you," said Gov. Lurleen Wallace in Montgomery, "that it will be vetoed."

But the threat by Alabama's First Lady appeared more symbolic than real. This is a demonstration project subject to gubernatorial veto within 30 days. But the veto can be overridden by War on Poverty Director Sargent Shriver.

"If the Governor vetoes this unwise project, then these people in Washington should respect her wishes," said Rep. George W. Andrews (D.-Ala.), dean of the Alabama delegation and a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.

But it seems unlikely that OEO would back down. It had already heard objections from congressmen and other Alabama officials at a session two weeks ago before making the final approval.

The grant will go to the Southwest Farmers Cooperative Association operating in 10 counties, nine of them among the poorest in the nation.

Its aim is to help the farmers create an economic atmosphere that will allow them to stay there, rather than migrate to big city slums.

The grant will be used to teach improved production methods to farm families—800 initially and up to 1500 within a year.

Mayor Joe Smitherman of Selma, where the cooperative will have headquarters, and

other officials have charged that the grant would likely be used to promote "Black Power" politics. (The cooperative is open to all poor farming families but is predominantly Negro.)

All of Alabama's Representatives and Senators, except for Republican Rep. William L. Dickinson, who was in Vietnam, and Democratic Rep. Robert E. Jones, whose North Alabama district is far removed from the cooperative, met with OEO officials to voice their objections.

Their main objection was that the cooperative lacked the experts to accomplish its objectives. They wanted any such funding to go through existing channels, such as Auburn University's Agriculture Extension Service.

But the OEO in its announcement said that the cooperative's grant request was thoroughly investigated and that Federal experts, including Agriculture Department specialists, would help.

While Alabama officials expressed their shock and dismay at the grant, the National Council of Churches and the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty praised it as imaginative and significant.

"This economic self-help program is a reaffirmation of the basic mandate of Congress that programs funded by OEO should strike at the roots of poverty—and be carried out with the maximum feasible participation of the poor," said Richard W. Boone, executive director of the Crusade, a coalition of church, civil rights, labor and business groups working in the poverty field.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1967]

ALABAMA CO-OP GETS POVERTY AID DESPITE OPPOSITION IN CONGRESS

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, May 11.—The Office of Economic Opportunity has decided to grant $399,967 to an Alabama cooperative of Negro farmers despite the opposition of the state's concerted political power.

The antipoverty agency, which announced the grant last night, was caught for more than a month in a political pressure squeeze between the Alabama politicians on one side and liberal, union, and church-oriented groups, such as the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty.

Gov. Lurleen B. Wallace of Alabama has authority under the Economic Opportunity Act to veto the grant and thus force the poverty agency director to reconsider it. The director has the authority, however, to override such a veto.

The area was once devoted predominantly to cotton, but the cooperative's leading crops now are cucumbers, okra, and peas.

The conflict was analogous to last winter's long fight over refunding the Child Development Group of Mississippi, a Head Start project opposed by Mississippi political power. The project was cut off in September, then refunded on a smaller scale after months of cross fire.

The Mississippi fight strained relations between Sargent Shriver, the poverty agency director, and the Citizens' Crusade. Today, however, Richard W. Boone, executive director of the crusade, said in a statement:

"Mr. Shriver and his staff are to be congratulated on making this grant. In doing so, the O.E.O. has displayed the kind of leadership and imagination that have been too often lacking in other departments of the Government in the recent past."

UNIDENTIFIED TARGETS

Mr. Boone did not identify his targets but was believed to mean old-line agencies that are reluctant to tackle grass roots problems that could lead to political recriminations. A recent example was the Agriculture Department's refusal to provide emergency food for Mississippi persons who, a Senate subcommittee had found, were hungry, if not starving.

The recipient of the grant is the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association operating in Dallas, Lowndes, Wilcox, Perry, Hale, Greene, Monroe, Marengo, Choctaw, and Sumter counties.

The grant is designed to test ways by which poor farmers can significantly raise their income and become self-sufficient. With organization and captial, for example, they can buy fertilizer and other supplies at savings. By cooperative selling they can bargain with the larger buyers for higher prices.

CONGRESSIONAL OPPOSITION

Representative William Nichols, a Democrat, who is one of six members of the Alabama Congressional delegation that went to the poverty agency offices and argued for three hours against the project, said in a statement today:

"I strongly oppose this grant along with other local and state officials on the ground that the leadership of the cooperative was insufficient to handle such a project. We felt along with other members of the Alabama delegation that if the project were to be funded the leadership should be strengthened to include directly members of the State Extension Service and other Agriculture officials."

Donald M. Baker, general counsel for the poverty agency, was in Selma, Dallas County, today for talks with Sheriff Wilson Baker and Mayor Joel Smitherman in connection with the grant.

The O.E.O. public affairs office said the agency was not expecting harassment of the cooperative and that Mr. Baker's trip was a courtesy to explain to local officials the rationale of the grant.

D. SUPPORT FOR THE ORIGINAL SWAFCA GRANT

Support was voiced early for the imaginative new program. Dr. Martin Luther King called it "an encouraging step forward in the war on poverty, a ray of hope for those in the Nation's poorest counties who live in unbelievable conditions of despair." Walter P. Reuther, head of the Citizens Crusade Against Poverty, hailed the program as the "first real opportunity for many." And Roy Wilkins of the NAACP said it was "a chance to bring some real democracy to rural Alabama." More support was reported in the Montgomery Alabama Advertiser shortly after the grant was announced.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS BACK DISPUTED GRANT

Three leaders of national religious organizations have issued a statement supporting the decision of the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity to allocate funds to the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association at Selma.

The statement was issued by Dr. J. Edward Carothers, chairman of the anti-poverty task force of the National Council of Churches, New York; Mathew Ahmann of Chicago, director of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, and Rabbi Henry Siegman, executive vice president of the Synagogue Council of America, New York.

The grant to the association has been criticized by Selma Mayor Joe Smitherman, Dallas County Probate Judge Bernard Reynolds and others. The officials claim the organization would be run by advocates of the "Black Power" movement.

The religious leaders said the allocation of $399,967 for the association's rural readjustment project "is one of the significant developments of the war on poverty."

Their statement added: "This program will help create the social and economic atmosphere in hard-pressed rural areas of the Deep South that will make it possible for people to succeed where they are. It will help reduce the necessity for migration of the rural poor from slums in the country to slums in the city."

Dr. Carothers, Ahmann and Rabbi Siegman said the Selma-based association's "officers and board have been careful not to become identified with any political or civil rights organization, so it is with deep feeling that we denounce those who are using smear tactics . . ."

The three organizations whose leaders issued the statement support the Selma Interreligious Project, established after the 1965 Selma march to promote racial justice.

E. GOVERNOR WALLACE'S VETO AND SARGENT SHRIVER'S OVERRULING OF THAT VETO

Gov. Lurleen Wallace of Alabama vetoed the project on June 16. The Governor made several procedural objections, and also said that she felt that the money would be used to subsidize Negro political action. She also claimed that the board in control of the program had not been democratically elected and that, in any case, the program only duplicated existing services.

The OEO subsequently made an exhaustive study of the program with the help of several other Federal agencies. The study revealed no substance to the Governor's objections. I would like to include the account of Mr. Shriver's overriding Governor Wallace's veto that was printed in the Washington Post. I would like to also enclose, at this point, a copy of a memorandum from Theodore Berry, director of the community action program, to Mr. Shriver. This memorandum was sent to Governor Wallace with the letter formally rejecting her objections.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 4, 1967]

ALABAMA OVERRULED ON VETO OF OEO GRANT

(By Jean M. White)

Sargent Shriver has overturned Gov. Lurleen Wallace's veto of $400,000 poverty grant to a Negro farmers' cooperative in Alabama.

The letter overriding the veto was mailed from the office of Economic Opportunity yesterday. A spokesman said the contents cannot be released until the letter is received by the Governor's office.

But Shriver is known to have answered point by point the reasons given by Mrs. Wallace in her veto letter.

One of these was the charge that the grant would likely be used to promote "Black Power" politics in Alabama. The OEO and FBI have investigated and found no evidence to support this charge.

Mrs. Wallace's veto of the grant to the farmers' cooperative was the latest in the list of confrontations between Alabama and the Federal Government. Earlier OEO had overridden Gov. George Wallace's veto of a grant for a migrant workers' project.

The poverty chief can overturn a gubernatorial veto on demonstration projects.

The $400,000 grant will go to the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association to teach improved agriculture production methods to farm families.

About 800 families will be helped at first and up to 1,500 within a year. The cooperative will operate in ten counties—nine of them among the poorest in the Nation. The hope is that the poor farmers will be able to stay on their farms rather than migrate to slums in the big cities.

Before making its final grant to the cooperative two months ago, OEO had heard objections from Alabama Congressmen and officials.

One objection from them was that the cooperative didn't have expert advice. They wanted the funds channeled through existing channels such as university agricultural extension services.

OEO answered that Agriculture Department specialists would be available for advice.

RECONSIDERATION OF GOVERNOR WALLACE'S VETO OF THE SOUTHWEST ALABAMA FARMERS' COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1967.

To: The Director.
Through: Deputy Director.

RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons stated below, I urge you to reconsider Governor Wallace's veto of the Southwest Alabama Farmers' Cooperative Association grant and find the grant to be "fully consistent with the provisions and in furtherance of the purposes of" Part A of Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

Attached for your signature are the following documents:

(1) Formal statement of reconsideration.
(2) Letter for Governor Wallace.
(3) Letter of notification to the grantee.

JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION

1. The objections expressed by the Governor in her June 16, 1967 veto letter are without merit.

A. The objections numbered 2 through 7 have not previously been made to this agency and, therefore, deserve to be answered fully.

I. The grant was made pursuant to the FY 67 Research and Demonstration plan as required by Section 207 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended.

II. Section 207 requires that the Research and Demonstration plan "to the extent it contemplates activities or programs that may be undertaken by other Federal agencies or the making of grants or contracts that might be made by other Federal agencies having demonstration and research responsibilities, shall be approved by the Director only after consultation with such agencies." This has been done. The Act does not require consultation with other agencies before each grant is made. Nevertheless, the Department of Agirculture and the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce were consulted before the SWAFCA grant was made. Both agencies support the grant. Copies of the Department of Agriculture support memoranda are attached.

III. The grant proposal was filed in the Southeast Regional Office as required by Section 207 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended. The Regional Office comments, which are attached, anticipated opposition by "local leaders," including some local CAA officials and requested that some kind of control "be placed" on Shirley Mesher, a white worker who was instrumental in the development of the project, but plainly stated that "with greater emphasis being placed on rural programs, this program could be a wonderful opportunity for the Office of Economic Opportunity to enhance its position in this area."

IV. Section 209(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, states that "when the Director of OEO receives an application from a private nonprofit agency for a community action program to be carried on in a community in which there is a community action agency carrying on a number of component programs, he shall, within five days, give notice to such community action agency and the Governor of the state in which the community is located of the receipt of such application." This provision applies only to applications for Section 204 and 205 "community action programs" and does not extend to applications for Section 207 demonstration grants. More important, none of the interested parties was prejudiced by OEO's failure to notify them within five days from the receipt of the SWAFCA application. Representatives of both the CAA's in the ten county SWAFCA area had an opportunity to discuss their concerns with OEO officials in Washington. The Governor was given ample time to review, and to veto, the grant.

V. I do not know precisely what, OEO regulations the Governor believes to be violated by the composition of the SWAFCA Board of Directors; but I suspect she is referring to Part B(6) of the CAP Guide which states that broadly-based community action programs are to be preferred. To be "broadly based, a community action agency must provide ample opportunity for participation in policy making by the major public and private agencies responsible for services and programs concerned with poverty, other elements in the community as a whole, and the population to be served by the community action program. . . . Representatives from private and public agencies shall include at least one representative of the chief elected officials, or official, of the community, the board of education, the public welfare agency and the major private social service agencies. Consideration should also be given to representation by the public health agency, the public housing, and urban renewal agencies, the local office of the state employment services. . . ." But Section 7 of Part B states that "the existence of a broadly-based community action agency is not a prerequisite to the granting of Federal assistance." In any case, the CAP Section 204 and 205 community action program components, not Section 207 demonstration programs.

It would be inappropriate to permit one or both the CAA's in the 10-county area to control SWAFCA. Each CAA operates in only one of the ten counties and even if both would be willing to work together—which is extremely unlikely—their combined area would extend to only two of the ten affected counties.

B. The Governor's remaining objections have already been dealt with at length either in the justification of the SWAFCA grant, the letter from Mr. Harding to Probate Judge Reynolds of Dallas County, Alabama, or in both. These documents are attached for your information. It would serve no purpose to repeat their contents here. Suffice it to say that:

(1) The project does not duplicate existing services. FHA has stated that it cannot provide a large enough loan to permit SWAFCA to purchase necessary equipment, seed, fertilizer and insecticides. Many of the cooperative's members are too poor to meet FHA individual loan criteria, and to date less than 15% of the farmers have been able to obtain such loans. Less than 1% have ever received soil tests or any extensive service training.

(2) The proposal submitted by the Dallas County CAP did not represent a viable alternative; it was little more than a copy of the agricultural services technical assistance component of the SWAFCA project, and did not include cooperative buying or selling, loan insurance fund, or economic development assistance.

(3) FBI and OEO investigations have not substantiated the charge that participants in SWAFCA have committed illegal acts or that SWAFCA would use grant monies for unauthorized purposes. Background investigations of the SWAFCA Board of Directors and of Shirley Mesher, the white civil rights worker who was instrumental in the organization of SWAFCA, have uncovered no objectionable information. Evidence tending to implicate SWAFCA, its members, its staff, or its sympathizers with "SNCC" or violent "Black Power" activities has been, at best, insubstantial. The Hatch Act, OEO guidelines and the grant itself prohibit grant funds from being used for partisan political purposes. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and a special condition to the grant will insure that interested poor white farmers in the area are given an opportunity to become members of the cooperative.

(4) No authorized OEO official "guaranteed" funding of SWAFCA prior to the time the grant was actually made. I have not heard of any statements that were made in February; I know that on April 3, Peter Mickelsen, while attending a meeting in Selma, stated that he would do everything he could to insure that the grant was made. Mr. Harding's letter to Judge Reynolds apologized for any misunderstanding created by this statement.

(5) Salaries, which are far from exorbitant, compare favorably with wages paid for comparable work in the area when the lack of fringe benefits or job security is considered. Some have been increased above their original level at the suggestion of RPP&E. Salaries have been set at the lowest level that will attract the technical staff that will be essential to the success of the project.

OEO concurrence on all staff appointments will insure that only the highest quality personnel are hired. Mr. Calvin Orsborn, who is the cooperative's business manager, is one of the most respected and successful Negro businessmen in the area. Mr. Vincent Jones, who has offered to become the comptroller for SWAFCA, holds a B.S. in accounting from Southern University and a M.S. from the University of Chicago and is currently an assistant professor of accounting and the coordinator of the accounting section of the School of Business of Southern University. Dr. Asa C. Simms, Jr., who has offered to become the horticulturist, holds a B.S. in horticulture from Hampton University, an M.S. in botany and plant pathology from Ohio State, and a Ph. D. in botany and plant pathology from Ohio State, and is currently a professor of biology at Southern University.

(6) The risk involved in the project is certainly substantial especially if the project's opponents engage in physical or economic harassment; but risk is inherent in demonstrations unless we are to demonstrate only foregone conclusions. RPP&E, the Department of Agriculture, two independent consulting firms (Robert Nathan Associates and Continental Allied, Inc.) all believe that it is economically feasible.

2. Although the project has been severely criticized by local Alabama politicians, it has been strongly supported by liberal politicians from all areas of the country, and by a wide range of civil rights groups and liberal church organizations. In addition, it has been treated sympathetically by the news media—e.g., CBS–TV, NBC–TV, NY Times, Christian Science Monitor, Washington Post, New Republic, Washington Star, Jet, and fourteen language services of the Voice of America.

3. Most important, the project is truly innovative; it attempts to give poor farmers an opportunity to manage their own affairs and, by increasing their capacity to earn income, offers them an opportunity to remain in rural areas. The regional cooperative envisioned in the project should greatly increase its members bargaining power, enabling them to buy necessary supplies and equipment more cheaply, and receive higher prices for their produce. Modern farm techniques and methods imparted through intensive technical assistance should improve crop selection and increase crop yields and economic development assistance will help the program participants discover other profitable economic ventures. The concepts embodied in this demonstration will not help all poor farmers; but the project is, I believe, an exciting self-help venture worthy of our support.

THEODORE M. BERRY,
Director, Community Action Program.

Concurrence:

D. HESS.
G. GREEN.
D. BAKER.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for the rest of this session, I am sure every piece of legislation will be considered in terms of what it can do about the riots. The poverty legislation, now pending before the Committee on Education and Labor, is a logical bill to ask this question about. The enemies of the poverty program are, of course, leaping to the chance to discredit the program by linking it somehow to the riots. We are told by some that if we even have a poverty program next year, it will only be "rewarding the rioters," and that all we have tried to do for the 30 million American poor should be jettisoned because maybe one-twentieth of 1 percent of them were involved in riots. That makes sense, Mr. Speaker, about as much sense as trying to control floods by tearing down all the levees on all our rivers because somebody somewhere was heard to express the hope it would rain the day before a cloudburst.

Yesterday, Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, testified before the Education and Labor Committee on the poverty program with special attention to the charges that poverty workers were involved.

With his characteristic candor he admitted that there was some involvement. In 27 cities where there have been disturbances this year, there are 12,128 paid poverty workers. In those same cities, there have been 6,733 persons arrested for involvement in the riots. Of these, precisely six individuals were paid poverty workers. Like I said, one-twentieth of 1 percent. If that is the case that the enemies of the poverty program have to make, I hope they do not expect to be taken seriously.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting Mr. Shriver's very enlightening and moving testimony at this point in the RECORD, and I commend it to my colleagues.

STATEMENT BY SARGENT SHRIVER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 31, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Five months ago this Committee was presented with a tightened and strengthened version of the Economic Opportunity Act proposed by this Administration for Fiscal Year 1968. Two months later a substitute bill was introduced by certain members of this Committee.

In your consideration of antipoverty legislation you have held more than six weeks of hearings and listened to more than 100 witnesses—the great majority of them from outside government.

I am glad to have this opportunity to sum up the record as it looks to me.

The question at which you have taken a long, hard look is this: Should there be an Office of Economic Opportunity? Of the 97 public witnesses who have appeared before you, 64 have addressed themselves to this question in their testimony. Of these, only one called for the elimination of OEO, the independent agency the Congress established to hear and serve the needs of the poor.

These are some of the witnesses who voiced a strong appeal for the continuation of OEO:

Mitchell Ginsberg, distinguished scholar and Commissioner of Welfare of New York City—speaking for the National Association of Social Workers.

Andrew Biemiller, Legislative Director of the AFL–CIO, speaking for 14 million American working men and women.

Consignor Corcoran, Executive Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, speaking for millions of fellow Americans.

Rabbi Richard Hirsch, Director of the Religious Action Center, speaking on behalf of the Inter-religious Committee Against Poverty, a coordinating body of all religious groups in America.

Mrs. Bruce Benson, Vice President of the League of Women Voters, speaking on behalf of thousands of informed and active women across America.

Miss Dorothy Height, President of the National Council of Negro Women, representing tens of thousands of women long active in the struggle against poverty.

Joseph Barr, Mayor of Pittsburgh, and President of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, speaking for the chief executives of the nation's 600 largest cities.

Whitney Young, Director of the National Urban League, distinguished civil rights leader.

Arthur Flemming, President of the University of Oregon, former Secretary of HEW, and representing the National Council of Churches.

Clarence Mitchell, Washington representative of the NAACP, speaking for half a million members of that organization.

William Gossett, President-elect of the American Bar Association, thousands of whose members have already been helpful in the War on Poverty.

Richard Boone, Director of the Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty, a coalition of over one hundred national organizations in every walk of American life.

Mrs. Fred Harris, speaking technically only for herself, but, in effect, speaking for millions of Americans on Indian reservations, in migrant labor streams, and in rural America.

I could go on and on. The 4,000 pages of testimony already in your record are replete with the names of others—business leaders, health experts, conservationists, veterans, religious leaders, women—the whole spectrum of American society—speaking with one voice. "We need the OEO."

Another major issue that came before this Committee was whether or not Job Corps should be converted into a vocational education program under the Office of Education. Those in our country most familiar with Job Corps said: "No". It should not. The Secretary of Labor said: "No." Top officials of HEW said: "No." Dean William Perlmutter of the State College of New York said: "No." G. C. Whitaker, Board Chairman of Graflex, said: "No." Dr. Spencer Smith of the Citizen's Committee on Natural Resources, said: "No."

These were some of the witnesses who saw the value of Job Corps. They want it kept a part of OEO to serve—in cooperation with American business—the hardest hit of the poor.

Another big issue concerned Head Start. Should it also be transferred to the Office of Education? Here too, the record is clear. While some educators, testifying on the Elementary & Secondary Education Act have said that Head Start should be transferred—those who are experts on the subject of poverty, say: "No."

Head Start is more than an educational program. It affects the total life and culture of the child—his health, his parents, behavior, environment, diet and outlook. The entire program is directly related to the community action effort. Your witnesses agreed that Head Start should remain a part of OEO.

Another question concerned the earmarking of funds. No witness nor any Member of Congress suggested that local community initiative be limited by the earmarking of funds. To the contrary, all witnesses speaking on the issue strongly urged there be no earmarking of community action funds.

Every witness who commented on local share, urged a return to the 90–10 federal-local matching requirement, rather than an increase in the share required by local communities. This testimony runs contrary to the proposal of the Opportunity Crusade that even greater funds be demanded from the local communities.

OEO is sometimes accused of spending too much—but the witnesses who appeared here thought the opposite: OEO is not spending nearly enough.

Whitney Young said we should spend at least $10 billion a year.

AFL–CIO said spend more money.

The Citizen's Crusade Against Poverty said spend more.

Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP said spend more.

The representatives of America's bar associations—who identified themselves as Republicans as well as Democrats—urged the Legal Services Program spend 3 times as much as now.

Educators said: "Double Upward Bound."

Mayors asked for twice as many Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees.

The Governor of Alaska, for one, urged us to double VISTA. And, following the recent trouble in Detroit, Governor Romney sent an urgent telegram requesting 200 additional VISTA Volunteers. I am happy to tell you that by 5:00 PM of the day the Governor sent the telegram, 35 VISTA Volunteers arrived. 46 arrived Saturday. 50 arrived Sunday. 55 more will be there today. 2 tomorrow, and 57 more Wednesday. This is a poverty program in action where it is needed. And it is needed everywhere.

That's the record. You heard it. I heard it. The American public has heard it. No one can conclude from the testimony that OEO is not doing its job. Its performance is known and its record is clear.

On the other hand, what witness or what group has spoken on behalf of the proposed Opportunity Crusade? No one said, let's try something else. *No* witness has explained yet why the substitute bill would provide a better program.

Where were the witnesses who thought OEO should be dismantled and destroyed? Only the U.S. Chamber of Commerce thought Job Corps and Head Start should be shifted. But, not even the Chamber said the OEO should be eliminated. Who came here to say OEO should be given less money? No one.

The record is clear. OEO has been given bipartisan support to speak and work on behalf of America's poor. It has been given bipartisan support for the President's request for a 2.06 billion dollar appropriation. Now it is our urgent responsibility to let the poor of urban and rural America know that it is not a question of *how long* it will take to defeat poverty, but *how soon*.

Since you began your hearing, American streets have become American battlegrounds. Instead of guns and butter, it seems now to be guns and guns.

Let me make my position unmistakably clear. When I became Director of OEO, I took an oath—a simple oath to defend this country against all enemies, foreign and domestic. I consider those who would mock our laws, shatter our peace, burn our homes and kill our people to be enemies of our country. To promote, encourage, tolerate or excuse violence is against every intention I have had, against every action I have taken since I came to Washington in 1961.

After the riots began, voices of reason and order swiftly announced: "We will not tolerate violence. We will not permit lawlessness."

And they are right.

But there are voices that say, "We cannot, as a nation, tolerate the conditions that produce violence and lawlessness."

And they are right, too.

The programs of the War on Poverty and the countless people who have volunteered or are employed to carry them out are squarely on the side of law and order.

Yet, we have seen cynical attempts to create doubt and fear about the role of the War on Poverty in the aftermath of violence and disorder.

Such attempts are unworthy of any public official or private citizen. And they cannot be permitted to stay the hand or weaken the resolve of Congress in passing that legislation most needed to eliminate discontent and eradicate the causes of violence and disorder.

Let there be no mistake about it. Riots that barnstorm the country in June, July and August are not just quaint "happenings." Beneath the surface of America's cities is an explosive store of discontent waiting for a random spark to ignite it.

It is discontent with joblessness. Discontent with inhuman housing. Discontent with money-hungry landlords and merchants. Discontent with the raw differences between justice, health, and convenience for the poor and the rest of America. These are the combustibles that fire up a riot.

But even if there were no riots, even if every impoverished section of America remained quiet and uncomplaining, the conditions are wrong. They are wrong socially, politically and morally. And they must be corrected—wherever they exist.

Through the Economic Opportunity legislation, you have provided a variety of mechanisms in the best traditions of America to right these wrongs. The 4,000 pages of testimony accumulated in these hearings provide ample evidence they are working.

But what about these charges that employees of antipoverty programs have been involved in stimulating, encouraging and participating in acts of violence?

We have canvassed the cities and have found that these allegations are simply not true.

To the contrary. In almost every one of the 1,050 communities where community action exists, there is ample evidence that the CAA is calming fears and frustration: bridging the communications gap between the poor and the rest of the community; providing the opportunities that put people to work; giving them training and eductaion; and showing them that health and justice exist for them right where they live.

These efforts are recognized across the nation.

The Honorable Harold M. Tollefson, Mayor of Tacoma, Washington and the president of the National League of Cities, said, "We are disturbed at recent charges . . . that the antipoverty program has been responsible for stirring up unrest. The antipoverty program in city after ctiy has been responsible for just the opposite of that."

Because of the riots and the problems they reflect, Cardinal O'Boyle of Washington, yesterday called for the development of a stronger antipoverty program "whatever the cost."

Last Friday, John Lindsay, the Republican Mayor of New York, defended the antipoverty program strongly when asked if the arrest of four young participants reflected the failure of the program. "It is not the failure of the program," he said. "Since July 1, we have recruited 35,000 youngsters . . . in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. If you only recruit youngsters who never had a problem or never will have a problem, then the program is a failure."

Let me back up these comments with additional facts.

In the 27 cities that have had riots this summer, there are 12,128 persons who are direct employees of OEO funded agencies. Most of them neighborhood workers, health aides, clerical staff, community organizers, live in or near the ghetto neighborhoods in which the riots occurred. In these 27 cities, a total of 6,733 persons were arrested. In the same 27 cities, *six* of the 12,128 paid poverty workers were arrested. To date, none of the six has come to trial and none has been convicted.

In 27 cities, the total estimated damage to buildings in the ghettos is $273,652,800. OEO pays the rent on 491 facilities in these 27 cities. Not a single one was burned. Not a single one was looted. And the total damage was confined to a few broken plate glass windows. Why? Because like buildings displaying the Red Cross in time of war, the people recognized that these facilities were among the few places where they could find refuge and aid.

In Detroit alone, 3,783 persons were arrested. There are *1,547* paid anti-poverty workers in that city but *not a single one is under arrest.*

Let me give you a rundown on cities and a handful of the stories of individual and group heroism that surfaced during the riots. These are the stories that largely have yet to make national headlines.

In Detroit, all the Centers on this map continued operations during the entire period of the riot. In the first two nights of the riot, these two Centers, Western and Southeastern, were open all night. All the Centers were open until 8 PM, during the night of the holocaust, and they began closing their doors an hour earlier only when the curfew was established.

This is the sub-station at 8906 12th Street, an area where some of the worst damage was inflicted—that sustained a broken window.

This is a storefront facility used by two Outreach workers. A large plate glass window on the front was broken. The repair cost, as I said earlier, is estimated at $150.

Of a total of 1,547 paid anti-poverty workers in these and other Centers in the city, 1,165 live in or in close proximity to the riot area. In the early stages of the outbursts, these men and women worked continuously, trying to calm the unruly crowds. Toward the end of the riot and even now, neighborhood workers and community organizers circulated through the area and tried to find out what help was needed in the way of food, clothing and shelter for the victims burned out.

These workers were put into action by the CAP Director, Phil Rutledge, who was assigned by the Mayor to head a special committee coordinating the efforts of private and public agencies to aid victims of the riot. The four main Centers have been used as food distribution points.

In Newark, on the first night of the riot, members of the Community Action staff attempted to disperse the crowd in front of a police station, but were unsuccessful. Throughout the riot, many of the CAP staff continued to get people off the streets.

During the worst days and nights, 30 Neighborhood Youth Corps police cadets worked 12-hour shifts. Four were at the 4th Precinct which was rushed three times by rioters. The cadets manned the communication system, took over desk duties and freed patrolmen for anti-riot duties.

"They were magnificent," said Newark Police Commissioner Dominick A. Spina.

Two hundred NYC enrollees working for the Housing Authority aided in everything from emergency food distribution to loading and unloading trucks. To the best of our knowledge none of the 2,560 NYC enrollees is known to have been involved in the rioting or looting.

In Grand Rapids, a week ago today, the Community Action Agency in that city ordered a task force of street workers into the riot area to help police. The task force consisted of 16 summer antipoverty workers. It was expanded the next night to 50. The whites in the group worked in the downtown area and the Negroes moved about the southeast side, telling folks to "cool it." Members of the group received police identification cards and some were issued bullhorns. On the second night of rioting, two of them received shotgun wounds during the performance of their duties.

The Grand Rapids press described them as a "group of young Negroes bent on trying to keep Grand Rapids cool." Captain Francis Pierce, head of the police riot squad, said "They are doing a beautiful job and, believe me, we appreciate it."

The task force of street workers is a $20,000 component of Grand Rapids $49,000 Emergency Summer Program.

In Toledo some 25 neighborhood center Outreach workers maintained the only communication with teenage rioters on Monday and Tuesday nights. In order to cool tempers, neighborhood poverty centers manned all-night telephones to take complaints and grievances, suggesting every time that they should be resolved in conversation rather than in conflict, in mediation rather than with Molotov cocktails.

In city after city, the poverty workers have tried to prevent, not cause, riots. When riots did occur, they were working next to the police and national guard to bring an end to the lawlessness.

The Grand Rapids press described them as a "group of young Negroes bent on trying to keep Grand Rapids cool." Captain Francis Pierce, head of the police riot squad, said "They are doing a beautiful job and, believe me, we appreciate it."

The task force of street workers is a $20,000 component of Grand Rapids $49,000 Emergency Summer Program.

In Toledo some 25 neighborhood center Outreach workers maintained the only communication with teenage rioters on Monday and Tuesday nights. In order to cool tempers, neighborhood poverty centers manned all-night telephones to take complaints and grievances, suggesting every time that they should be resolved in conversation rather than in conflict, in mediation rather than with Molotov cocktails.

In city after city, the poverty workers have tried to prevent, not cause, riots. When riots did occur, they were working next to the police and national guard to bring an end to the lawlessness.

In Elizabeth, N.J., for example, the director of the community action agency, after a night of high tension and some violence, convened a meeting of responsible adult leaders of the Negro community, helped them get up a list of requests, and acted as spokesman for the community in presenting these requests to the mayor. The mayor agreed to most of the requests, which were concerned solely with actions to keep tensions down, including designation of a group of men from the community to tour the streets, talk to youngsters and help keep the area calm. They wore special identifying insignia bearing the legend "Peace Keeper," which had been selected by the mayor. So far, this band of "Peace Keepers," sometimes walking the streets until the early morning hours, has proved effective in sparing Elizabeth the agony of a riot.

Last weekend, I received a telegram which summarizes how effective poverty workers have been. The telegram is from the Mayor of Newark, Hugh J. Addonizio:

"Let there be no mistake about my position in regard to the national anti-poverty program. I support the program and all it has done to bring hope to many including thousands in my own city. Any suggestion or interpretation of remarks attributed to me which suggest I am opposed to anti-poverty programs are wrong. . . . There is no mayor

anywhere in America who can say he wants the elimination of the anti-poverty program . . . programs such as our Legal Services Project, Head Start, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, our year-round pre-school and our summer recreation programs are all now indispensable parts of our community's life . . . Newark and all our cities would be worse without this program."

Whenever man-made tragedy strikes, it is popular to look for a scapegoat. But the time has come for action—not recrimination. Let us adopt the position most eloquently stated by Senator Thruston Morton who said last Wednesday: "I deplore the irresponsibility of seeking to place blame for a national tragedy. Our time of troubles will not be remedied by blatant accusations and pious political posturing." It is time also for the sense of urgent priorities which led Senator Morton to his recommendation that funds immediately be put into our cities to give jobs to the jobless and hope to the hopeless.

The facts I have presented prove that OEO offers alternatives to violence; that OEO has taught the poor to build up, not tear down; that once the riots began, OEO smothered, not fanned, the flames.

Who then is responsible for the riots? I mean ultimate responsibility, not merely who shot the first gun or looted the first store.

All America is responsible. All of us here in this room. We are all actors in this American tragedy. We are in trouble because too many Americans prefer not to know each other. Not to care about each other. As Governor Romney said just yesterday, "Most white people do not know any Negroes. Most Negroes do not know any white people." This terrible isolation is what breeds distrust and hatred.

I am not saying Americans must all become friendly with each other or that privacy is evil. I'm just saying that ignorance of our fellow citizen's needs destroys more than it protects.

Our country is destroyed when the man in the suburban house in Chevy Chase does not know about the man in the ghetto house in Cardozo.

Our country is destroyed when the affluent know more about the Beverly Hillbillies than the destitute poor in the Appalachian hollows in Kentucky or West Virginia.

Our country is destroyed when a dog on Park Avenue eats better than a human being a few blocks over on First Avenue.

Our country is destroyed when we are soft-hearted about sending slum kids to summer camp but then soft-headed about job training programs for unemployed fathers.

Our country is destroyed when the scourge of rat bites on the bodies of poor children is treated as a laughing matter and funds are denied which could put an end to this infestation.

In Chicago, an OEO program has demonstrated that rats can be eradicated on a city-wide basis. Yet, we refuse to extend our knowledge to benefit the poor of every city.

Our country is destroyed in a thousand ways like this.

It is foolish to think the country can go on like this. More and more the poor who are cut off from American life are repeating the statement of Churchill when someone tried to ignore Britain: "We will not be dealt with as part of a blob." And we in America cannot treat the poor as a blob. Their needs must be met in the same manner and speed that the appetites of the affluent are satisfied.

The need for jobs. The need for education. The need for decent housing. The need for health. The need for justice.

There must be a total elimination of poverty. Right now, OEO funding in Detroit represents only 14 percent of the need that this city has expressed. In Hartford, we are spending only six percent of that city's need. New York gets 10 percent of its need. Atlanta, 21 percent.

But we cannot use lack of money as an excuse for lack of effort. What we don't have in financial resources we must make up in human resources.

The Administration bill calls for a massive effort to create an army of volunteers for the War on Poverty to supplement the 375,000 Americans who, this year alone, joined with us in the battle. But, in addition to this citizens volunteer corps, why can't the successful businessmen in our cities devote a few hours a week to working with the struggling businessmen in the slums?

Why can't a Catholic or Protestant parish in a suburban area adopt a church in the inner city?

Why can't our country clubs allow poor children to swim in the pool on Mondays when the clubs are closed?

Why can't architects devote some of their time to working with the poor to build new communities?

In short, why can't all Americans begin to use the alternative of democracy—because without democracy, there is no alternative.

In conclusion, I want to say a word about ghettos. Right away we think of a city slum. But there is another kind of ghetto—an interior ghetto of the mind where we seal off parts of democracy that don't suit us, where we box off our obligations to justice and shut out our commitments to fairness. This ghetto of the mind is no less stinking and rotten than the ghetto of the city.

Right now, all of us have ghettos to get out of. The sooner we begin, the sooner this country can become what its founders meant it to be.

In truth, the War on Poverty is not being fought for the poor. It is for all Americans—because all Americans stand to gain by it. Not just with peace in our cities, but also peace in our hearts.

Five years ago a young and valiant President, speaking on the steps of the Capitol of the United States, spoke these words:

"To those peoples in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich."

What President Kennedy, five years ago, pledged to the poor and destitute beyond the shores of America, we must *now*, both pledge and give to those who live in the ghettos of our cities and the blighted areas of rural America.

We must do it "Not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right."

CUT THE LITIGATION—SAVE THE NEW HAVEN

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the New Haven Railroad, which serves the Connecticut Fifth Congressional District, which I represent, faces possible liquidation within the next 60 to 90 days unless immediate action is taken to effect the merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central Railroads, and to insure the inclusion of the New Haven in the Penn Central system.

Because the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has intervened in the litigation concerning the proposed merger which has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, I have urged Attorney General Ramsey Clark to speed pending cases to permit immediate approval of the proposed merger under the conditions outlined by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I include herewith a copy of my letter to the Attorney General:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1967.

Hon. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has intervened in the proposed merger of the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads, which has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission and therefore I am directing this letter to you.

The New Haven Railroad, which serves the District which I represent, faces liquidation within the next 60 to 90 days unless immediate action is taken to effect the merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central Railroads and particularly to insure the inclusion of the New Haven in the Penn-Central system.

Litigation of the proposed merger has already created delays which have proved costly to the New Haven. Further delays will result in the disintegration of the New Haven and I, therefore, urge you to take action in the courts which will facilitate and not impede this merger and the inclusion of the New Haven therein. With the same interest in mind, I also urge you to recommend the immediate acquisition on a lease basis of the New Haven by the Penn-Central system, upon approval of the merger and pending completion of formal take-over agreements.

The urgency of stabilizing the New Haven has been clearly defined and the disaster to the economy of New York, Connecticut, and other New England States which would result from its closing is well known to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal government.

At the time of the recent railroad strike, the nation became painfully conscious of the importance of uninterrupted railroad service to the economy of the nation and to our defense production and military efforts. Connecticut is one of our country's arsenals and the impact of the liquidation of the New Haven would be felt not only in the States immediately affected, but also in our war effort. It should be remembered also that the economic welfare of more than 9,000 employees of the New Haven is at stake and this is a vital consideration.

Because of the involvement of the Justice Department in this matter and the delays which have brought the New Haven to the point of collapse, I emphasize to you as Attorney General the need for speedy action and the necessity to move pending litigation to permit immediate approval of the proposed merger under the conditions outlined by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] 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 Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, along with others I have been severely critical of the trend of the Federal Government taking over governmental functions and services that could be handled better at the State and local levels; and certainly, nothing has occurred to change my thinking in this area.

However, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an administration-sponsored proposal that seeks to avoid centralization in Washington of one of our most important consumer protection services. I am referring to the proposed legislation to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act (H.R. 6168) which includes provisions designed to aid the States in strengthening their own programs.

For some time, I have shared with others a deep concern over the fact that not all meat products are inspected to assure consumers of their wholesomeness. I have been concerned, too, with the great disparity between local, State, and Federal rules and regulations governing the inspection, sanitary processing, and labeling of meat products.

Most people mistakenly believe that all meat products are inspected. Consequently, they are apathetic or outright opposed to any suggestions that State and local governments need additional funds to step up meat inspection activities. Too few realize the hazards now present to their health, and the opportunities for fraud and deception that accompany weak or nonexistent State or local inspection programs.

The truth of the matter is that the Federal meat inspection program—which is so ably administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Service—applies only to those firms which conduct part or all of their business across State lines.

It does not apply to those firms which operate solely in intrastate commerce. The inspection of this important segment of the meatpacking industry is the responsibility of State and local governments.

Even with rapid transportation and widespread marketing, the amount of nonfederally inspected meat and meat products in this country is significant. Approximately 19 million head—or 15 percent of the commercially slaughtered animals—are slaughtered in plants which do not have Federal inspection. In addition, an estimated 8¾ billion pounds—or about one-fourth of the commercially processed meat products—are produced and sold without Federal inspection. Many of these products are subject to State or local laws, but significant amounts are sold without any form of Government inspection.

While most of the States have some form of meat inspection law, only slightly more than half of the States require mandatory inspection. Further the degree to which these State laws are implemented varies greatly between States.

Most States recognize the need for new or improved inspection programs. During the past year, 18 actively considered meat inspection legislation, although not all of them succeeded in passing their proposals. Unfortunately, most States are confronted with a shortage of money and trained manpower with which to support effective, mandatory meat inspection programs for products produced and sold within their own borders.

In view of this situation, one might think that the Federal Government should bring all meat inspection under its Federal program, But, that is not the intent of the administration's proposal. Rather, it seeks to provide Federal assistance to the States to enable them to strengthen their own programs and to provide a means by which the States and the Federal Government can coordinate the respective efforts.

Specifically, the proposed legislation includes provisions through which USDA and a State can cooperate in the development and administration of a State meat inspection program. To qualify, the State must have a meat inspection law imposing mandatory inspection and sanitation requirements for intrastate operators comparable to Federal requirements.

Cooperation would include furnishing advisory assistance in planning and developing the State program, furnishing technical and laboratory assistance, and aid in the training of inspection personnel. Up to 50 percent of the estimated total cost of the cooperative program would be furnished by the Federal Government.

In addition, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to appoint advisory committees of State officials to help evaluate State programs and develop better coordination and uniformity between State and Federal systems.

Consumers expect and demand a wholesome supply of meat and meat products that are free of adulteration, truthfully labeled and processed under sanitary conditions. They do not care who provides the service—their concern is that they be protected.

By working together, as proposed, Federal and State governments can fulfill their obligation to protect the health and welfare of consumers. The protection demanded can thus be provided.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1, 1967.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with considerable regret that I submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Public Works effective today.

It has been a privilege and honor for me to work with the many fine Members of this Committee during the 89th and 90th Congresses. My association with and participation in the deliberations of this group will always remain a pleasant and rewarding experience.

Sincerely,

JOE SKUBITZ.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 837), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 837

Resolved, That JOE SKUBITZ, of Kansas, be and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. RODINO), for Tuesday, August 1, on account of official business.

Mr. KORNEGAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for July 31 and August 1, on account of official business.

Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), on account of official business.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), 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. OLSEN, for 1 hour, on August 10.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, tomorrow, August 2, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUILLEN (at the request of Mr. BUSH), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN), for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material in the Committee of the Whole today on military construction bill.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BUSH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. UTT.

Mr. HUNT.
Mr. BUCHANAN.
Mr. DENNEY.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TIERNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. IRWIN.
Mr. MOORHEAD.
Mr. O'HARA of Michigan.
Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts.
Mr. COLMER.
Mrs. SULLIVAN.

SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rules, referred as follows:

S. 63. An act for the relief of Dr. Enrique Alberto Rojas-Vila; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 64. An act for the relief of Dr. Luis Osvaldo Martinez-Farinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 491. An act to determine the rights and interests of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 528. An act to place in trust status certain lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 741. An act for the relief of Rumiko Samanski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 811. An act for the relief of Valentina Sidorova Parkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 828. An act to amend section 5(b) of the Act of March 18, 1966 (Public Law 89–372), so as to make the prohibition contained therein on the filling of certain vacancies in the office of district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania inapplicable to the first vacancy occurring after the enactment of such Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 946. An act to amend the Tucker Act to increase from $10,000 to $50,000 the limitation on the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts in suits against the United States for breach of contract or for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1105. An act for the relief of Dr. G. F. Valdes-Fauli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Dr. Francisco Monts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1394. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Santiago Vidal Santiago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1406. An act for the relief of Dr. Jorge Mestas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1410. An act for the relief of Tran Van Nguyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Duk Hee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1471. An act for the relief of Dr. Hugo Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1482. An act for the relief of Dr. Ernesto Nestor Prieto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1483. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro Lopez Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1500. An act for the relief of Dr. Adela Aurora Rubio Madariaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1525. An act for the relief of Dr. Mario R. Garcini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1544. An act for the relief of Jose Eduardo Aunon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1557. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos E. Garciga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1606. An act for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Dr. Maria del Carmen Trabadelo de Arias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1898. An act for the relief of John Anthony Bacsalmasey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro;

H.R. 1564. An act for the relief of Antonina Rondinelli Asci;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of John Joseph Shea;

H.R. 1724. An act for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa;

H.R. 1814. An act for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro;

H.R. 1818. An act for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos;

H.R. 2532. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket numbered 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez;

H.R. 3631. An act to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land;

H.R. 5224. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh;

H.R. 5862. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves;

H.R. 5996. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcelo;

H.R. 6098. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9080. An act for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Munoz; and

H.R. 11089. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the Employees' Life Insurance Fund.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled Joint Resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 31, 1967:

H.R. 6098. An act to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1967:

H.R. 11089. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide additional group life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment insurance for Federal employees, and to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 2, 1967, 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:

966. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a set of recently issued publications entitled "Prevention of Power Failure," pursuant to the provisions of section 202 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

967. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

968. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in behalf of certain aliens, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

969. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

970. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the manpower and training needs of the States and of local governments in water pollution control, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–753; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 43. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the San Felipe division, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; with

amendment (Rept. No. 523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5784. A bill to authorize the disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile (Rept. No. 524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5787. A bill to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5788. A bill to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (Rept. No. 526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 839. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that members of the Armed Forces shall be retired in the highest grade satisfactorily held in any armed force, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2630. A bill to provide for the furnishing of a uniform and the presentation of a flag of the United States for deceased members of the National Guard; with amendment (Rept. No. 528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 5645. A bill to revise the provisions of title 10, United States Code, relating to the recoupment of disability severance pay under certain conditions (Rept. No. 529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8009. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the restriction on the use of certain private institutions under the dependents' medical care program (Rept. No. 530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 8375. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize a dislocation allowance under certain circumstances, certain reimbursements, transportation for dependents, and travel and transportation allowances under certain circumstances, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 10242. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the authorized strengths by grade for medical officers on active duty in the Army, Navy, and Air Force; with amendment (Rept. No. 532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 11144. A bill to authorize an increase in the number of Marine Corps Reserve officers who may serve in an active status in the combined grades of brigadier and major general (Rept. No. 533). 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. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 11962. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 11963. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11964. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 11965. A bill to suspend for 10 years Federal benefits for conviction of rioting and prohiting entitlement to such benefits thereafter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 11966. A bill to amend section 320 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the authorization of funds for designing and constructing bridges on Federal dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 11967. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 11968. A bill to provide for the training and equipping of the National Guard in riot control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 11969. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the transportation and shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of alligators and alligator hides taken in violation of Federal or State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H.R. 11970. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 11971. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman need not have been married to a man for any particular period of time prior to his death in order to qualify as his widow for benefit purposes if he was a member of the Armed Forces drawing combat pay when he died; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11972. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental retardation to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 11973. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 11974. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of certain losses sustained by patrons of cooperative organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 11975. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 11976. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 23, 1955 (ch. 375, 69 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 11977. A bill to provide for the training and equipping of the National Guard in riot control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 11978. A bill to increase the effectiveness of certain student loan insurance programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 11979. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 11980. A bill to promote the general welfare, foreign policy, and national security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 11981. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 11982. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 11983. A bill to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 11984. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 11985. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11986. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain legal public holidays on Mondays, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11987. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasible and desirable means of establishing a marine sanctuary in the Santa Barbara Channel, Calif.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 11988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 11989. A bill to repeal subsection (c) of section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, to permit adjustment of status of persons from the Western Hemisphere on the same basis as other aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 11990. A bill to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 11991. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 11992. A bill to provide for public disclosure by Members of the House of Representatives and by candidates for such office and to give the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct appropriate jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself and Messrs. FEIGHAN, RODINO, McCULLOCH, and MOORE):

H.R. 11993. A bill to amend the act of October 3, 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 11994. A bill to restrict the disposition of lands acquired as part of the national wildlife refuge system; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ECKHARDT (for himself, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 11995. A bill to assist State and local governments by authorizing grants to States and units of general local government for improvements in law enforcement and

criminal justice, and to establish a National Police Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 11996. A bill to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime, to increase the effectiveness, fairness, and coordination of law enforcement and criminal justice systems at all levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 11997. A bill to recognize the essential nature of police work by amending the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to provide for the deferment of police officers (including highway patrolmen) from induction into the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 11998. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which tickets to professional, semiprofessional, and amateur baseball, football, basketball, hockey, and soccer games will be furnished at no cost by local police officers and firemen to individuals under the age of 19, particularly such individuals who are economically underprivileged; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 11999. A bill to authorize certain real property to be used for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCLURE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 12000. A bill relating to the Federal share of the cost of certain Federal-aid highway projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 12001. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to expand the jurisdiction of U.S. commissioners relative to petty offenses committed within Federal lands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 12002. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Quechan Indians of the Fort Yuma Reservation, Calif. and Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 12003. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to authorize marketing orders with respect to blackberries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12004. A bill to amend the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956 to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 12005. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 12006. A bill to provide for equitable acquisition practices, fair compensation, and effective relocation assistance in real property acquisitions for Federal and federally assisted programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 12007. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the most feasible and desirable means of establishing certain portions of the tidelands, bays, and estuaries, Outer Continental Shelf, seaward areas, and Great Lakes of the United States as marine sanctuaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 12008. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 12009. A bill to transfer to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia the functions, powers, and duties of the National Capital Planning Commission and certain other instrumentalities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12010. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Wheeling Creek Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention District compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 12011. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Surgeon General of the United States to provide food and medical services on an emergency basis from unexpended funds previously appropriated for UNICEF, UNO, and UNESCO, to prevent loss of life and nutritional diseases; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 12012. A bill to encourage worldwide interest in U.S. developments and accomplishments in military and related aviation and equipment by authorizing Federal sponsorship of an international aeronautical exposition in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 757. Joint resolution to establish a national housing goal; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.J. Res. 758. Joint resolution concerning a neighborhood action crusade; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GOODELL (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. COWGER, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. RUMSFELD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. MIZE, Mr. BATTIN, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. QUIE, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. POLANCO-ABREU, and Mr. SAYLOR):

H.J. Res. 759. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.J. Res. 760. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban slum dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAILLIARD (for himself, Mr. LAIRD, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. KLEPPE, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, and Mr. ESHLEMAN):

H.J. Res. 761 Joint resolution concerning a neighborhood action crusade; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.J. Res. 762. Joint resolution to establish a national housing goal; to the Committee on Bank and Currency.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN:

H. Con. Res. 442. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Select Committee To Investigate Civil Disorders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H. Con. Res. 443. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Select Committee To Investigate Civil Disorders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. Con. Res. 444. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Select Committee To Investigate Civil Disorders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 445. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Select Committee To Investigate Civil Disorders; to the Committee on Rules

By Mr. LENNON:

H. Con. Res. 446. Concurrent resolution creating a Joint Select Committee To Investigate Civil Disorders; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 838. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 839. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Res. 840. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H. Res. 841. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation of the cause of recent riots in large metropolitan areas; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 842. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 124; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H. Res. 843. Resolution creating a select committee to study the impact of East-West trade and assistance to nations which support aggression, directly or indirectly; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12013. A bill for the relief of Alberto Sciuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 12014. A bill for the relief of Theodore Alkousakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12015. A bill for the relief of Takio Nozu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 12016. A bill for the relief of Wong Kang Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 12017. A bill for the relief of Curt Arvid Knoppel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 12018. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Matta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 12019. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the B'nai B'rith Henry Monsky Foundation in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 12020. A bill for the relief of Maria I. Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12021. A bill for the relief of Serafim da Cunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 12022. A bill for the relief of May Avila Bermudez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12023. A bill for the relief of Jaime Pico de Vera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 12024. A bill for the relief of Lourdes E. Samonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 844. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 4058) entitled "A bill for the relief of the JE-IL Brick Co." to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H. Res. 845. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 11961) entitled "A bill for the relief of S. Leon Levy" to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

135. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the executive vice president, National Rivers and Harbors Congress, relative to the report of the projects committee of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, prepared at the annual convention of the association, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Salute to the President of Girls' Nation, Miss Cathy Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call to the attention of the Congress the election of Miss Cathy Johnson of Birmingham, Ala., as president of Girls' Nation.

Cathy, who has just finished her junior year at Shades Valley High School, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Johnson. She is a member of the National Honor Society, French National Honor Society, French Club, American Friends Service Club, pep squad, History Club, a representative on the student council, and will be president of usherettes at her school next year.

A straight "A" student, Miss Johnson is a member of the Shades Valley Presbyterian Church in Birmingham. Prior to her election as the national president, Cathy was elected Alabama Governor of Girls' State and led the Alabama delegation at the 21st annual session of Girls' Nation, now in progress at American University.

Girls' State, culminated by Girls' Nation, is the youth citizenship training program conducted annually by the American Legion Auxiliary to give high school juniors experience in the process of government, preparing them for their approaching citizenship responsibilities.

Girls' State sessions are held each year in State capitals in which high school juniors chosen for qualities of leadership set up their own miniature city, county, and State governments run by the rules of procedure based on State and local law. From Girls' State two senators are selected to represent their constituents at Girls' Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that the future of our country rests with our youth. The girls participating in the Girls' Nation convention are preparing themselves for the role they will soon assume in their society. With young people of the quality of these fine young ladies in the Girls' Nation convention taking an active interest in public life, America can look to the future optimistically.

We in Alabama are especially proud of our delegation and of Miss Cathy Johnson. She represents the type of high-thinking, progressive leadership we in Alabama would like to be characteristic of all our political leaders. It is natural then that we have followed with interest the rise of this outstanding young lady. It is with great pride that the people of Alabama salute Miss Cathy Johnson on her election as president of Girls' Nation.

Republicans and Rats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, most of the Republican membership in this body decided to make a party issue of the Rat Extermination Act of 1967. Seventy-nine percent of them refused to permit that bill to come to a vote. They demonstrated party solidarity. And by doing so they killed—or tried to kill—one more positive program to help the poor and the city dweller across the Nation.

The Republicans say they are against rats. Yet, they refused to let this body vote the modest sum of $20 million for a Federal assistance program to control and eliminate rats.

The Republicans also say they are for Federal aid to education. Yet, most of them supported proposals which seriously threatened the continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Republicans say they are for helping the poor, yet they propose bills which would dismember the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican vote against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 is part and parcel of the same vote against people and cities which the Republicans have been casting for 50 years.

They have demonstrated again that they are out to retard President Johnson's progressive domestic programs—thus they vote against rat extermination, children, and the poor.

When the people get all the facts on the callous Republican vote against rat control, there is going to be a popular reaction which will surprise even the most hardened of my Republican colleagues.

The Republican vote against the Rat Extermination Act of 1967 is a vote against the cities.

Mr. Speaker, it almost amounts to a vote against health and for disease. Certainly, it is a vote against urban rehabilitation.

And it is an insult to all of us in the body who want to move America forward by supporting President Johnson's compassionate urban programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge those of conscience in this House to reconsider the Rat Extermination Act and vote the modest 2-year assistance program the President has recommended.

Hon. Christian A. Herter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this Nation lost a great statesman with the passing of the Honorable Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts. He was an accomplished, dedicated, and devoted public officeholder and continued to serve his Nation until the time of his death.

Christian Herter served honorably and well in our State Department at the beginning of his long and varied career of public service. He served as a member of the Massachusetts State Legislature and was Speaker of that body. He served here as a Member of Congress for five consecutive terms and compiled a most distinguished record here. He was admired and respected by all who knew him in the Congress. His leaving this body to return to Massachusetts was regretted by members of both parties. He served two terms as chief executive of the State of Massachusetts. He then returned to the State Department as Under Secretary and finally as Secretary of State.

His abilities were recognized by leaders of both our great political parties and by many of those here who numbered him among their friends.

Mr. Herter served as Secretary of State under President Eisenhower. He was then appointed Special Assistant for Trade Negotiations by President Kennedy, a post he retained under President Johnson. His efforts on behalf of inter-

national trade expansion for this country will long be remembered.

He is missed not just here but throughout the world.

My deepest sympathy is extended to his family.

Results of 1967 Public Opinion Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Congressman, I felt it was extremely important to me to know the feelings of the people I represent in the First Congressional District of New Jersey, and for this reason, I distributed a public opinion questionnaire to my constituents.

Their responses have proven to be extremely valuable and show the great concern they feel about the many serious issues facing our country.

The question which seemed to arouse the greatest amount of interest and comments among my constituents was the one involving the war in Vietnam, a matter of concern to all of us. Sixty-nine percent of those polled favored mounting a strategically sound effort for military victory: 17 percent favored holding key positions and trying to negotiate a settlement; only 7 percent favored continuing our present course, and 7 percent favored withdrawing as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD the seven questions and the answers to my 1967 public opinion questionnaire:

[Results in percent]

1. What should we do about Vietnam?

Continue our present course	7
Mount a strategically sound effort for military victory	69
Hold key positions and try to negotiate a settlement	17
Withdraw as soon as possible	7

2. Do you favor a surtax of 6 percent on personal and corporate income tax?

Yes	13
No	87

3. Do you favor expanding trade with communist oriented countries?

Yes	27
No	73

4. Do you believe the executive branch of the Government is providing the people with adequate, factual, information about what it is doing?

Yes	21
No	79

5. Do you favor sharing of federal taxes with state and local governments without federal control?

Yes	53
No	47

6. Do you favor the establishment of a new Hoover-type commission to help streamline and reorganize the Federal Government?

Yes	78
No	22

7. Do you favor taking politics out of the Post Office Department, and requiring Postmasters and others to be selected on merit alone?

[Results in percent]

Yes	95
No	5

Job Corps at Camp Breckinridge, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in past weeks we have heard considerable discussion about the effectiveness of our Federal antipoverty programs in dealing with the enormous problems of the disadvantaged Americans. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a report on the Breckinridge Job Corps Center in Kentucky which shows the dramatic success of the work going on there to train 1,800 young men to be productive members of society. This center exemplifies the nationwide success that we continue to read of all the Job Corps centers.

The report which I have referred to was written by the distinguished Member of the House, Representative FRANK HORTON, from the 36th Congressional District of New York. The distinguished Representative has firsthand knowledge of this success story from his recent visit to the center to deliver the commencement address to a graduating class of 34 young men. His report indicates that these high school "dropouts" are on the road to developing a commitment, not only to a useful occupation, but even more significantly, to a better way of life which emphasizes the breaking away from a poverty-welfare existence and moving upward to independence and self-esteem.

I would like to urge my colleagues to read Congressman HORTON's findings at Breckenridge and for the benefit of those who have not seen his article, I include it in the RECORD:

SALVAGING THE NATION'S REJECTED YOUTH

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

A few days ago, I had the opportunity to see a new edition of the American dream taking shape in the state of Kentucky. People from Rochester and the 36th Congressional District are closely involved in making the dream come true.

Early in 1966, Graflex, Inc., one of the fine corporations in the 36th District, contracted with the Federal government's Office of Economic Opportunity to take over operation of the Men's Job Corps Center in Breckenridge, Kentucky.

When I arrived last week in Breckinridge at the invitation of Graflex board chairman Gaylord C. Whitaker to tour the center and deliver a commencement address, about 1,800 young men were being trained in 11 different occupations, including general automotive repair, service station operation, small and marine engine repair, automotive sales, auto repair, welding, heater and burner repair, electronics, landscaping and nursery work and the culinary arts.

"Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime." That's the Breckinridge philosophy which Mr. Whitaker voiced at the commencement exercises and it is working.

A typical Job Corpsman entering the camp is between 16 and 21 years old, has a reading level equal to a fifth-grader, has completed only 7 years of formal schooling, is 7 pounds underweight and, in most cases, has never held a steady job. Nearly half are from broken homes, half come from families on the relief rolls and 8 out of 10 never have been examined by a doctor or a dentist. Ten per cent have been punished for a serious crime.

The Job Corpsmen have their own student "government" with officers and regular meetings to consider camp affairs. Combine this with the valuable training received in many manual arts, and you have the beginning of a man of responsibility. I was greatly impressed with the dedication and enthusiasm of two of the student leaders who served as our guides during a tour of the Breckinridge camp, Governor Noah Williams and Sandy Phillips, Secretary of State, both studying electronics.

I addressed a group of 34 Corpsmen who spent about 9 months at the camp. The investment made in them, both in money and manpower, is significant. But it represents only a fraction of the cost which local, state and federal governments would have spent in maintaining them through relief programs if they did not receive the fine training available there.

Seven out of ten stay in the program and complete it. Arrest rates for Job Corps graduates are about half the national average. The benefit that the Job Corps gives in re-creating human dignity is, of course, immeasurable. Certainly, there are problems in the administration of some centers. But this is inevitable, considering the vastness of the program. The Job Corps system works—I am convinced of that.

At the commencement ceremonies, I told the graduates and spectators: "You are the living examples of the success of this program. The fact that 34 graduates stand ready today to go into the job market means that both you and Breckinridge have confidence that you have successfully learned a valuable occupational skill. My only advice to you is that you apply the same hard work toward developing this skill after you leave here as you applied in learning the skill under the guidance of the Breckinridge staff. As businessmen from Graflex and other successful companies have told you, there is no substitute for a skilled, honest and reliable worker."

The Breckinridge operation is a prime example of the way in which private industry and the Federal government can cooperate to make this country move forward. Graflex took on this job with the confidence that it could do the job well. That confidence has been borne out, and I am proud of my Graflex constituents for their contribution. The Job Corps program, while far from perfect, is a realistic answer for the nation's disadvantaged youth. Hope has replaced despair, and economic equality is the result.

In Tribute to John E. Franson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on July 22, John E. Franson, forest supervisor of the

national forests in Mississippi, succumbed to a heart attack. He was a good and respected friend, and an outstanding leader in promoting the conservation and use of forest resources in Mississippi.

During his long years of dedicated public service with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Forest Service, he also applied his professional skills on national forests in Michigan, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania.

He inspired fellow employees and State and county officials to actions aimed at better protection and conservation of natural resources. He did an exceptional job of communicating to public officials and the public, all activities and accomplishments on the national forests.

Mr. Franson's leadership manifested itself in the initiation of progressive management programs on the Mississippi national forests and in a strong spirit of cooperation with the State's public and private agencies directed toward better mutual understanding and working relationships. This resulted in such achievements as improved wildlife habitat, an effective range management program, more road construction and better road design, fewer forest fires and less damage to the State's natural resources, and jobs for people on forest beautification and recreation projects.

Indeed, the State of Mississippi has lost one of its most ardent champions of conservation. His good works remain with us.

The 45th Birthday of Radio Station WJAG, of Norfolk, Nebr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT V. DENNEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, if our democracy is to maintain its strength and vigor it must be grounded in a strong public interest. As we all know, newspapers and radios contribute strongly toward an informed citizenry and, therefore, to strong public interest in our Nation.

Radio station WJAG, of Norfolk, Nebr., has recently celebrated its 45th birthday. It is to this station's 45 years of continual public service that I call the attention of my colleagues.

One of the oldest stations in the Midwest, WJAG has not changed ownership since it obtained its first Federal license on July 26, 1922. Founded by Gene Huss, and now directed by his son, Jerry Huss, this broadcasting organization has been expanded over the years to four stations now called the Beef Empire stations.

Bob Thomas, a good friend and another second-generation son of the station, is the very able vice president and general manager of the Beef Empire stations. His father, Art Thomas, was a past manager of WJAG.

Mr. Speaker, WJAG and other stations like it have made the job of representing our constituents well considerably easier by their continual efforts to educate their listeners on the issues and events of our country. It is fitting and proper that we recognize WJAG's contribution in this area as she celebrates her 45th birthday.

A New Awareness of the World in Which We Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the vast network of communications systems linking distant continents together today has given Americans a new awareness of the world in which they live.

And this awareness has fathered an insatiable curiosity about the philosophies, problems, objectives, customs, and traditions of other nations and peoples.

Through newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals, the most primitive aborigine in the deepest jungles of Africa becomes a very believable person with social, political, and economical problems just as real as those which face Americans themselves.

Concern for and interest in people of other nations among an informed society is certainly understandable, since knowledge spawns tolerance and understanding. These are key ingredients in a free world society characterized by international friendships.

On the other hand, misapprehension and mistrust are dangerous seeds being sown by those who would profit by promoting suspicions among nations. Such intrigue must not go unchallenged.

While government and free enterprise organizations are actively working to establish highly favorable relations with other peoples, we must reach out in other directions to find new methods of promoting a more favorable national image. This is a responsibility which should be borne by every American.

Each of the more than two million Americans who travel abroad each year has the opportunity to perform a real service for his country. Through his personal contacts with the residents of foreign nations, the individual tourist becomes an extension of our diplomatic service and an ambassador-without-portfolio in the countries through which he is traveling.

Many American travelers possess impressive credentials, such as the knowledge of customs, traditions, and language of foreign nations. Obviously, they are well equipped to serve the best interests of their country while traveling abroad.

Unfortunately, other Americans are ill equipped to represent their country while visiting other nations. They are indifferent to the values of individual diplomacy and this indifference contributes to the success of those who would create suspicions about our great Republic.

A growing awareness of what constitutes the highest standards of individual diplomacy has given birth recently to a number of privately financed programs whose explicit purpose is to educate the American tourist on his responsibilities while traveling abroad.

One such program is being conducted today by Club Internationale, a nationwide vacation club whose members save in advance for low-cost, luxury vacations. The club is headquartered in Washington and, within less than 3 years, has grown in membership to more than 15,000 persons in 35 chapters across the United States.

Club Internationale was established explicitly for the purpose of placing foreign vacations within the financial range of those who might not normally be able to afford them. But beyond the vacation program itself, the club sponsors a unique people-to-people program designed to equip members with the essential tools of effective individual diplomacy.

Through programs sponsored by individual chapters of Club Internationale, members have the opportunity to participate in language lessons and cultural studies, and to correspond with people in whose countries they will be visiting. And special arrangements with foreign governments permit members to actually visit in the homes of foreign nationals in order to savor more fully the customs and traditions of various foreign countries.

These principles of good international relations are further reflected through other activities. For instance, one Club Internationale chapter has adopted an Ecuadorean child through the Foster Parents Plan, Inc., and is helping to pay for such essentials as his education, food, and clothing.

Such programs are certainly worthy of our recognition and support.

House Hearings on Consumer Credit, Truth-in-Lending Legislation To Begin Monday, August 7, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, House hearings on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill passed by the Senate on July 11, and on a comprehensive consumer credit protection bill, H.R. 11601, will begin next Monday, August 7, 1967, in the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

So many requests are coming in from organizations wishing to be heard during the hearings that it will be necessary to schedule afternoon as well as morning sessions, even though there may be interruptions in the afternoon sessions because of business on the House floor.

S. 5, as passed by the Senate, requires an annual percentage rate disclosure on all finance charges in credit transactions

except for first mortgages, open end or revolving charges such as made by department stores, and on transactions on which the cost of credit is $10 or less. Business and commercial credit transactions are also exempt.

H.R. 11601, which I introduced as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, joined by five other subcommittee members as cosponsors—and cosponsored, also, in a separate bill, by numerous other Members of the House—contains all of the disclosure requirements of S. 5, but none of its exemptions except for business and commercial credit transactions. Thus, it includes first mortgages and revolving charges, and does not set a minimum figure for coverage.

BROAD COVERAGE OF CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION BILL

In addition, H.R. 11601 would establish a Federal ceiling of 18 percent on the annual percentage rate of any consumer credit transaction, unless the States have lower ceilings. Also, it would prohibit the garnishment of wages for the satisfaction of debts; it would create a National Commission on Consumer Finance to make an investigation of the entire consumer credit industry; it would also give to the Federal Reserve Board of Governors standby powers to restrict or regulate consumer credit in periods of national emergency, and to establish minimum margins for trading in commodity futures contracts.

In view of the far-reaching nature of some of the proposals in H.R. 11601, and in view of the fact also that the House committee has not previously held hearings on truth-in-lending legislation, we intend to make every effort to provide an opportunity to those organizations which want to be heard on this legislation to testify before us.

However, we do not plan to permit the hearings to drag out over a long period of time. Hence, we are requesting witnesses to submit their written statements in advance for inclusion in the record and for review by members of the subcommittee prior to the hearing, so that we can devote the time to questioning of witnesses and, thus, speed up the proceedings.

I have assured President Johnson, Speaker McCormack, Chairman Wright Patman of the parent committee, and others who are anxious to have effective truth-in-lending legislation enacted in this session, that we will do our best to get a good bill out of the subcommittee reasonably soon. Whether it will contain all of the provisions of H.R. 11601 will depend largely upon the nature of the information we are able to develop in the hearings beginning next Monday.

The schedule of witnesses will be made public after confirmation of tentative assignments has been received from prospective witnesses with whom the subcommittee has been in contact.

COSPONSORS OF CONSUMER CREDIT PROTECTION BILL

Consumer Affairs Subcommittee members who have joined me in introducing H.R. 11601 include Representatives Henry B. Gonzalez of Texas, Joseph G. Minish of New Jersey, Frank Annunzio of Illinois, Jonathan B. Bingham of New York, Democrats; and Seymour Halpern of New York, Republican.

An identical bill, H.R. 11806, introduced by Representative Abraham J. Multer of New York, ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is cosponsored by Representatives William A. Barrett of Pennsylvania, Peter W. Rodino, Jr. of New Jersey, Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin, Leonard Farbstein of New York, Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois, William F. Ryan of New York, Fernand St Germain of Rhode Island, Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York, Robert L. Leggett of California, Spark M. Matsunaga of Hawaii, James J. Howard of New Jersey, Joseph P. Vigorito of Pennsylvania, Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii, Joseph Y. Resnick of New York, James H. Scheuer of New York, and Frank J. Brasco of New York, all Democrats.

Numerous other bills on consumer credit pending before the subcommittee are restricted, as is S. 5, to credit disclosure requirements only.

What Is This?—Blackmail?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, in February 1959, Lyndon Johnson, then Senator, urged a group of members of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives, meeting in the Capital, to fight for their rights in Congress, saying:

> I don't know how many beer bottles you folks have, but the time has come when you must ask no quarter and give none. Fight them . . . in the corridors of the Capitol, in each House, generate public opinion, support your organization—and eventually, if necessary, use your beer bottles.

Democrat Congressman Thomas G. Abernethy, on the House floor on July 25, 1967, criticized the President for seeking minority votes by joining their chant, "We Shall Overcome."

Vice President Humphrey, speaking in New Orleans on July 18, 1966, stated:

> If I had to live in a slum, I think you would have had more trouble than you've had already, because I've got enough spark left in me to lead a mighty good revolt.

With top leaders of our country making such statements, it is easier, to understand, but no less reprehensible, when militant civil rights leaders travel the country making inflammatory statements and speeches.

Stokely Carmichael, now showing his true Red color in Havana, in a speech in Florida referred to the bricking up of walls where formerly windows had been broken by Molotov cocktails. He said:

> We are coming back next time with dynamite.

In Havana he said:

> This fight is not going to be a simple street meeting. It is going to be a fight to the death.

His successor as head of the Student "Nonviolent" Coordinating Committee, H. Rap Brown, is presently free on bail, accused of inciting the Cambridge riots. Among many inflammatory statements of which he is quoted were:

> I don't know who burned the school down, but you should have burned it down long ago.

And—

> You better get yourselves some guns.

When arrested, he said:

> We built this country and we'll tear it down.

At a more recent press conference, Brown stated:

> If Washington, D.C., don't come around, Washington, D.C., should be burned down.

Max Stanford, field chairman of the Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM—a highly secret all-Negro, Marxist-Leninist, Chinese-Communist-oriented organization, had been in frequent contact with Stokely Carmichael. He threatened to "disrupt the whole country," and called for "burning down Washington," and said:

> If we don't get justice, we're going to tear this country apart.

Since 1961, according to the Library of Congress, there have been 128 riots of national importance in the United States; some involving Negroes, some whites, and some both. Most of these were racial disturbances.

With each new riot, a representative of the Urban League, or the NAACP, or CORE, or some other Negro group, blames it on the lack of Federal spending for poverty elimination, and states emphatically that riots will continue until massive funds are channeled into the ghettos.

What is this? Blackmail? How can anyone define it in any other terms? Have Americans become so conditioned to such illegal pressures that they no longer speak up? When Castro demanded ransom, we paid it in spite of a great outcry from those who retain a spark of the American spirit and courage which prompted those immortal words, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

And since then we have witnessed repeated use of this dirtiest of all pressure tactics in both national and international affairs, and with each failure to oppose it, blackmail has come more to be considered an honorable means of obtaining that which logic and argument cannot convince has merit.

The answer to these grasping, ungrateful, power-seeking leaders should be for Congress to declare that help will be forthcoming in direct proportion to the degree of self-help evident in an area. It does not cost anything to clean a place up; it takes only effort to clear weeds and remove trash; it requires but one thing to start an improvement program, and that is desire. Then, and only then, when the effort has been started, should funds be provided for grass seed, for building

materials, and for other necessities, and for job training.

Spending of massive sums in urban renewal types of slum clearance is but a temporary wash job unless it is accompanied by massive efforts by those who have influence—the white and Negro leaders of the area—who will devote their talents to uplifting the slum residents to self-sufficiency. How much more constructive and really helpful would such a leader be than one who exhorts to murder, robbery, and arson.

The funds spent for welfare, antipoverty programs, job training, housing, and urban renewal have run into the billions. The projects have been sold on the basis of helping to eliminate the ghettos, the slums, and poverty generally. As project upon project has been added, and million dollars upon million dollars, so have riots increased in size, intensity, and numbers.

The idea has proved wrong, just as the welfare state throughout history has failed. Yet, with every new disturbance, the same voices are heard condemning those who will not vote for enlarging the very plans which have failed so miserably.

Congressman ABERNETHY rightfully criticized the liberal elements of both parties for sowing the seeds of rebellion. The riots are the result "of the political bidding contest the two parties have been engaged in, in their all-out effort to get the minority racial vote," he said. In spite of all the assistance given, the situation worsened because, as he said, "The black power boys came back for more, and more, and more, and more."

As Dr. Joseph Jackson, great Negro leader of the National Baptist Convention, says:

> No sociologist has yet told us what corrupts the human spirit more, poverty or wealth. I am convinced that men have the power to withstand and defy an evil environment.

We hear that these ghettos are tinder dry, and just waiting for a spark to ignite them into an inferno, that such ignition is spontaneous when conditions get to a certain combination of elements, just as a fire starts by spontaneous combustion in a home. Rubbish. Consider the "elements" of the Detroit riot.

Police raided an after-hours drinking establishment at 5 o'clock on a Sunday morning—nice lawful endeavor, so the police were wrong in interfering. "Spontaneously," 200 bottle-and-rock-throwing persons gathered at 5 a.m. Then, again "spontaneously," fires erupted throughout the neighborhood. Firemen raced to the scene, and, as they got out to begin battling the blazes, sniper fire broke out from the rooftops. It was a consistent pattern throughout the area—but it was "spontaneous."

Again I say, rubbish. Unrehearsed mobs do not gather and then disperse through an area, with individuals each doing the identical thing in an identical way at an identical time. Our police departments in these major cities are not the "town constables" of bygone days. They know what is going on, and how it is being done, and would have the situation in hand, if they were not forced by higher authority to use kid gloves.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, now in his 50th year in that agency, can hardly be considered ill-informed. Describing the Negro riots, he said:

> Communists and other subversives and extremists strive and labor ceaselessly to precipitate racial trouble and to take advantage of racial discord in this country. Such elements were active in exploiting and aggravating the riots, for example, in Harlem, Watts, Cleveland, and Chicago.

Our Attorney General, the top law-enforcement official in the Nation, thinks our crime is merely a social problem. So long as he thus continues to think, just so long will hoodlums, whether so-called civil rights leaders or not, continue to enforce their demands upon society by the pure and unadulterated blackmail now being used.

Today, according to some estimates, there are 15 million poor families. Give them each $5,000 a year, for a total cost of $75 billion annually, and what would we have? One hundred seventy-five million people would be poorer; the 15 million families would have lost that much more self-respect and self-reliance, and riots would increase. Instead of being thankful for the $5,000, many would be looking at those making $10,000 and would be rioting to force additional "massive Federal funds" to eliminate the ghettos of poverty.

One of the basic problems is that the administration promised far more than it could give, legislatively or financially, and gave far more than could be responsibly absorbed. The Negro people can be helped, but self-help must be accompanied by self-responsibility, and remain a major portion of the assistance program. In the meantime, insurrection must be stopped, and now is the time.

The War Profiteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1967

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, has been a longtime leader in the congressional fight to curb wartime profiteering.

In an article in the August 1967 issue of the Progressive magazine, entitled "The War Profiteers," Mr. GONZALEZ charges that "the sudden and tremendous upsurge in procurement" for the war in Vietnam in the past 18 months has loosened Government procurement practices and set the stage for profiteering.

He notes that "in fiscal 1966 prime contract awards soared to $38.2 billion, an increase of more than $10 billion" over fiscal 1965, and that estimates for prime contracts in fiscal 1967 range as high as $45 billion.

Mr. GONZALEZ asks if the Renegotiation Board, the Government agency created in 1951 to beat back the profiteers during the Korean war, will be able to do a thorough job in recovering excess profits from Vietnam war contractors.

The issues that Mr. GONZALEZ raises in his thoughtful article are of great concern to this body. Therefore, I insert the article in the RECORD at this point and urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

THE WAR PROFITEERS

(By HENRY B. GONZALEZ)

During a war, it is necessary for a nation to mobilize both its human and material resources—men, arms, equipment, and other supplies. But there is a crucial difference in the ways by which men and property are pressed into service for war.

Men are drafted. If they are in the prescribed age bracket and otherwise qualify, they are mobilized, willing or not. The civilian who is conscripted into the military sacrifices the comforts of his family, his home, his job, his security, and possibly his life. The individual has no opportunity to bargain or negotiate for his pay and benefits. His compensation is fixed by law and it is pitifully low.

Property, on the other hand, is purchased, much of it through the awarding of contracts by the government, usually at great profit to corporations.

One would suppose that those persons who supply the government with property in time of war would be willing to do it without exacting excessive profits. In light of the heavy sacrifices by those who go to war, those who do not fight but who benefit from the war by doing business with the Government should at least be expected not to take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

But the facts make it clear that profiteering is taking place on a considerable scale and there is evidence that it is on the upswing.

"War profiteering" apparently is an unmentionable subject in Washington. Even the independent Renegotiation Board, established in 1951 to beat back the profiteers during the Korean War, prefers the term "excess profits." Nevertheless, the Board made determinations of excess profits in the amount of $24.5 million in fiscal year 1966. This money was returned to the U.S. Treasury by private contractors. In addition, $23.2 million was received by the Government through "voluntary refunds" and "voluntary price reductions" in connection with renegotiation proceedings. These recoveries, although small, are all the more remarkable in light of what Congress has done to the Renegotiation Board since it was created in 1951.

War profiteers grow fattest and richest when elected public officials, the press, and other news media ignore the issue. It is in the absence of public attention today that the profiteer can successfully push his special interest legislation with one hand while pocketing "excess profits" with the other.

There was a time when war profiteering was a more glamorous and a more newsworthy issue. Some of us can recall the headlines made by the then Senator Harry S. Truman with his extensive Senate investigations into profiteering during World War II.

The War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, predecessor to the present Board, recovered more than $11 billion dollars in "excess profits" from private contractors doing business with their Government during World War II. More than $800 million was recovered in the aftermath of the Korean War. The real question is, how much got away?

The reason that profiteering increases in

time of war is easily understood. During such periods the Government's need for supplies and materials increases suddenly to great heights. The requirement for speed in production eliminates the opportunity for often long, cautious negotiations, careful surveys, and other steps which sound purchasing policy otherwise requires. The practice of inviting bids for Government contracts is set aside; competition decreases and often disappears. The forecasting of costs of production becomes impossible except as a matter of guesswork. As a result, contractors, in seeking to guard against contingencies and often for less justifiable reasons, skyrocket their costs. It is during this crucial time, when the nation's need is greatest but its ability to proceed with caution is least that negligent and unscrupulous dealings are widely practiced.

Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin, chairman of the Economy in Government Subcommittee, recently said that when he found out how the Defense Department is currently spending its enormous budget—an annual average of $1,600 for each American family—it "shocked me out of my chair."

No better example of the taking of "excess profits" exists than the one documented by the case of *Boeing Airplane Co. v. U.S.*, decided by the United States Tax Court in 1962. Boeing had attempted to charge, as a legitimate expense on its Government contract for military aircraft, the cost of the design, development, and construction of the prototype of the 707 commercial airliner.

Another item claimed by Boeing as a legitimate expense against its contract was $629,000 for "institutional" advertising, selling expense, and entertainment expense. The court found that the "institutional" advertising consisted in Boeing keeping its name before the public as a producer of commercial aircraft. This is not a new practice. Then Senator Harry S. Truman wrote in *The Progressive* in 1943 of parallel abuses in World War II, and pointed out that "the advertising costs the corporations practically nothing because the taxpayer foots the bill."

In the Boeing case the selling expenses were incurred in connection with its commercial business, and the entertainment expense was in part for the purchase of meals and the general entertainment of visitors and business associates. None of these items was allowed by the court.

Boeing had appealed a $9.8 million determination of excess profits by the Renegotiation Board. The court determined that Boeing owed the government not $9.8 million, but $13 million in excess profits, underscoring the weakness, or at least the moderation, of the Renegotiation Board. But renegotiation cases seldom reach the courts. If they did there might well be more Boeing-type cases.

A North American Aviation, Inc. case, decided by the Board in 1962, held that the company had received excess profits in the total amount of $16.5 million. And a $10 million refund of excess profits was obtained from General Motors in 1958, as a result of a Congressional investigation into the production of the F081F airplanes.

It is no surprise, then, that there is a movement to abolish the Renegotiation Board, or that among the strongest members of the movement are the aerospace industries. In a letter dated March 23, 1966, the Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc. stated to the House Ways and Means Committee:

"This association is convinced that expiration of the [Renogotiation] Act would not harm the nation's defense effort and would not increase the cost of procurement."

It is the level of procurement and the relative rate of procurement that determines the profiteer. As an obvious example, Government procurement reached record high levels in an extremely short period with the outbreak of World War II. A similar situation occurred with the Korean War. Vietnam, until recently, has been somewhat different. It is the sudden and tremendous upsurge in procurement that loosens up Government—mainly Defense Department—practices and sets the stage for profiteering. For Vietnam there was no sudden upsurge until last year.

For several years preceding 1966, procurement and prime contract awards by the Department of Defense had remained at a high but a fairly steady level. In fiscal year 1964, prime contract awards totaled $28.7 billion. In fiscal 1965, the figure even declined, to $27.9 billion. But in fiscal 1966 prime contract awards soared to $38.2 billion, an increase of more than $10 billion or approximately thirty-nine per cent in a one year period—a sudden and tremendous upsurge.

The figures for the first six months of fiscal year 1967 show a twenty-eight per cent increase over the 1966 figures. The best estimate projects about a twenty per cent increase for the full year, which will place prime contract awards for 1967 at $45 billion. This amount will be the highest dollar amount in any year since World War II, including the Korean period. Inevitably these increases will add a greater workload to the Renegotiation Board and will hopefully result in large recoveries of excess profits. But how well-equipped is the Board to do a thorough job?

The Government's earliest attempts to curb profiteering resulted in the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934. This law, as later amended, fixed profits on shipbuilding at ten per cent and on aircraft at twelve per cent. Unfortunately, neither the Vinson-Trammell Act nor subsequent attempts to restrict excessive profits by building safeguards around the contract itself worked as intended. Vinson-Trammell contractors simply padded their costs to defeat the statutory percentage limitation on profits. Cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts; lump sum contracts; escalator clauses; permitting price adjustments in accordance with fluctuations of labor and other costs; and letters of intent to negotiate a formal contract were all tried without material success.

With the experience of World War I, when profiteering reached a zenith, and the failure of Vinson-Trammell, still fresh in Government circles, the principle of renegotiation was introduced at the outset of World War II. Under the Renegotiation Act of 1942 the Government reserved the right to renegotiate wartime contracts by procurement officials. Thus, a contractor may be called upon to refund to the Treasury that portion of his profits for the fiscal year examined—on contracts with Government departments named in the Act—which are determined by the Board to be excessive.

The Renegotiation Act of 1951 made the Board independent for the first time. But the Act is temporary and must be renewed every two years. The 1951 Act was strong and sound. It enabled the Government to recover more than $800 million in connection with contract awards during the Korean War, in addition to large voluntary refunds.

Beginning in 1954, however, a series of amendments was pushed through Congress with the intent of *reducing* the ability of the Board to do the job intended. For example, under the original Act, contractors whose prime contract awards totaled at least $250,000 during the fiscal year were subject to renegotiation. The 1954 amendments raised the floor to $500,000. In 1956 the floor was again raised, to $1 million.

An even more serious limitation on the Board's ability to police the profiteers is the multitude of exemptions that have been inserted into the Act. Contracts for "durable productive equipment," meaning machinery, tools, or other productive equipment with a useful life of more than five years, are exempt. There is an exemption for "Standard Commercial Articles or Services"—articles customarily maintained in stock by the contractor, the commercial non-governmental sales from which constitute at least thirty-five per cent of the total sales of that article during the fiscal year. This covers a huge range of products and services.

Other limitations now include an exemption for construction contracts let by competitive bidding, a five year carry-forward loss provision, and elimination from the Act of a number of Government agencies which were originally covered. These agencies include the Coast Guard, Department of Commerce, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Canal Zone Government.

There is a time lag of about eighteen months between the awarding of prime contracts and the time they come before the Renegotiation Board for review, if they ever do. So the impact upon the Board's activities as a result of the huge step-up in Defense procurement for Vietnam has not yet been felt. When it does hit, it will confront a Board hamstrung not only by statutory limitations and with its jurisdiction narrowly defined. It will also find a Board seriously reduced in manpower. The Board's activities are conducted today with less than twenty-five per cent of the personnel it had during the Korean War.

The profiteers who intentionally gouge the Government for excessive profits during a time of war are also guilty of consciously withdrawing efficiency from our industrial capacity. These private-businessmen profiteers are in reality guilty of sabotage.

It is a peculiar system of national values when young men are vilified and sent to the penitentiary for refusing conscription—a method of coercion the opposition to which was responsible in large part for the formation of the United States—while contractors and corporate executives are permitted to stay home and profiteer off the people in a time of war. In light of the heavy sacrifices made by the men who do the fighting and dying, one would expect that those who do business with the Government would not take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

Our history has been one of rampant war profiteering, and I am convinced, as even the limited annual reports of the Renegotiation Board reveal, that profiteering is going on now, is increasing, and will continue to increase unless something more realistic is done to stop it. For this reason, I have introduced legislation to put some meaning into renegotiation. My bill, H.R. 6792, would bring the floor for contracts subject to renegotiation back down to $250,000, eliminate the all important standard commercial articles exemption, eliminate the competitive bid-construction exemption, eliminate other exemptions with respect to subcontracts, and place TVA under coverage of the Act.

These changes would restore the Board to approximately the condition it was in and the strength it had at the outbreak of the Korean War. There is no excuse for not taking proper safeguards against profiteering. By confining the Board the way it is restricted at present, we have, in effect, locked up the policeman on the beat in the middle of a crime wave.

But powerful forces are moving to do just that. Last year a serious effort was made to kill the Board by not extending the Renegotiation Act. The Act was extended, until 1968. An even more serious effort to kill it will surely be made next year. In the meantime, an investigation of the Renegotiation Act was authorized. Both the law and the Board have been examined and investigated several times. The latest Congressional investigation of the Board was as recent as 1962.

What we ought to be investigating is not

the Board, but profiteering itself. A full-fledged Congressional investigation into profiteering, in which the names of contractors and corporations who have taken excessive profits in the past would be revealed, and in which the appropriate officials could be examined, would be both a revealing and an enlightening lesson. It could lead to important new legislation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 2, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Dr. Maggart B. Howell, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Waco district, Waco, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, upon whose truth our country was formed, by whose mercy we remain a nation:

We praise Thee, great, good, graspable God, for our Republic—these sacred Halls, Thy servants who minister here, and the citizens who have sent them. We are Thine. This is Thy world, not ours.

We repent of our sins in it, littleness when we ought to have been big, dullness to our brother's need, blindness to Thy truth, way, life; love of ease instead of painful pursuit of godly growth, loose living contrary to the disciplined life. Do Thou forgive us!

God bless America, land that we love. Help us restore law and order coupled with a compassion for the exploited least of our brethren. Grant us to see that "obedience to law is liberty"; that we can be free only as we accept the shackles of freedom. Enable us to be not so much our brother's keeper as our brother's brother. Give us concern instead of complacency, sharing in place of selfish indulgence. Sustain our sons and daughters in Vietnam. Assist us to find peace in justice for all people. Give us perspective to know what is right, and courage to do it.

We pray for our President and the Congress. Grant these our brothers wisdom for decisions, courage for proper action, stamina to persevere in their tedious tasks, the will to please God rather than men. Keep their families; nurture their children; guard their homes.

And now, O God, we commit ourselves to Thee "to serve this present age, our calling to fulfill. Oh, may it all our powers engage to do our Master's will." In Christ's name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 1680. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lessie Edwards;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of Sevasti Diakides;

H.R. 4015. An act for the relief of T. Michael Smith;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Alfredo F. Mondez, M.D.;

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; and

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 1517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Matteo Groppo;

H.R. 1532. An act for the relief of Dr. Alfredo A. Navarro;

H.R. 1564. An act for the relief of Antonina Roundinelli Asci;

H.R. 1612. An act for the relief of John Joseph Shea;

H.R. 1724. An act for the relief of Hwang Duk Hwa;

H.R. 1814. An act for the relief of Giovanni and Francesco Urga-Ferraro;

H.R. 1818. An act for the relief of Marina Panagiotis Restos;

H.R. 2532. An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma in docket No. 303 of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3221. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Cross;

H.R. 3522. An act for the relief of Dr. Rafael F. Suarez;

H.R. 3631. An act to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land;

H.R. 5224. An act for the relief of Dr. Guillermo Fresco De Jongh;

H.R. 5862. An act for the relief of Dr. Juan F. Chaves;

H.R. 5996. An act for the relief of Dr. Bernardino D. Marcelo; and

H.R. 9080. An act for the relief of Federico de la Cruz-Munoz.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1674. An act for the relief of Frank I. Mellin, Jr.;

H.R. 1680. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lessie Edwards;

H.R. 2668. An act for the relief of Sevasti Diakides;

H.R. 4015. An act for the relief of T. Michael Smith;

H.R. 6666. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilyn Shorette;

H.R. 7324. An act for the relief of Alfredo F. Mondez, M.D.; and

H.R. 8254. An act for the relief of Jan Drobot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11722. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 31, 1967, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and subcommittees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

Committee on the Judiciary.

Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Roger W. Heyns, of California, to be a member of the National Science Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., of New