

Maj. Gen. Keith Lincoln Ware, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Raymond Chandler Conroy, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Glenn David Walker, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Melvin Zais, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Charles Gribble, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Philip Seneff, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Leon Rowney, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Norton, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be brigadier generals

Col. George William Dickerson, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Leo Edward Benade, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Roy Skiles Kelley, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Joseph Warren Pezdirtz, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Theodore Antonelli, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Arthur Godding, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Sammet, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Carter Fuson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Bennison Fulton, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Welch Stone, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. James George Kalergis, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Harry Lee Jones, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Mack Tarbox, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. George Philip Holm, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Thomas Gleason, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Russell Reed, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Paul Young, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Edward Potts, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Joseph Hennessey, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Gordon B. Cauble, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Robertson Ward, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Victor Lee Cary, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Oscar Esko Davis, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. John Wilson Dean, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Richard Jackson Allen, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Don Rue Hickman, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. David Simuel Henderson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. James George Shanahan, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Marshall Bragg Garth, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Ralph Julian Richards, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Darrle Hewitt Richards, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Howard Harrison Cooksey, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lewis Frederick Shull, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Kenneth Wade Kennedy, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Charles William Fletcher, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Dean Dunlop, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Henry Phipps, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Melvin Armand Goers, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Lewis Edward Maness, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Albert Edward Hunter, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George William McCaffrey, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Dunwoody Blackburn, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. John Winthrop Barnes, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Rex Herbert Hampton, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Eugene McLeod, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold Halsey Dunwoody, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Verne Lyle Bowers, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Maurice Jacob Halper, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Vincent Henry Ellis, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas King Trigg, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. William Warren Cobb, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Col. Clifford Pershing Hannum, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. James Vance Galloway, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Fred Kornet, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Herbert Eric Wolff, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Sidney Bryan Berry, Jr., [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold Edward Parker, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Col. James Shira Pegg, [XXXXXX], Dental Corps, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

Vice Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Marion E. Carl	Clifford B. Drake
Arthur H. Adams	Wallace H. Robinson,
Louis Metzger	Jr.
Jonas M. Platt	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward J. Doyle	Edwin H. Simmons
Leo J. Dulacki	Robert B. Carney, Jr.
Harry C. Olson	Herman Poggemeyer,
Carl W. Hoffman	Jr.
William G. Johnson	William C. Chip
Henry W. Hise	Ralph H. Spanjer

U.S. AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Thomas R. Aaron, to be colonel, and ending Roland A. Tremblay, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 2, 1967 (11AF).

U.S. ARMY

The nominations beginning Jack V. Doriot, to be colonel, and ending Dorothy R. Street, to be major, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 4, 1967 (9A).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed is the man whose strength is in Thee.—Psalm 84: 5.

O God, our Father, grant unto us the spirit of understanding and good will as we face the glory of a new day by waiting upon Thee in this moment of prayer. We would be still in Thy presence and

receive the strength which sustains us, the wisdom which makes us wise, and the peace which holds us steady through troubled times.

Forgive our impatience revealed in discouragements, outbursts of temper, and hasty words we so often regret. Forgive our impetuosity made known in worried attitudes, careless conversation, and hurried actions for which we are so repeatedly sorry.

Strengthen us to do our best in this hour of our Nation's need—to think constructively, to speak courageously, and to act confidently that here in this place men may see democracy in action and democracy at its very best. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 17, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2531. An act to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek Judgment Fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of intestate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs;

H.R. 4809. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willifred S. Shirley;

H.R. 5967. An act for the relief of Albert P. Morell;

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of John E. Coplin; and

H.R. 7362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain properties within the Colonial National Historical Park, in Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes.

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

S. 292. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, in order to exempt from the provisions of such section certain transportation of merchandise which is in part over Canadian highways;

S. 294. An act for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro;

S. 1165. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians;

S. 1872. An act to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION FOR CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR SEPTEMBER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Thursday, August 24, or any subse-

quent day, to consider a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the month of September.

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

There was no objection.

SHORT WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said, both on the floor of the House and elsewhere, concerning the 3-day legislative workweek.

The general public, quite understandably, does not understand nor condone such a practice.

I join with my colleague, the Honorable JAKE PICKLE, of Austin, in his remarks as referred to by the editor of the Corpus Christi Times on Monday, August 14, 1967.

In order to bring these remarks to the attention of the entire Congress, I place this excellent editorial in the RECORD at this point:

SHORT WEEK

Rep. Jake Pickle of Austin recently voiced an old complaint of western congressmen against their eastern colleagues' "T-to-T Club." That is the group of members whose districts are within easy commuting distance of the capital who, with House and Senate leadership connivance, get tacit consent that no serious business will be done on the floors of Congress except on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays so they can take four-day weekends mending political fences, doing private business, and being with family and friends at home.

Even if this three-day work week does not apply to much committee activity, where most of Congress' actual work is done, it nevertheless seriously drags out congressional sessions. This is the session that President Johnson last fall thought might be finished up by early summer, but now it is likely to run to late in the fall.

Three of the 15 regular appropriations bills have yet to be passed for the fiscal year that is already over a month old. And Congress in late summer still has much major legislation to complete—the President's tax bill, foreign aid, the anti-poverty program extension, the anti-crime bill, just to mention a few of top importance.

Pickle's point is glaringly underlined by Congress' delay on the Johnson anti-crime bill. During the worst of the recent urban rioting, the House broke off debate on that bill on a Thursday to resume the following Tuesday. With time running out in the nation's crisis of violence, so did Congress.

COVERAGE OF POSTAL AND OTHER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES UNDER THE LANDRUM-GRIFFIN ACT

Mr. HECHLER. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to require postal and other Federal employee unions to be subject to the reporting, disclosure, and other provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

In a democracy, it is very healthy to shine the searchlight of publicity on all groups associated with the legislative and political process. It is true that these unions are subject to rather loosely drawn provisions of the lobby registration and corrupt practices acts, but everyone around here realizes that the full facts and figures of postal union financing and political activities, for example, are under cover. The big and powerful postal unions are like icebergs, and the people have a right to know the nature of what goes on beneath the surface.

We have seen that there is an unholy alliance between the big bulk mailers and the big postal unions, teaming up to demand low rates on third-class mail and sky-high salary raises for postal employees which run the postal deficit higher and higher. This Congress will vote and I will enthusiastically support a pay increase for all Federal employees, but I trust it will be a sensible increase instead of the runaway boost demanded by some postal union officials.

Many of these problems of extreme pressure, frequently against the public interest, would be minimized if the Congress carried out the suggestion of Postmaster General O'Brien that the Post Office be made a Government corporation.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

PURCHASE OF LAND FROM TEXAS SOUTHMOST COLLEGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 472) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that this deal now proposed is in behalf of Southmost College at Brownsville, Tex.

In 1950 this college was granted by the Federal Government some 42 acres, together with 75 buildings, comprising old Fort Brown, at no cost to the college. It seems strange indeed that almost immediately after the grant of this land and buildings, with an appraised value of some \$250,000, the Department of Agriculture immediately found it necessary to locate a research station on the property. The college, in 1953, constructed a building for a research laboratory for the Department of Agriculture at a cost of some \$72,000, and with an annual rental of almost \$11,000, which means that in the 10 years following 1953 the building was more than paid for, and still the rental continues, although at a reduced rate.

I say again that it seems strange that

the Department of Agriculture determined so quickly, after the college took possession of this property at no cost, that it needed a laboratory. It is one of the deals we find all too often in the handling of the affairs of this Government.

Now the taxpayers are asked to put up \$125,000 for the purchase of this laboratory and about 4 acres of land pertaining to it, after having spent well above \$100,000 for a lease of the building which cost originally \$72,000.

I hope that in the future this Government will manage its affairs with a view to savings for the taxpayers of this country rather than windfalls for colleges and other institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection for the loss to the Federal Government has already been incurred and I am not aware of any recovery that can now be obtained.

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

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

H.R. 472

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to acquire by purchase, with any funds available for agricultural research, one and nineteen one-hundredths acres and three and sixty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less, as improved, out of the motor transport area fourteen and six thousand seven hundred fifteen ten-thousands acres in the Fort Brown Reservation in Brownsville, Cameron County, Texas, and now leased to the Government of the United States for research purposes.

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.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE SAC AND FOX INDIANS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10566) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 10566

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma, and the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska that were appropriated by the Acts of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81), and October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133), to pay judgments by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 138 and 143, together with interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and other litigation expenses, shall be divided as follows:

36.91 percent to the Sac and Fox Tribes of the Mississippi in Iowa;
51.70 percent to the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma; and
11.39 percent to the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska.

The funds so divided, including the interest thereon, and the funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska that were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 195, including interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and other litigation expenses may be used, advanced, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing bodies of the respective tribes and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. Any portion of such funds that may be distributed per capita to the members of the respective tribes shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

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

TO AMEND THE ACT OF OCTOBER 3, 1965

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11993) to amend the act of October 3, 1965.

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

Mr. HALL, Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like very much to know why this bill should be considered by unanimous consent in view of the fact that the Commission has been established, although belatedly; second, why the report does not include a statement as to who the Commissioners are, either in the other body or in this body, or the ones appointed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, although this involves no additional cost to the Government, according to the report, it does seem as though it would have had an opportunity to have completed its work and made its final report. I question whether or not such vague statements as are made in the bill and the report of the committee thereunto warrant continuing another study commission in this day of "commissions" to study all things.

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOORE. I might say to the gentleman from Missouri, the reason behind this legislation being considered on the Consent Calendar is the fact that the five members of the Select Commission on the Western Hemisphere from the House of Representatives jointly submitted for consideration of the House the legislation which we have before us, H.R. 11993. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], for and on behalf of himself and the other House members of this Commission, who are the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], and myself coming from the State of West Virginia, submitted this legislation. So it had the unanimous support of the Commission members who were the representative members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that information. Then do I understand that the five cosponsors, or the original sponsor and four cosponsors of this bill,

are the House appointed members of the Commission and, if so, does it say so in the committee report accompanying the bill?

Mr. MOORE. The report itself does not so indicate. It is deficient in that respect. However, on the Consent Calendar the legislation is shown to have been authored by Mr. CELLER for himself and for Messrs. FEIGHAN, RODINO, McCULLOCH, and MOORE. If I may further respond to the gentleman's inquiry, the funds appropriated for the select Commission's work amounted to \$800,000. The Commission has as of this time spent approximately \$107,000 of the authorized amount.

If I may anticipate and perhaps suggest a question, it would be, Why would an extension of the July 1, 1968, date for the imposition of a ceiling on Western Hemisphere immigration be delayed for 1 year, which is what is anticipated by this proposed resolution? In anticipating this question, I say in answer to the gentleman that the Commission, and in fact a good portion of the Members of the House and the Members of the other body did not realize when we passed the amendments to the immigration law in 1965, we made applicable to the Eastern Hemisphere and also as well to the Western Hemisphere an amendment, which I authored, which required labor certification for any intending immigrant to enter the United States. This requirement of the law, which was an amendment provided for by the immigration law changes of 1965, has had the effect of slowing down immigration into this country from the Western Hemisphere countries.

The Commission feels that in having an additional year to report to the House, they would have the facts and the figures which would be accumulated over that year concerning the operation of labor certification requirements of the law. Then we would be better prepared to come to this body, and to the other body with a report which would meet the approval of both bodies.

The interesting factor, if I may further respond to the gentleman from Missouri, is that since the amendments to the act of 1965, the number of Western Hemisphere immigrants has been materially reduced by reason of the operation of that amendment, to the point where last year the total number of immigrants to the United States from the Western Hemisphere nations approximated 128,000 people, out of which would normally come a group, which, if the ceiling were imposed, would not be counted, they being the spouses and children of U.S. citizens.

Actually, the 120,000 figure has not been reached; but, net immigration has been materially below the 120,000 figure.

Mr. HALL. Further reserving the right to object, and I thank the gentleman from West Virginia again for his lucid explanation, and I certainly wish to commend the committee and this House upon working its will on requiring labor certification, and I hope it will continue to do that. Personally, I am one who is happy that we have not reached the automatic ceiling.

But is it not true, I will query the gentleman from West Virginia, that this

also as a secondary part of the proposed legislation—we are considering by unanimous consent—extends for 1 year the period of the automatic ceiling of 120,000 such immigrants? In other words, it defers for 1 year the clapping on of that automatic ceiling? Is that not also a part of this legislation?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct. This does delay the imposition of that ceiling of 120,000 for 1 year.

In the event that this legislation, and this authority sought by this legislation, be not given, the difficulty with which we are confronted is that if a ceiling goes into effect on July 1, 1968, and the Commission has not had the opportunity or has not made its complete report, it would have the effect of permitting 120,000 immigrants to come into the United States from the Western Hemisphere countries on a first-come, first-served basis. It would conceivably be possible, if there is a sufficient number of independent applicants for immigration purposes say, for instance, from Brazil that would have registration dates prior to other intended immigrants from other countries, for us to get the 120,000 Brazilians and no other Western Hemisphere immigrants would be admitted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] this question: Does this extension of time—of applying the ceiling—in any way resolve unto the Commission itself the powers of the Congress and of its legislative intent?

Mr. MOORE. I would say to the gentleman, none whatsoever.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Now, is it a correct statement that the work of the Commission was delayed because the five Presidential appointees were not designated for some 7 to 11 months?

Mr. MOORE. I think that is a fair assumption; that that is a fair statement of the facts.

The House of Representatives acted very promptly. As a matter of fact, within 9 days the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed the five House Members to this Commission. The other body acted 1 month later. I will use the dates—on October 12, 1965, the Speaker appointed the five House Members, and in November the other body added its five Members.

It was not until June 1966 that the Chief Executive appointed what we call the public members of this Select Commission.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman name those for the information of the body?

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. In reply to the gentleman's inquiry, the Members from this body, as I have indicated, are Mr. CELLER, Mr. RODINO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. MOORE. The members from the other body are Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HART, and Mr. HRUSKA.

The public members of the select

committee are Mr. Scammon, Mr. Farrell, Mr. Rutenber, Mr. Gordon, and Mr. Leo Cherne. There has been one resignation from the public members of the Commission, Mr. Gordon, one of the Under Secretaries of State, has since been appointed to the presidency of Johns Hopkins University, and Mr. Covey Oliver, Under Secretary of State, has been appointed in Mr. Gordon's place.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that information, inasmuch as it was omitted from the report of the committee.

I would next ask the gentleman, what about the Commission and its activities with regard to the Cuban refugees into the United States?

Mr. MOORE. May I say that the Commission does have, if you will look at the legislative mandate which is given to it, the duty to look into the problem of Cuban refugees. However, the ceiling itself does not anticipate presently meeting the problem of the Cuban refugees for this reason: that the manner in which Cuban refugees are handled today and their entrance into the United States comes under another provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. I should say to the gentleman that it is a provision which has been in the act since its codification in 1952, and this is the authority which has been delegated, although we are not satisfied in some instances that the Chief Executive uses it as we in the Congress felt that it would be used, but this is a provision of parole under 212(d) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act wherein the President of the United States under certain circumstances can authorize parole into the United States of certain individuals who meet the criteria of the law. He has extended the right of parole to the Cuban refugees, therefore their admission to the United States has been accomplished in that manner.

May I say to the gentleman that there is a continuing operation of the airlift, and every Cuban refugee that comes into our country by the airlift comes under the provisions of the parole section of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and they are not touched by this legislation.

Mr. HALL. They are not touched either by the ceiling that would be automatically imposed of 120,000 if this legislation does not pass, as of July 1, 1968, nor are they affected by the studies of this Commission since they come under a separate parole section of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as revised and amended in 1965.

Is that what the gentleman is saying? Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Now, would the Commission have any effect on the some 2,700 U.S. citizens who are alleged to be held incommunicado, or otherwise, or not being released and paroled, or held in prison, anent the takeover by Castro in Cuba, and the Communist regime there at the present time?

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

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MOORE. I believe the gentleman might well recall that I brought to the attention of the House some time ago that there were approximately 2,700 U.S. citizens—actually, there were 800 U.S. citizens, together with their spouses and children making 2,700, being held in Cuba, and who were not being permitted the opportunity to leave Cuba.

If they did leave it was necessary that they take Cubana Airlines going into Mexico, or some other country in the Western Hemisphere, and not allowing them direct admission to the United States. And I did maintain, I believe the gentleman will recall, that I felt that we should terminate the airlift until such time as we got our U.S. citizens out of Cuba.

I am pleased to report, in responding to the gentleman's question, and to report to the House, that the negotiations have been successful and are underway, and that a number of U.S. citizens that were in Cuba at the time I raised the point here on the floor are now in the United States.

But I must also say to the gentleman, to be completely honest in this presentation, that again Castro will not permit them to come directly from Cuba to Florida by airlift, but he makes it necessary for those individuals to incur the expense of going to Mexico or to some one of the other Western Hemisphere countries and then subsequently be brought into the United States.

As to the U.S. citizens who are in Cuba, this legislation will not affect them in any manner.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's response. The gentleman is obviously well grounded and knowledgeable as to the Immigration Act which, of course, he had a large part in helping us to rewrite on the House floor when it was passed in 1965.

In view of the gentleman's statement and in view of the apparent need for haste in order to extend this date to January 15, 1969, and other extensions therein; and in view of the fact that there is no additional cost to the Government, but realizing that we are pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the Chief Executive as a result of his delay in appointing his members on the Commission, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

H.R. 11993

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 21(c) of the Act of October 3, 1965 (79 Stat. 920), is amended by striking out "January 15, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 15, 1969".

Sec. 2. Section 21(e) of the Act of October 3, 1965 (79 Stat. 921), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1968" and "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969" and "July 1, 1969", respectively.

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

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC FINANCE, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the majority leader if this has been cleared on this side of the aisle?

Mr. ALBERT. I am informed that this has been cleared by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

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

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 678, PROVIDING DISPOSITION OF FUNDS IN FAVOR OF UPPER AND LOWER CHEHALIS TRIBES OF INDIANS IN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 678) 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, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HALEY, EDMONDSON, TAYLOR, BERRY, and HANSEN of Idaho.

PROVIDING FOR DISTRIBUTION OF UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED OR THE FEDERAL CODE ANNOTATED TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 570) on the resolution (H. Res. 506) providing for the distribution of the United States Code Annotated or the Federal Code Annotated to Members of the House of Representatives, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 506

Resolved, That (a) in each Congress, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall procure for and furnish to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resi-

dent Commissioner from Puerto Rico, either one complete set of the current volumes of the United States Code Annotated, and the current pocket parts thereof, published by the West Publishing Company, Saint Paul, Minnesota, and the Edward Thomas Company, Brooklyn, New York, or one complete set of the current volumes of the Federal Code Annotated, and the current pocket parts thereof, published by the Bobbs-Merrill Company, Incorporated, a subsidiary of Howard W. Sams and Company, Incorporated, Indianapolis, Indiana, and New York, New York, as such Member or Resident Commissioner may elect, upon his written application to the Clerk containing his certification that the volumes and pocket parts thereof for which he applies are intended for his personal use exclusively.

(b) A Member or the Resident Commissioner is not entitled, during his term of office, to more than one copy of each of the current volumes, and the current pocket parts thereof, for which he applies under this authorization or to receive a set of volumes and pocket parts under this authorization and a set of the Code of Laws of the United States, and supplements thereto, under section 212 of title 1, United States Code.

(c) Until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives such sums as may be necessary to carry out this authorization.

(d) The Committee on House Administration is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this authorization.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 1, strike out "in each Congress" and insert in lieu thereof "subject to subsection (b)."

On page 2, at the end of line 5, insert the following: "The complete set of the volumes and pocket parts thereof for which the Member or Resident Commissioner applies shall be furnished on a current basis for the continuous period of his service as a Member or Resident Commissioner beginning immediately after his application therefor, irrespective of the number of his terms of office covered by such period of service, and his selection of the set of such volumes and pocket parts may not be changed during such period of service. A Member and the Resident Commissioner is entitled to apply for and receive a set of volumes and pocket parts under this authorization after each break in his service as Member or Resident Commissioner."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "during his term of office," and insert in lieu thereof "for the continuous period of his service described in subsection (a)."

Also on page 2, line 9, after the word "or" insert the following: ", after the close of the Ninetieth Congress,"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FOR THE FURTHER EXPENSES OF THE INVESTIGATION AND STUDY AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 124

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 571) on the resolution (H. Res. 842) to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 124, and ask for

immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 842

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 124, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$150,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, after line 8, add the following: "Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 124.

Amount requested: \$150,000.

PAST AUTHORIZATIONS

The 89th Congress, first session; Authorized, \$250,000; expended, \$88,721.84; balance, \$161,278.16.

The 89th Congress, second session: No request; expended, \$115,112.12; balance, \$46,166.04.

The 90th Congress, first session: Authorized, \$150,000; expended, \$75,410.74; balance, \$74,589.26—as of July 31, 1967.

SUMMARY OF JUSTIFICATION FOR ABOVE RESOLUTION

Chairman RIVERS, on August 1, ordered a broadening of investigations to include a full and thorough inquiry into various phases of our national security. This immediate inquiry will accomplish the following:

First, determine the status of plans including contingency plans for effecting a military victory in Southeast Asia;

Second, determine the ability of our Armed Forces to simultaneously meet present commitments in Southeast Asia, as well as treaty obligations, including the availability of military equipment, and present and projected force levels;

Third, seek to determine the extent to which our Naval vessels require replacement, modification, or weapons improvement;

Fourth, determine the present status of major weapons systems previously authorized and funded; and

Fifth, determine the existence of any plans, studies, or recommendations, that may affect the assigned roles and missions of each of the four services.

Budget	
Salaries and fees.....	\$110,000
Travel	30,000
Telephone	2,500
Supplies	2,500
Reserve	5,000
Total	150,000

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 125 of this Congress approved \$150,000 for a 12-month period for the use of the Armed Services Committee in connection with the investigation and study of the Department of Defense activities within the scope of the Committee's jurisdiction. Through July 31 the Subcommittee for Special Investigations has been operating within this budget, and as of August 1, there is a balance of \$73,692.72.

However, on August 1, Chairman RIVERS ordered a broadening of investigations to include a full and thorough inquiry into various phases of our national security. He directed an immediate inquiry to determine the status of plans including contingency plans for effecting a military victory in Southeast Asia; the ability of our Armed Forces to simultaneously meet present commitments in Southeast Asia, as well as treaty obligations, including the availability of military equipment, and present and projected force levels. The inquiry is to encompass the possible existence of shortages in equipment and/or personnel, and determine the extent to which such shortages may be "eliminated" by directed reductions in requirements, tables of organization, combat support inventories, manning levels, and reserve stocks.

Information is also to be developed with respect to projected time estimates for achieving a military victory in Southeast Asia and the number of military personnel required to achieve a military victory, or the cessation of hostilities and the establishment of a viable government in South Vietnam.

The inquiry will also seek to determine the extent to which our naval vessels require replacement, modification, or weapons improvement; the present status of major weapons systems previously authorized and funded; and the existence of any plans, studies or recommendations, that may affect the assigned roles and missions of each of the four services.

There is attached hereto our estimated budget for the cost of this undertaking. The individual items represent our best judgment of probable costs based on our long experience in the field of investigation. I believe it is an austere budget and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the committee will approve the full amount.

Salaries and fees.....	\$110,000
Travel	30,000
Telephone	2,500
Supplies	2,500
Reserve	5,000
Total	150,000

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

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12257) to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and expand the authorization of grants to State for rehabilitation services, to authorize assistance in establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and to provide assistance for migrants, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12257

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 "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967".

GRANTS TO STATES FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

SEC. 2. Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years ending after June 30, 1968, section 1(b)(1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 31(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "and", and by inserting before the period at the end thereof "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of \$500,000,000, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of \$600,000,000".

GRANTS TO STATES FOR DEVELOPMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS

SEC. 3 Section 4(a)(2)(B) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. 34(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1967" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1968" and by striking out "June 30, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1969".

CENTERS FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS

SEC. 4. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is further amended by redesignating section 17 as section 19 and by inserting after section 16 the following new section:

"NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS

"Sec. 17. (a) In order—

"(1) to demonstrate methods of (A) providing the specialized, intensive services, as well as other services, needed to rehabilitate handicapped individuals who are both deaf and blind, and (B) training the professional and allied personnel needed adequately to staff facilities specially designed to provide such services and training such personnel who have been or will be working with the deaf-blind;

"(2) to conduct research in the problems of, and ways of meeting the problems of rehabilitating, the deaf-blind; and

"(3) to aid in the conduct of related activities which will expand or improve the services for or help improve public understanding of the problems of the deaf-blind; the Secretary is authorized to enter into an agreement with any public or nonprofit private agency or organization for payment by the United States of all or part of the costs of the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a center for vocational rehabilitation of handicapped individuals who are both deaf and

blind which shall be known as the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

"(b) Any agency or organization desiring to enter into such an agreement shall submit a proposal therefor at such time in such manner, and containing such information as may be prescribed by the Secretary. In considering such proposals, the Secretary shall give preference to those proposals which (1) give promise of maximum effectiveness in the organization and operation of the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and (2) give promise of offering the most substantial skill, experience, and capability in providing a broad program of service, research, training, and related activities in the field of rehabilitation of the deaf-blind.

"(c) The agreement shall—

"(1) provide that Federal funds paid to the agency or organization for the Center will be used only for the purposes for which paid and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section and the agreement made pursuant thereto;

"(2) provide that the agency or organization making the agreement will make an annual report to the Secretary, which the Secretary in turn shall transmit to the Congress with such comments and recommendations as he may deem appropriate;

"(3) provide that any laborer or mechanic employed by any contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on any construction aided by Federal funds under this section will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5); with the Secretary of Labor having, with respect to the labor standards specified in this paragraph, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c); and

"(4) include such other conditions as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(d) If within twenty years after the completion of any construction (except minor remodeling or alteration) for which funds have been paid pursuant to an agreement under this section the facility constructed ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed or the agreement is terminated, the United States, unless the Secretary determines that there is good cause for releasing the recipient of the funds from its obligation, shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears the same ratio to the then value of the facility as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the portion of the facility financed with such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

"(e) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'construction' means construction of new buildings, acquisition of existing buildings, and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, newly acquired, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings; and includes the cost of architects' fees and acquisition of land in connection with any of the foregoing, but does not include the cost of off-site improvements;

"(2) the determination of who are both deaf and blind shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Secretary."

SERVICES FOR MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

SEC. 5. The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is further amended by inserting after section

17 (added by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

"PROJECT GRANTS FOR SERVICES FOR MIGRATORY AGRICULTURAL WORKERS"

"SEC. 18. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State agency designated pursuant to a State plan approved under section 5, or to any local agency participating in the administration of such a plan, for not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of pilot or demonstration projects for the provision of vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who, as determined in accordance with rules prescribed by the Secretary of Labor, are migratory agricultural workers, and to members of their families (whether or not handicapped) who are with them, including maintenance and transportation of such individuals and members of their families where necessary to the rehabilitation of that individual. Maintenance payments under this section shall be consistent with any maintenance payments made to other handicapped individuals in the State under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. Such grants shall be conditioned upon satisfactory assurance that in the provision of such services there will be appropriate cooperation between the grantee and other public and private nonprofit agencies having special skills and experience in the provision of services to migratory agricultural workers or their families. This section shall be administered in coordination with other provisions of law dealing specifically with migrant agricultural workers, including title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 311 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963."

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

SEC. 6. Section 5(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C. sec. 35(a)) is amended by striking out "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (10), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph:

"(12) effective July 1, 1969, provide that no residence requirement will be imposed which excludes from services under the plan any individual who is present in the State."

MATCHING REQUIREMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 7. Effective July 1, 1968, section 11(h) (1) (B) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is amended by inserting "the District of Columbia," after "the allotment percentage for".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12257 deals with one of the most remarkable partnerships ever established between the Federal Government and the States. For the last 47 years, this union of State and Federal enterprise has meant the difference between success and failure for vast numbers of our Americans who are handicapped.

In fact, the program has just surpassed the 2 million mark in the number of handicapped people who have been restored to activity and usefulness during this time.

The growth and improvement in this program in recent years has been outstanding. It has been my personal

privilege to be closely involved in the development of this rehabilitation program over a period of many years. One of the historic turning points in building this program came in 1954, when Congress passed major legislation to greatly broaden and modernize our efforts in rehabilitating the disabled. As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Assistance and Rehabilitation of the Physically Handicapped, I traveled with the committee as we conducted lengthy hearings across the country as well as here in Washington. We wrote a bill which established a new system of financing for the Federal-State program; introduced a national research and demonstration grant program; began a system of Federal support to train more professional workers in rehabilitation; and made a beginning toward expanding, equipping and staffing the Nation's rehabilitation centers and workshops.

We were told by the administration officials at that time that the program had reached a "plateau," that further growth was virtually impossible under the old law.

I believe the results speak for themselves. From 1920 to 1954, the Federal-State program rehabilitated fewer than 1 million people. In the 13 years since 1954 the program has rehabilitated well over a million people.

In 1954 about 56,000 disabled people were rehabilitated. In 1967 the total was 173,000.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration's research program today supports nearly 500 research and demonstration projects operated all across the country. It has produced significant new knowledge which is making it possible to restore large numbers of disabled people who could not have been helped in 1954.

We have about twice as many rehabilitation centers and workshops in this country as we had 13 years ago.

This fall well over 5,000 young people will be taking university training for careers in rehabilitation work, under the training grant program of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Without the increase in trained personnel during the last 10 years, we could not have mounted any substantial expansion of rehabilitation programs in this country. For example, in 1954 our universities produced a total of six trained rehabilitation counselors. This year the number was about 800. In fact, over this 13-year period, some 3,200 rehabilitation counselors have completed their college work.

So, as one who has labored over a long period of time on behalf of rehabilitation programs for disabled people, I want Members of this body to share my satisfaction in the remarkable progress that has been made in the last decade or so.

Much of this success story is a result of the personal leadership of the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary E. Switzer. Since she assumed her post more than 15 years ago, she has demonstrated an unusual capacity for effective management, and enthusiasm and leadership.

Last week the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare gave Miss Switzer a

personal vote of confidence when they named her to direct a new organizational structure in the Department—one which is designed to use the experience that she and the States have gained in vocational rehabilitation to help cope with the problems of public dependency throughout the United States.

As I indicated to the House last week, I share the confidence which President Johnson and Secretary Gardner have shown in Miss Switzer. I am convinced that she will bring new vitality, initiative, and success to her latest effort on behalf of the American people.

In 1965 the House of Representatives passed with complete bipartisan support a bill to make major changes and improvements in the public rehabilitation program. With the consent of the other body, the President signed the bill into law in November 1965. The House will recall that the author of the 1965 amendments was the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS]. Mr. DANIELS is also the principal sponsor of the bill before us today. He is chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education which conducted hearings on the bill and afforded it initial consideration. May I take this opportunity to compliment the members of the subcommittee and Mr. DANIELS and to express particularly to the gentleman from New Jersey my deep appreciation for his continuing interest and work on legislation designed to improve rehabilitation programs for our handicapped people.

Now, less than 2 years after the 1965 amendments, we are already seeing the results of that fortunate piece of legislation. The number of handicapped people being served has risen substantially. In the fiscal year just ended, 174,000 handicapped youth, men, and women received a wide variety of restorative and training services, and were placed in useful work.

H.R. 12257 proposes six additional amendments to the law. The first would extend the present financing system for Federal-State rehabilitation program for another 2 years, through fiscal 1970. It would authorize the allotment among States of \$500 million in 1969, \$600 million in 1970.

The estimated appropriations required under such allotments are \$343 million in 1969 and \$408 million in 1970.

A second amendment would authorize appropriations to continue for one additional year the Federal support of statewide planning in the States. This will permit the States to complete the planning now underway. The estimated cost is \$3 million.

A third amendment would authorize the establishment and support of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults. Here the committee is completely convinced that the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to act on behalf of one of our most neglected groups of Americans. Testimony before the subcommittee gave overwhelming support to this proposal and I am convinced this will be a pathfinding project for the hundreds of deaf-blind persons who have been largely bypassed in all the health, education, and social programs of our Nation. The bill would au-

thorize the Secretary to enter into an agreement with a public or nonprofit private agency or organization to establish and operate such a national center. The center would be concerned mainly with providing highly specialized services to the deaf-blind; however, it also would have a strong research organization, a teaching program to prepare more professional workers in this difficult field, and would conduct a number of other special supportive activities. The estimated first year cost is \$400,000.

A fourth amendment would authorize a new program of project grants to the States to pay 90 percent of the cost of providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory agricultural workers and members of their families. Among this low-income group, health problems and disabling conditions are especially prevalent. The nature of their migratory lives means that they seldom get the help they need from the regularly operated State and local agencies. This bill would encourage and assist the State rehabilitation agencies to organize and carry out projects to provide services to these migrant workers. Rehabilitation services also could be provided to family members where this is needed to assure success in completing the rehabilitation program. The estimated first year cost is \$9 million.

A fifth amendment would require that State vocational rehabilitation agencies provide services to handicapped individuals without requiring a residency test. This would permit much more prompt service to thousands of handicapped persons and the committee is convinced it will have little or no effect on the numbers of people served in any State.

Finally, a sixth amendment would make a special provision affecting the Federal allotments available to the rehabilitation program in the District of Columbia. In determining the allotments of funds among the States for the basic Federal-State program, the District would have a fixed allotment percentage of 75 percent, the same as other non-State jurisdictions such as the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Guam. This will be a far more equitable treatment of the District than is provided in the Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this bill to Members of the House as a most useful step in the right direction. It is designed to assist people who probably are most in need of our assistance and encouragement. It emphasizes rehabilitation as a constructive way of dealing with the problems of disability and other handicapping conditions. The House has an outstanding record on a bipartisan basis of supporting this program and I am hopeful that today we can afford H.R. 12257 our unanimous approval.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12257, to extend and improve the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. I am very pleased to be a sponsor of this bill.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Act is one of the best conceived pieces of legislation ever enacted by the Congress. Like so many other successful programs, it received its greatest impetus under the administration of President Eisenhower with the 1954 amendments to the act. Steady progress has been made since then in bringing the benefits of rehabilitative services to more and more of our fellow citizens who suffer debilitating handicaps. In considering this bill, a review of that progress is in order.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, 441,339 handicapped persons were being assisted and 134,859 persons were successfully rehabilitated and returned to gainful employment; this year those figures will be 720,500 persons being assisted and 218,500 persons actually rehabilitated.

That is a record of accomplishment which merits congratulations to everyone connected with it—local rehabilitation workers, State directors, and to Miss Mary Switzer and her staff at the National Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. Perhaps most of all, however, congratulations should go to the handicapped individuals themselves, and to their families, as they prove over and over the maxim that "You can't keep a good man down." Often the rehabilitation process is long, and arduous, and discouraging to a person who has less than a steely determination to triumph over physical handicaps. All of us know and admire individuals who have won this kind of victory.

It is the kind of victory for the individual that this society should treasure. And we should give every possible support to the thousands of dedicated persons who work through vocational rehabilitation to make these victories possible.

This bill assures a continued and increasing level of financial support to the States for vocational rehabilitation through fiscal 1970. It also launches a national effort to help those who suffer the worst handicap of all—the deaf-blind. I do not think that any of us not so afflicted can even imagine a world without sight or sound in which a human soul and mind must struggle to emerge as a person. Only a handful of individuals, such as the remarkable and gifted Helen Keller, have managed to triumph in that struggle, and then with the lifelong help of a dedicated teacher of true genius, the late Anne Sullivan. In launching a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults by this legislation, we hope to extend the work and lives of these two great women. This kind of effort was urged by His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, on April 15 of this year, when he gave special recognition to the needs of the deaf-blind.

The bill also authorizes a special effort to help handicapped migrant workers, and this too is a timely recognition of a special need. It is consistent with our other efforts to assist a group whose needs have been too long neglected.

For these reasons, I urge enactment

of H.R. 12257. I want to especially commend the chairman of the subcommittee which brought this legislation before us, our colleague DOMINICK DANIELS, and the ranking Republican member, OGDEN REID. On our side, Congressmen BELL, ERLÉNORN, SCHERLE, and STEIGER of Wisconsin participated in the work of the select subcommittee. This is a good bill, a bipartisan bill, and its provisions reflect credit upon all those who worked on it.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 12257, which is vitally necessary to the more than 4 million Americans who need vocational rehabilitation in order to enable them to lead productive lives.

Lest we forget, there are presently some 16 million Americans of working age who are limited in the performance of their major activity, not including those in hospitals and institutions, nor some 5 million Americans, in addition, who are mentally retarded. Of these 16 million, some 4 million, it is estimated, can be assisted through vocational rehabilitation, and that number increases by 400,000 new cases each year. Yet only 173,000 persons were rehabilitated for useful work under the provisions of this act last year. In other words, we are still falling behind, although we are making clear and hopeful progress.

Clearly, we can do more. Clearly, we can do better. We must do more to enable handicapped individuals to lead lives of dignity and worth, and not live out their days in frustrated dependence.

The vocational rehabilitation program is some 47 years old and underwent extensive changes in 1965. The amendments we are considering today would extend certain aspects of that program and make a number of minor but important changes.

First, the bill authorizes a 2-year extension of appropriations for grants to the States for vocational rehabilitation services which are provided to handicapped individuals to help prepare them for employment and useful, productive lives. The Federal Government underwrites 75 percent of the cost of these programs, and authorizations are made in the amount of \$500 million for fiscal year 1969 and \$600 million for fiscal year 1970.

One of the encouraging trends is that State funds for this program are increasing, and the States are carrying more and more of the load. In fiscal 1967, State expenditures for vocational rehabilitation increased some 33 percent over fiscal year 1965.

In my own State of New York, for example, a total of \$22.1 million was available in fiscal year 1967. This represents \$6.8 million contributed by the State and \$15.3 million allotted by the Federal Government. Notably, New York was able to utilize 100 percent of its Federal allocation in 1967 because it was able to meet completely the matching requirements. This represents an increase of 34 percent in the amount of Federal funds that New York State was able to match between fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Second, the bill authorizes 1 additional year of appropriations for support of statewide planning in vocational rehabil-

itation by the States, through June 30, 1968, but funds so appropriated would remain available through June 30, 1969.

Third, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into an agreement with a public or non-profit private agency or organization for the establishment and operation of a national center for deaf-blind youths and adults. Dr. Howard Rusk, perhaps the most eminent authority in this field, testified that there are some 5,000 deaf-blind persons in the country and facilities are now capable of serving no more than 250 of them. Dr. Rusk stated that:

Of all the gaps in our present resources for the severely disabled people this probably represents the greatest one.

As he pointed out, the needs of the deaf-blind are completely different from those of other multiple handicapped individuals, and we are clearly not meeting them at all.

I am pleased the committee has retained the proposed facility solely as a facility for the deaf-blind, rather than as an institution for the multiple handicapped in general. However, I believe we would have done a singular honor to the individual American most responsible for the progress limited though it may be, that we have made in the treatment of the deaf-blind if we had named the center the Helen Keller Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults. To recognize Miss Keller's achievements while she is still alive would indicate that we in the Congress are sensitive to the struggles and the successes that she has borne, and a center named in her honor would be a lasting inspiration to those it is designed to serve. While it is not possible to so amend this bill today, I am hopeful that the other body of Congress, as a whole, will consider this step in the near future.

Fourth, the bill before us today would establish a program of project grants to the States for providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory agricultural workers and members of their families. The 2 million migratory workers in this country lead lives more unsettled, more lacking in hope, and often more devoid of the necessities of life than almost any other group in our society. Several pieces of legislation enacted in recent years have made special provision for the additional needs of these migrants, and the legislation before us today would also recognize the special services they require. It is estimated that some 40,000 migratory workers are in need of vocational rehabilitation, but only 3,000 to 5,000 would seek it each year. At 90-percent Federal financing, and \$3,000 per case, the total cost is estimated to be \$8.1 million. In addition, supportive services would be available to members of the family of the person being rehabilitated so that the family unit—whether or not the other members are handicapped—would be able to remain intact. In my judgment, this is the least we can do for people whose family lives are too often disrupted.

Fifth, the bill would require that vocational rehabilitation services be provided by State agencies without regard to the place of residence of the handicapped individual.

Finally, adjustments are made in the allotment formula for the District of Columbia to take into account the clear need for vocational rehabilitation in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this bill, which has enjoyed strong bipartisan support, will be promptly enacted and endorsed here today and will be construed as a vote of confidence in the basic program of assistance to the handicapped of America so that they will become fully productive in as many instances as possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12257, a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. I am pleased to be a co-sponsor of this legislation, and to serve on the Select Subcommittee on Education which, under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], initially considered the bill.

There is a tremendous amount of personal satisfaction involved in having a part in legislation to improve and extend the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation. Probably no other governmental program accomplishes so much visible good for our society as this one. The task assigned vocational rehabilitation, moreover, is one of great difficulty, involving a complex of medical, educational, employment, and social services brought to bear through both public and private agencies on behalf of handicapped individuals. The effectiveness with which this is accomplished is one of the best examples of how government can serve society in a way which is both intelligent and humane. This program has both a head and a heart.

We have been making steady progress in our cooperative effort to help handicapped citizens overcome their afflictions to the point where they are self-supporting and making a contribution to society. Very often the contribution of rehabilitated individuals is far beyond that of most of us who have not suffered such handicaps. The economic benefits of the program are enormous, but the human and spiritual benefits are far greater.

In the 3 years ending next June 30 this program will have assisted over 1,800,000 handicapped persons, and over 560,000 of these will have been rehabilitated and returned to productive employment. Ultimately, a very high percentage of the people assisted will be rehabilitated successfully.

More and more, vocational rehabilitation searches out and accepts new and more difficult assignments. The program is working now with people having suffered catastrophic afflictions, such as the ravages of stroke, in which the prospects for success are far from certain. But unlike certain analogous Government programs, the people in vocational rehabilitation are not content merely to accept

the easier cases in which the prospects of success are high in order to maintain a "good record." They build a good record without such stratagems. They recognize that the test of a program is not only in what is accomplished, but in what is attempted. In this legislation that working principle is extended into very difficult areas.

The bill authorizes the establishment of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults. There are no words to describe adequately the extreme difficulties of helping these most-afflicted of all handicapped persons. The life of Helen Keller, for example, is a miracle wrought in two lifetimes of two women of genius, Miss Keller herself, and her teacher, Anne Sullivan. We have just finished the year-long centennial commemoration of the birth of Anne Sullivan, who died in 1936. We are fortunate still to have Miss Keller among us. The accomplishments of these two women form the basis of virtually all that we are able to do today for the deaf-blind. The intent of this bill is that all the facilities of modern technology and medicine will be concentrated on enabling us to do more.

The need is urgent. Outbreaks of rubella—familiarily known as German measles—in recent years threaten a new wave of deaf-blind children, and although we may discover an effective vaccine against rubella in the future, there is no way to undo the damage already done except to find new ways of reaching into the dark and soundless worlds of these individuals. Every limited success in this task is itself a miracle; perhaps more so than even our greatest accomplishments in space exploration. That is a measure of the difficulties yet to be overcome. Yet, tragically, the needs of the deaf-blind have not received adequate attention. That situation is being remedied.

His Holiness, Pope Paul VI, has been foremost among those calling for a greater effort to help the deaf-blind, and this bill is one of the responses to those pleas. It could not be more timely.

The bill also authorizes new efforts by vocational rehabilitation to reach handicapped migrant workers, who even without any physical handicap are among the most needy in this affluent society. In shaping this part of the bill, we attempted to leave as much flexibility as possible for rehabilitation workers to assist both the handicapped individual and his family. The situation of migrant workers is not that of the typical person in need of rehabilitation services, and there are difficult environmental factors which have to be surmounted. Once more, however, we anticipate that the gains will be all out of proportion to the funds expended.

Finally, this bill provides a continuity of program authorizations through 1970 and the assurance that there will be no letdown in the level of funding authorized. There has been steady progress in the level both of Federal funding and State matching which is reflected in a steady increase in the coverage and accomplishments of the program in all parts of the Nation. As a further strengthening of this progress, the bill would also eliminate any residence re-

quirements for assistance under State plans beginning in fiscal 1969.

There is much that government cannot do and cannot cause to be done for people. The limitations should be recognized, because when more is promised than can be delivered government itself is discredited. Vocational rehabilitation is an example of what can be accomplished for individual citizens through an intelligent and soundly structured Federal-State program which builds confidence in our governmental institutions. I urge enactment of H.R. 12257 to further strengthen and extend this program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the distinguished chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], for his superb leadership in bringing this important legislation to the floor by a unanimous vote of his great committee. We are also grateful to the gentleman from Kentucky for his dedicated, distinguished, and able chairmanship of this great Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, also I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his diligence, perseverance, and devotion to vocational rehabilitation in bringing the bill before the House with the unanimous support and backing of his subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, too, to pay tribute to all those throughout this land who have been associated over the years with this humanitarian program. The lives of countless thousands have been made helpful and useful to themselves, to their communities, and to the Nation because of vocational rehabilitation.

This great program began 47 years ago in 1920, and since that time the Congress has reviewed the program, authorized appropriations, and suggested changes. As a result of the forthright action of the Congress, improvements have been made which allowed the program to reach many more of the Nation's disabled persons, restoring them to active and useful places in their communities.

This bill today will authorize grants for the States for fiscal year 1967, and authorize an additional year of appropriations to the States for support of statewide planning of rehabilitation programs.

Another significant aspect of this bill is that it authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into an agreement with a public or non-profit private agency or organization for the establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House give its overwhelming approval to this important legislation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the author of the bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

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

Mr. DANIELS. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the chairman of the full committee and the gentlemen who introduced the bill. This is a program that I think really does a job and certainly has been beneficial not only to the people who have trained under it but also has been beneficial to the taxpayers of this country.

May I ask one question? Is the amount included here included in the President's budget?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes, it is.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. DANIELS. I thank the gentleman for his contributions.

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

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to commend the chairman of the subcommittee on bringing this bill out. The gentleman will recall I filed this bill in the 89th and the 90th Congresses and, by reason of his chairmanship, this committee has given it prompt and expeditious consideration. I want to state that previous work done by my good colleague on the Subcommittee on the Handicapped in this and the last Congress has done a great deal to help in this regard.

I have always hoped that this bill would become law. The need is very great, the timing is perfect, because we have already performed the studies to add the personnel to this center. I am hopeful that we can obtain expeditious and successful consideration of the bill.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] and his committee for bringing out a bill which I was happy to sponsor during the last two sessions of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12257, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967. Many of my colleagues have already referred to the various amendments in this bill and I shall not make further reference to them at this time. However, I would like to voice my support of one particular provision of the bill—that provision which would establish a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults.

Mr. Speaker, the deaf-blind may be the most severely handicapped of all disabled people. Deprived of two of the major senses by which mankind receives and transmits precise information, the deaf-blind exist in an overwhelming void of isolation and deprivation. They are in actual practice entirely reduced to receiving messages by taste, smell, or touch. Not only are these people untouched by the flood of sound and scenery that endows mankind with most of his awareness of his environment and associates, they are also deprived of the cultural depths and personal satisfactions which accompany the spoken and written language, the infinite stimulation of music, the visual bustle of city streets, the peaceful quietness of the countryside, the rapid rise and fading of opportunities, and so on ad infinitum.

The deaf-blind make up only a small

part of our population. They are so few that per capita cost conscious public programs have been slow to respond to their needs. We must also share the guilt that arises from the fact that these people have been neglected for so long. While their needs are many, we now know they are obtainable. No better example can be given to attest to that fact than the great lady we all know or have read about, Miss Helen Keller.

Today, however, there are very few opportunities for the deaf-blind to receive appropriate training. The deaf-blind have been largely left to vegetate in homes, a great burden to their families and associates, or as inmates of custodial institutions. This shameful condition stems from a lack of understanding of what may be imprisoned behind the closed eyes and the shut ears and from the bewilderment of an uninformed public.

H.R. 12257 would take a major step in meeting the needs of this thoroughly neglected segment of our population. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

As the original sponsor of this bill in the Congress and its predecessor, the 89th Congress, I wish to commend those colleagues who served with me on the ad hoc Subcommittee of the Handicapped. I believe our work on this subcommittee contributed to the passage of this legislation.

However, the real father of this bill is not even a Member of the Congress. I refer to Mr. Robert Smithdas a resident of my district. I am honored to have been a classmate of Mr. Smithdas who was an honor graduate of St. John's University—despite the fact that he is deaf-blind. It is the work of Bob Smithdas as set forth in his testimony in the committee hearings which has inspired all of us who have come to know him to do more in this field.

In addition I would like to use this opportunity to also commend Dr. Peter Salmon, director of the Industrial Home for the Blind in Brooklyn, N.Y. Dr. Salmon who has given his life to the cause of the blind, deaf, and deaf-blind deserves a major share of the credit for this particular legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for the hard work and study that he entered into prior to this subcommittee considering this legislation. I congratulate the gentleman from New York for his leadership, his efforts, and his help, all of which has made the work of the subcommittee much easier. His proposal for the establishment of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults has been incorporated in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12257, cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967." The legislation had strong bipartisan support and was reported by the Select Subcommittee on Education and the full Committee on Education and Labor without a dissenting vote.

Mr. Speaker, my first subcommittee assignment, when I came to Congress, was on the Special Education Subcom-

mittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, to which rehabilitation and special education were assigned. In the course of hearings throughout the country, I came to understand certain things. First, that there are millions of handicapped children, youths, and adults, and that their needs are great. Second, that a great deal of knowledge has been gained with respect to how to help these people meet their needs. Third, that the resources of the agencies and organizations serving handicapped people are totally inadequate to do the job that is expected of them.

Last week, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, announced a major organizational change within the Department. For this sizable challenge in reshaping the Government's public programs, the Secretary turned to one of the most able and experienced administrators we have today, Miss Mary E. Switzer, longtime Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation—a person who has demonstrated her capacity to seek out the new, in finding solutions to the old.

In her new capacity, Miss Switzer now serves as Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Services. She directs five agencies which bring together the Department's major programs in welfare, rehabilitation, and certain health and health-related programs. As part of the reorganization, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has been redesignated as the Social and Rehabilitation Services Administration.

Since the principal official concerned with this bill has been given a new vote of confidence by the President, and the Secretary, I am particularly pleased to urge the enactment of H.R. 12257.

The studies and reports of the subcommittee on which I served in 1965, contributed to the passage of legislation which increased the Federal commitment to the education of handicapped children. It also helped lay the groundwork for the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965, under which we are seeing a rapid advance in the scope and effectiveness of rehabilitation services to the Nation's handicapped youth and adults. The 1965 legislation was drafted by the Special Education Committee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. It was my honor and privilege to introduce the committee bill and to present it to the House.

As chairman of the Select Education Subcommittee which has been assigned jurisdiction over rehabilitation legislation, I am presenting to the House another measure to further expand and strengthen services to the Nation's handicapped citizens. Before presenting the legislation in detail, let me make these observations.

First. It is a basic concept of American democracy that every individual be given an opportunity to make the most of his abilities. This means the opportunity to work, to earn, to pay taxes to one's government, and otherwise assume the rights and responsibilities of full citizenship. Millions of handicapped people are denied these opportunities because of the nature and extent of their disabili-

ties. The simple aim of vocational rehabilitation is to help these handicapped people to achieve the opportunities which might otherwise be denied them.

Second. During 47 years of its existence, over 2 million handicapped individuals have been rehabilitated by the State vocational rehabilitation agencies under the State-Federal rehabilitation program which this legislation aims to strengthen. The number of people rehabilitated during the 1967 fiscal year exceeded 173,000, and this number is expected to increase steadily. These encouraging results were made possible by the passage of Public Law 333 of the 89th Congress, to which I have already referred. It is almost impossible to imagine what the rehabilitation of these people has meant to the economic life of the Nation and to the handicapped people themselves and their families.

Third. Ninety-five percent of the handicapped people rehabilitated under this program have incomes under the poverty level at the time they apply for service. A high percentage have no income. The vocational rehabilitation agencies are the original antipoverty agencies in this country, and continue, without fanfare, to make an increasingly important contribution to this objective. The more complete utilization of vocational rehabilitation agencies in our entire antipoverty efforts would result in great benefits to our people.

Fourth. The vocational rehabilitation program is probably the best illustration of an effective State-Federal partnership to accomplish a worthy social objective. The States pay 25 percent of the cost of this program. The States operate the program. State Governors and State legislatures believe in the program and support it. The relationship between the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration which administers the program at the National level, and the States is excellent, in fact, a model which others might study with profit.

Fifth. This program is intelligently, economically, and humanely administered at both National and State levels. It works with handicapped people on an individual basis. No group of workers is more client-centered than workers in the rehabilitation programs. No program has shown more imagination in its approach to today's critical human problems or more ingenuity in seeking new and better ways of serving its clients.

Sixth. Although vocational rehabilitation is one of the most successful and popular programs supported by this Congress, officials of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and State vocational rehabilitation agencies are frank in pointing out their own weaknesses and inadequacies, always with constructive suggestions for improvement.

In the light of the above stated facts, it is with pride and confidence that I now present to this House a proposal that will result in another important step in providing equality of opportunity for one of the Nation's underprivileged groups, the physically and mentally handicapped. House Report No. 563 includes a detailed explanation of the pro-

visions of H.R. 12257. I shall summarize briefly the objectives of the bill and how we expect to achieve them.

GRANTS TO STATES

Section 2 of the bill authorizes a 2-year extension of appropriation authority for grants to the States for vocational rehabilitation services. Appropriation authority under the present law terminates with the 1968 fiscal year. In order that the States, whose legislative bodies meet biennially, can know what they may expect in the way of Federal funds, it is extremely important that this extension be made during this session of Congress. The appropriation authority for the 1968 fiscal year is \$400 million. This authority would be increased to \$500 million for fiscal 1969 and \$600 million for fiscal 1970.

Much of the program expansion to be expected with increased appropriations will be used in developing cooperative programs with other agencies that have responsibility for some aspects of the needs of handicapped individuals. Particularly significant will be cooperative agreements between the vocational rehabilitation agencies and the public schools for the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals coming through special education classes; cooperation with mental hospitals and mental health centers in the rehabilitation of the mentally ill; cooperation with public welfare agencies in rehabilitating individuals on public assistance; and cooperation with correctional institutions in the rehabilitation of public offenders. We are seeing in the rehabilitation movement what is probably the most effective effort to coordinate services directed at common goals. This pioneering effort should be encouraged to the greatest possible degree.

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAMS

The 1965 legislation authorized appropriations through fiscal year 1967 for grants to States for statewide planning in rehabilitation. The object was to insure that each State would have a basis for developing service programs, facilities, personnel, and other resources, so that by July 1, 1975, each State would be able to furnish vocational rehabilitation services to all handicapped individuals who needed such help. The 1965 amendments did not become law until November 1965, with regulations to be issued even later. As a result, the first year of the authority was largely nullified. In this section of the bill, we are asking that the authority for statewide planning be extended 1 additional year. Unless this is done, the planning effort in the States will be interrupted and, in many cases, probably never completed.

CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS

This legislation authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into an agreement with a public or private nonprofit agency or organization for the establishment and operation, including construction and equipment, of a center for vocational rehabilitation of handicapped individuals who are both deaf and blind. The center is to be known as the National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults. Deafness

alone, and blindness alone, are recognized as among the greatest handicaps an individual may suffer. It is difficult for those of us with normal senses to have any degree of understanding with respect to what it would mean to be both deaf and blind. Authorities in the field are convinced there are at least 4,000, and possibly as many as 7,000 such persons in this country. The rehabilitation of these people is tremendously complicated and difficult. Nevertheless, there are numerous illustrations of individuals who have achieved rehabilitation despite this dual handicap. The first deaf-blind person to do so was Helen Keller, whose name is a household word in the United States. The committee had another such individual, Robert Smithdas, of New York City, testify on this legislation. Mr. Smithdas is living testimony of what can be accomplished under this section of the legislation.

The center to be established under this bill will have as its purposes: First, demonstration of methods to provide specialized, intensive services needed to rehabilitate handicapped individuals who are deaf-blind; second, training personnel needed to staff facilities especially designed to provide such services; third, conducting research in the problems of and ways of meeting problems of rehabilitating the deaf-blind; and fourth, improvement of the public's understanding of the problems of the deaf-blind.

It is anticipated that as many as 200 or 300 deaf-blind individuals will be served in the center at one time. Although the number may appear to be small, the knowledge and experience gained in this center will be widely disseminated to assist other institutions in the rehabilitation of additional deaf-blind persons. The committee believes that the establishment of this center is a progressive step of great importance.

I would like to mention that my esteemed colleague from New York, the Honorable HUGH L. CAREY, also saw the need for such a center, and introduced legislation which would create an institution of this very kind. I am happy to say Mr. CAREY's proposal is incorporated in H.R. 12257.

MIGRANT WORKERS

One section of the bill establishes a program of project grants to support rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory agricultural workers and their families. Members of the House are fully aware of the many problems of migrant workers. Scarcely a year goes by that legislation of some kind is not introduced for the purpose of assisting them. We believe that the provisions of this bill providing for the rehabilitation of migrant workers offer much promise. The legislation is drawn in such a way that the rehabilitation agency, cooperating with other health, education, and welfare agencies who also have responsibilities in this field, can work with families of migrant workers as a whole, identifying the problems of handicapped individuals, and doing whatever is necessary to advance their rehabilitation. Being a special project program, it would be possible for the Secretary to concentrate the expenditure of funds appropriated under

this section upon the problems of migrant workers, wherever they may be.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

Section 6 of the bill amends the Vocational Rehabilitation Act by requiring that State plans provide that residence requirements will not be imposed which exclude services under the State plan to any individual who is present in the State. The committee was naturally concerned with what effect this would have upon rehabilitation programs in the States. Mr. Howard Hanson, president of the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation, testified before the committee that the inclusion of this provision was satisfactory to the State vocational rehabilitation agencies, and that he did not believe that it would present any problems. He further stated that the passage of this section would simplify the process of providing services to handicapped individuals who move from one State to another.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one provision of this bill would result in increasing vocational rehabilitation allotments to the District of Columbia. Under present legislation, the District of Columbia is treated as a State. The problems of the District of Columbia are not, of course, comparable to those of a State. In fact, the District of Columbia cannot be said to be even a typical city. It is really the inner core of a comprehensive metropolitan area which includes several counties in Virginia and Maryland. The concentration of commercial property in this inner core results in a higher than average per capita income. Since per capita income is a factor in allotting funds, this results in a low allotment percentage for the District of Columbia. The peculiar characteristics of the District of Columbia also result in an unusual concentration of needy handicapped persons in the District.

In this bill, we are removing the District of Columbia from the "State" classification and giving it a higher allotment percentage, as present legislation already provides for Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. This provision is strongly supported by the Administration, and members of our committee feel that it is badly needed to enable the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation in the District of Columbia to make an important impact on the cost of dependency brought about by disability.

I mentioned earlier that this bill had bipartisan support in the committee. This should be emphasized. The objectives of rehabilitation are such that everyone subscribe to them, whatever his philosophy of government may be. Fortunately, also, the record of this program is such that all may agree upon its methods, as well as its philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, our programs for the disabled go to the heart of the American commitment. Every individual is of value. We just do not accept, any longer, the idea that a serious physical handicap means a life of dependence and uselessness. Today, through an inspired combination of education, health care, job training, and sheer human devotion,

hundreds of thousands of such lives are being rebuilt.

I urge all the Members of this House to support H.R. 12257.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this legislation, H.R. 12257. I was glad to be a cosponsor of this legislation with my distinguished colleagues in which we are amending and extending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, and I urge to my colleagues that it be enacted.

There is probably no Federal program which is more successful and meets the mark set for it than vocational rehabilitation, and certainly very few federally supported programs have such wide acceptance among all groups of our population, and in all sections of the Nation, as I believe will be evidenced by the vote a little later on.

This is not accidental, and it is not the result of uncritical evaluation. Vocational rehabilitation has operated in a field of great difficulty where failure, in many instances, might be excused. In recent years Congress has acted at the request of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to make their tasks even more difficult by extending the program into the area of catastrophic disability, such as that caused by stroke. Good progress is being made. I could show any of you the evidence of this in the operation of the vocational rehabilitation facilities in my congressional district, as I know there are all over the country. Also vocational rehabilitation is in many respects a model for Federal support in other fields—and it is a model too often ignored in the past few years. There is true coordination and partnership between the local communities, the State and the Federal Government in vocational rehabilitation. At a time when many people are saying that Congress should not reduce the 90-10 percentage in some programs, it is interesting to note that the States have increased their participation in vocational rehabilitation.

At a time when programs like the war on poverty program have fallen far short of their mark, vocational rehabilitation has progressed well. The poverty program surely must have been initiated to attempt to rehabilitate the people who live in poverty and bring them up to a more affluent and satisfactory life. The drafting of the poverty legislation, the Economic Opportunity Act, forgot all of the model features of vocational rehabilitation. If the poverty program followed the pattern of vocational rehabilitation, and specifically the local, State, and Federal partnership, I believe many of the gross criticisms about the Office of Economic Opportunity that have been heard in recent years would not have been the case because here is a program that is operated by the States and local communities through the instrumentality of a State agency under an approved State plan. It involves Federal, State, local governments, and the special capabilities of private agencies, in a cooperative effort in which the Federal role is unobtrusive and supportive. Yet there is strong national leadership through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Federal administration is excellent. Miss Mary Switzer and her staff are a smoothly functioning, highly competent team which year after year quietly demonstrate that a Federal agency can be an efficient and imaginative partner in achieving national and human goals.

This year over 700,000 of our fellow citizens will be receiving help from Vocational Rehabilitation, and more than 218,000 will have been rehabilitated and restored to productive and self-supporting lives. This represents a great national gain in economic terms, but it must always be thought of in terms of personal and human values that are beyond price.

H.R. 12257 further extends the program by providing authorization for grants to the States through fiscal 1970 at a rate calculated to assure steady progress, and by inaugurating new programs—one for the deaf-blind and one designed to bring rehabilitation services to handicapped migrant agricultural workers. The bill also eliminates any residency requirements after June 30, 1969. Unfortunately, in a number of States such requirements have denied services to those in need of them.

The establishment of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults will be a major step forward in helping the most afflicted of all multiple handicapped individuals. The problems of the deaf-blind, which have been brought to the attention of the whole world in the inspiring life of Helen Keller, are as great a challenge to the ingenuity of man as could be imagined. Despite the remarkable accomplishments of a few individuals afflicted in this manner, progress has been painfully slow in finding ways to help most deaf-blind individuals. The difficulties of teaching those who cannot hear speech or see objects or writing are beyond the ability of most of us to comprehend. There is perhaps no other endeavor in which the attributes of human compassion and scientific methodology must be so woven together to produce a favorable result. It is fortunate and fitting that this Center should be commenced in Helen Keller's lifetime.

The bill also authorizes a demonstration project effort to bring the benefits of the program to handicapped migrant workers. As in other fields, such as education, help for migrant workers is needed but must be rendered in such a way as to take into account a whole complex of family problems and environmental factors not present in normal circumstances. I strongly endorse this additional effort to assist these families.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think our committee has done a careful and constructive job in bringing this legislation to the House, and that the bill deserves the same unanimous support here that it received in our committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3

minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], who has for many years been chairman of the subcommittee that originally handled this legislation. The gentlewoman has done as much work on this piece of legislation as any other Member of the Congress, and she has made a great contribution.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his very gracious remarks.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, I urge the enactment of it by the House today.

I would also certainly take this moment to congratulate the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership on this legislation and for the prompt way in which he has brought the amendments of 1967 to the floor of the House for consideration and a vote today.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to borrow from a very eloquent statement made by Secretary Gardner at the time he appeared before our subcommittee. He said:

Our programs for the disabled go to the heart of the American commitment. Every individual is of value. Every individual should have the opportunity to grow to his full stature, to achieve his full potential, to live his life with some measure of dignity.

We just do not any longer accept the idea that a serious physical handicap means a life of dependence and uselessness. A few years ago the great majority of individuals with severe physical handicaps were condemned to lives of dependence. Today, through an inspired combination of education, health care, job training and sheer human devotion, hundreds of thousands of such lives are being rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally, the House has accorded programs carried on under the act strong bipartisan support, and whenever we consider legislation to modify or extend the act, compliment upon compliment is paid to Mary Switzer, Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation, Russ Dean, and other members of her staff for the efficient, yet imaginative, administration of rehabilitation programs. These tributes are well earned indeed. I am sure, in our expressions of praise and gratitude for the work of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, we speak not only for ourselves, but also for the more than 2,000,000 disabled yet rehabilitated Americans who have been extended services under the Federal-State partnership.

In our enthusiasm for this program, we should not, however, for one moment forget the problem to which the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is directed, nor the matter to which we are turning our attention today. During the debate on the 1965 amendments to the act, I repeated for the House a portion of the testimony of the then president of the Association of Rehabilitation Centers. I should like to repeat his statement again today because it seems to me he has stated very succinctly the problem we have under consideration:

The fight against the human and economic loss caused by disability in this nation is a matter of national concern. No nation can afford this waste and misery nor can long

endure the loss of retrievable human resources.

It is clear that the 1965 amendments to the act have strengthened the fight against the human and economic loss caused by disability. In my own State of Oregon, rehabilitation work is moving ahead. More State funds are being provided to expand the public program and several new projects are underway with voluntary groups. For example, Goodwill Industries of Portland is now working under a grant from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to modernize and expand their workshop for the handicapped, so that improved training can be provided to larger numbers of people. In another project, the State rehabilitation agency and the State corrections authorities have developed a new joint program to combine their resources in a special reception and diagnostic center for public offenders. Several other voluntary organizations—the United Cerebral Association of Northwest Oregon, the Willamette Valley Rehabilitation Center in Lebanon, the Open Door facility at Corvallis—are conducting special projects in cooperation with the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration.

The success of the rehabilitation program in terms of persons rehabilitated last year has already been mentioned today and it is part of the committee report on this legislation. The following is occurring, beyond an increase in the number rehabilitated:

A new grant program to help construct centers and workshop is underway.

A four-part program to improve and make full use of the Nation's sheltered workshops also has been launched.

Practically all of the States are now engaged in a statewide planning program to measure the rehabilitation resources that have developed a systematic plan for building their resources to meet the needs of their own people.

A national study on architectural problems in our present buildings is nearing completion. I believe this will help several hundred thousand handicapped people gain access to buildings where they have been barred for so long.

During the excellent hearings on H.R. 12257, conducted by the Select Subcommittee on Education under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, we heard glowing progress reports on these new programs. The reports came not only from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration but also from the national associations and from persons who are working at the local level.

Based on the testimony presented, I am convinced that a magnificent effort is being made and it is therefore with some reluctance that I will mention one matter which is of concern to me. As indicated in the report of H.R. 12257, the committee heard testimony that the program for furnishing technical assistance to workshops for the handicapped has not kept pace with the progress being made with the other programs authorized by the 1965 amendments. It is my understanding that the problem has come about because of limitations placed upon financing of technical assistance

activities. Over the last few years, I have had the opportunity to visit a number of sheltered workshops. Always, I have been impressed with the dedication and the untiring efforts of those who manage and maintain these centers. It did seem to me when we considered the 1965 legislation which provided for a number of programs to improve workshops, that it was indeed desirable and possibly necessary that the effort include the provision of technical assistance so that experts in various aspects of workshop operation could be assigned to workshops, at their request, to provide expert help in solving many of the complex and difficult problems which arise.

Quite frankly, because of my deep concern that technical assistance and expert advice was not being made available at the level the 1965 act envisioned, I was tempted to offer amendments in subcommittee to strengthen this authority. I did not, Mr. Speaker, offer those amendments based on my understanding that the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration would give this matter immediate and serious attention. As the House report indicates, the committee expects the technical assistance programs will be financed in such a way and at such a level that it can render maximum help in improving workshops through the country. I intend to watch very carefully the progress made under this provision.

Though we can view the accomplishments under the 1965 act with pride, we must always be looking toward the future. While we have solved, or are helping to solve, many problems, there are still many which are in need of solution.

H.R. 12257 looks to the future and will extend and expand the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services. It will provide a new program of assistance for the rehabilitation of handicapped migrants and their families. An improved means of financing the rehabilitation program in the District of Columbia is proposed. And more importantly, the bill authorizes assistance for the establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults. I do not think there will be debate or argument on the desirability and necessity of this final provision. It will provide for a rather modest expenditure which will result in immeasurable benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides a program which, indeed, does make an effective war on poverty. It makes tax producers out of tax consumers. It is worth every dime spent.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967 and to urge unanimous approval of this bill by my colleagues today. The bill will extend the Nation's vocational rehabilitation program to some of our most disadvantaged citizens, many of whom are in desperate need of help in order that they might lead active and productive lives. It will extend our present program through fis-

cal 1970, and several of its provisions have been recommended in Presidential messages to Congress earlier this year.

I am sure that I am not alone, Mr. Speaker, in relating the subject of vocational rehabilitation to the life story of a distinguished and inspiring American, Helen Keller. All of us stand in great admiration of the courage and vitality displayed by Helen Keller. The now famous play, "The Miracle Worker," dramatizes her successful struggle to overcome the physical handicaps which beset her; Miss Keller was born deaf-blind. However, it took more than her own indomitable will and capacity to achieve this success—she was not alone in this struggle. It was Anne Sullivan, her friend, companion, mentor, and teacher, who unlocked the doors of communication with Helen Keller. Miss Keller had years of devoted teaching and specialized care by Anne Sullivan and others like her, teaching and care which meant a subsidization of over a million dollars. It would have been tragic if Helen Keller had not received such aid, and it is similarly disheartening to see disabled persons in our present society vegetate and waste away in a life of dependence. Our disabled should be offered the most of our time, effort, and resources in order that they lead productive and fulfilling lives.

Most Americans do not recognize how widespread the problem of disability is. A national health survey has indicated that approximately 16 million persons of working age are limited partially or totally in their major activities—at work, or keeping house, or going to school. An estimated 4 million disabled are in need of vocational rehabilitation services if they are to become employable and some 400,000 new cases are added each year.

Throughout the 47-year history of the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, a wide range of services has been provided to help the disabled become active again and over 2 million Americans have been restored to active roles. As a result of the 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the Nation's rehabilitation program, both public and voluntary, are operating today at a far higher level of effectiveness.

However, our major task still lies ahead. The present bill introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor is directed to reach some of the most disadvantaged of our people, and proposes five changes in the law which should be enacted this year.

Two of these changes were advocated by President Johnson in his message on health and education earlier this year. One of these is the President's proposal to establish a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults. There is among both the general public and professional workers an almost complete ignorance of the capabilities of the deaf-blind or of their existence. Even an adequate count of the numbers of deaf-blind persons is unavailable. Experts in the field, however, place estimates at 5,000 to 7,000, figures which represent a large group of Americans for which the Federal Government, at present, is doing virtually nothing. The proposed Center would pro-

vide specialized intensive services for the deaf-blind as well as training for professional personnel working with them. It would provide research funds with respect to the problems and rehabilitation of the disabled. The bill also calls for planning of additional regional centers; services would then be available to those in any geographical area. When the program reaches all of our deaf-blind, it should provide, if you will, a modern version of Anne Sullivan, which would help them to overcome the massive communication barriers existing between them and the larger world.

Second, Mr. Speaker, in the President's message on poverty, he urged that a special effort be made to deal with the disabling conditions which are presently widespread among migratory agricultural workers. The tragic circumstances of these workers who follow the seasons and the crops is compounded when the worker or a family member sustains a serious disability. Special funds would also be made available to State rehabilitation agencies for projects to provide the complete range of vocational rehabilitation services to migratory agricultural workers and their families who become disabled.

Furthermore, the appropriation authorization is extended through fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for the Federal funds required for the Federal-State program, to carry out the basic service program for disabled people. The present authority in the law extends only to June 30, 1968. It is important that we give States, many of which are developing their budgets for 1969, enough advance notice of our intentions in order that they might plan and budget effectively in an established program such as this.

The bill also provides for Federal support for an additional year for the statewide planning now being undertaken in the States. In 1965, the amendments authorized each State to conduct a 2-year program of planning in rehabilitation. Each State was charged with the responsibility of developing a comprehensive program so that by 1975, it would be able to completely furnish rehabilitation services to all disabled persons. Today, most are still in the midst of their planning programs. The amendments did not become law until most of the first year of authorization had already passed, thus the results of termination of these planning projects are obvious; we must make a new authorization so that the States will be able to complete their planning.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to eliminate the use of residence requirements as a condition of providing vocational rehabilitation services to disabled people. Because of the highly mobile population in America, authorities are convinced that imposing a residence restriction interferes with services to many people who need help the most. We cannot allow our disabled people to remain disabled until a year's residence, or other residence requirement has been established.

These five amendments extend our commitment to some of the most disadvantaged of our people. This promise we

have happily borne is an expression by the American people of the dignity and stature of the individual, that every individual, no matter who he is or the disadvantages he labors under, will have the opportunity to achieve his full potential. It remains for us to continue to work toward these ends. Helen Keller well illustrates that productive lives can be led by even our most seriously handicapped. Her rehabilitation, moreover is testimony to the need and worth of men and women who share the dedication and ability of Anne Sullivan. These people, along with best facilities and greatest resources must be employed to help rebuild the lives of our disabled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 12257, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967, which were reported unanimously by the House Education and Labor Committee, I am very pleased to recommend this bill to the House.

I am sure that most Members are fully aware of the excellent work which has been carried out for so many years by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration under the leadership and direction of Miss Mary E. Switzer. This arm of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has set an example which all Government agencies should try to achieve. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has made its mission one of giving handicapped men and women the necessary tools by which they can take a more useful place in life.

This Federal-State program has proven itself over and over again to be the best example of what can be accomplished when a program is developed and directed properly. VRA is constantly striving to help give men and women the means of acquiring self-respect and thereby add dignity to their lives.

This past year, over 173,000 men and women were rehabilitated. Today these people are in the mainstream of life. They are working in every part of the country, in practically every type of occupation that is found in today's labor force. More than this, however, the rehabilitation program has proven that opportunity and fulfillment can be made real for large numbers of people who face very serious problems.

H.R. 12257 would extend through fiscal years 1969 and 1970 the appropriation authorization for the Federal funds required for this Federal-State program. This provision allows the basic support program to continue its operation in an orderly fashion. The bill also includes two proposals which I think should be given special attention. One of these would establish a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults. At present the Federal Government is doing virtually nothing to aid the victims of one of the Nation's cruelest handicaps.

The other provision that I would like to emphasize is the portion of H.R. 12257 which would establish a special system of grants to provide vocational rehabilitation services to disabled migratory agricultural workers and their families. All of us, I am sure, realize the desperate

need of this segment of our population. Their plight is normally not easy. However, when coupled with a disabling condition, their condition becomes a tragedy.

Another provision of the bill extends through fiscal year 1968 the present authority for statewide planning in each State. The objective was and is to develop a plan by which all disabled people can receive the services they need by 1975. Because of the time factor involved in the 1965 law, the States have not had a full 2 years to complete their plans.

An additional amendment proposed in the bill would provide that effective July 1, 1969, all States conducting vocational rehabilitation programs under an approved State plan would be required to furnish services without regard to a residency test. This provision is necessary in view of today's mobile population and the fact that these services must and should be given to all disabled people.

The final amendment makes special provisions affecting Federal allotments available to the rehabilitation program in the District of Columbia. As a result of this amendment, the District would have a fixed allotment percentage of 75 percent, the same as other non-State jurisdictions. I feel that this will give the District the impetus it needs for the further expansion of its rehabilitation services.

I trust and believe that Congress will act favorably on this bill for I know that each Member of this body is committed to improving the lives of the Nation's disabled.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12257, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 340, nays 0, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 224]

YEAS—340

Abbutt	Bolton	Clark
Abernethy	Brademas	Clawson, Del
Adair	Brasco	Cleveland
Adams	Bray	Cobelan
Albert	Brinkley	Colmer
Anderson,	Brooks	Conable
Tenn.	Broomfield	Conte
Andrews, Ala.	Brotzman	Corbett
Annunzio	Brown, Calif.	Cowger
Arends	Brown, Mich.	Cramer
Ashbrook	Brown, Ohio	Culver
Ashley	Broyhill, N.C.	Cunningham
Ashmore	Broyhill, Va.	Daddario
Aspinall	Burke, Fla.	Daniels
Ayres	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
Baring	Burleson	Dawson
Bates	Burton, Calif.	de la Garza
Battin	Burton, Utah	Dellenback
Belcher	Bush	Denney
Bell	Byrne, Pa.	Derwinski
Bennett	Byrnes, Wis.	Devine
Berry	Cabell	Dickinson
Betts	Cahill	Dingell
Bevill	Carey	Dole
Biester	Carter	Dorn
Blanton	Casey	Dow
Blatnik	Cederberg	Dowdy
Boggs	Chamberlain	Downing
Bolling	Clancy	Dulski

Duncan	Kleppe	Reid, N.Y.
Eckhardt	Kornegay	Reifel
Edmondson	Kupferman	Reinecke
Edwards, Calif.	Kuykendall	Reuss
Edwards, La.	Kyl	Rhodes, Ariz.
Eilberg	Kyros	Rhodes, Pa.
Erlenborn	Laird	Rivers
Esch	Landrum	Roberts
Eshleman	Langen	Rogers, Colo.
Evans, Colo.	Latta	Rogers, Fla.
Everett	Leggett	Rooney, Pa.
Evins, Tenn.	Lennon	Rosenthal
Farbstein	Lipscomb	Roth
Fascell	Lloyd	Roush
Feighan	Long, Md.	Roybal
Findley	McClary	Rumsfeld
Flood	McClure	Ruppe
Flynt	McDade	Ryan
Foley	McDonald,	St Germain
Ford,	Mich.	Schadeberg
William D.	McFall	Scherle
Fountain	McMillan	Schneebell
Fraser	MacGregor	Schweiker
Friedel	Machen	Schwengel
Fulton, Pa.	Madden	Scott
Fulton, Tenn.	Mahon	Selden
Fuqua	Mailliard	Shriver
Galifianakis	Marsh	Sikes
Gardner	Martin	Sisk
Garmatz	Mathias, Calif.	Skubitz
Gathings	Mathias, Md.	Slack
Gilbert	Matsunaga	Smith, Calif.
Gonzalez	May	Smith, N.Y.
Goodling	Mayne	Smith, Okla.
Green, Ore.	Meeds	Snyder
Green, Pa.	Meskill	Springer
Griffiths	Miller, Calif.	Stafford
Gross	Miller, Ohio	Stagers
Gude	Mills	Stanton
Gurney	Mink	Steed
Hagan	Minshall	Steiger, Ariz.
Haley	Mize	Steiger, Wis.
Hall	Monagan	Stratton
Halleck	Montgomery	Stubblefield
Halpern	Moore	Sullivan
Hamilton	Moorhead	Taft
Hammer-	Morgan	Talcott
schmidt	Morton	Taylor
Hanley	Mosher	Teague, Calif.
Hanna	Moss	Thompson, Ga.
Hansen, Wash.	Multer	Thompson, N.J.
Hardy	Murphy, Ill.	Thomson, Wis.
Harrison	Myers	Tiernan
Harvey	Natcher	Tuck
Hathaway	Nedzi	Tunney
Hawkins	Nelsen	Udall
Hays	Nichols	Utt
Hébert	Nix	Van Deerlin
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara, Ill.	Vander Jagt
Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara, Mich.	Vanik
Helstoski	O'Konski	Vigorito
Henderson	Olsen	Waldie
Herlong	O'Neal, Ga.	Wampler
Hicks	Passman	Watson
Holland	Patman	Watts
Horton	Patten	Whalen
Hosmer	Pelly	Whalley
Hull	Pepper	White
Hunt	Perkins	Whitener
Hutchinson	Pettis	Whitten
Ichord	Pickle	Widnall
Jacobs	Pike	Wiggins
Jarman	Poage	Williams, Pa.
Joelson	Poff	Wilson,
Johnson, Calif.	Pollock	Charles H.
Johnson, Pa.	Pool	Winn
Jonas	Price, Ill.	Wolf
Jones, Ala.	Price, Tex.	Wright
Jones, Mo.	Pryor	Wyatt
Karsten	Purcell	Wylie
Kazen	Quile	Wyman
Kee	Quillen	Yates
Keith	Railsback	Young
Kelly	Randall	Zablocki
King, Calif.	Rees	Zion
Kirwan	Reid, Ill.	Zwach

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—92

Addabbo	Conyers	Gettys
Anderson, Ill.	Corman	Gialmo
Andrews,	Curtis	Gibbons
N. Dak.	Davis, Ga.	Goodell
Barrett	Delaney	Gray
Bingham	Dent	Grover
Blackburn	Diggs	Gubser
Boland	Donohue	Hansen, Idaho
Bow	Dwyer	Harsha
Brock	Edwards, Ala.	Hollifield
Buchanan	Fallon	Howard
Button	Fino	Hungate
Celler	Fisher	Irwin
Clausen,	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, N.C.
Don H.	Frelinghuysen	Karth
Collier	Gallagher	Kastenmeier

Kling, N.Y.	Philbin	Scheuer
Kluczynski	Pirnie	Shipley
Long, La.	Pucinski	Smith, Iowa
Lukens	Rarick	Stephens
McCarthy	Resnick	Stuckey
McCulloch	Riegle	Teague, Tex.
McEwen	Robison	Tenzer
Macdonald, Mass.	Rodino	Ullman
Michel	Ronan	Waggonner
Minish	Rooney, N.Y.	Walker
Morris, N. Mex.	Rostenkowski	Watkins
Morse, Mass.	Roudebush	Williams, Miss.
Murphy, N.Y.	Sandman	Willis
O'Neill, Mass.	Satterfield	Wilson, Bob
Ottinger	St. Onge	Wydler
	Saylor	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Curtis with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Riegle.
 Mr. Gerald R. Ford with Mr. Delaney.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Bob Wilson.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Sandman.
 Mr. Dent with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Rodino with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
 Mr. Minish with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Hollifield with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. King of New York.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
 Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Goodell.
 Mr. Bingham with Mr. Wydler.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Saylor.
 Mr. Ronan with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Shipley with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. Boland with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Jones of North Carolina with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Pino.
 Mr. Willis with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. Gettys with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. Corman with Mr. Morris of New Mexico.
 Mrs. Resnick with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Murphy of New York.
 Mr. Walker with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ottinger.
 Mr. Irwin with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Hungate.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Satterfield.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Rarick.
 Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Karth.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 12257.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON ACQUISITION OF CAREER STATUS BY CERTAIN TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HENDERSON, CHARLES H. WILSON, WHITE, GROSS, and DERWINSKI.

AMENDING LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT, 1959, RELATING TO TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 9837) to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, as it relates to transportation expenses of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 9837

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph under the subheading "Administrative Provisions" under the heading "SENATE" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959 (2 U.S.C. 43b), is amended by striking out "for not to exceed four round trips in each year." and inserting in lieu thereof "for a number of round trips each year not to exceed the number of months Congress is in session in such year, such reimbursement to be made in accordance with rules and regulations established by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of August 28, 1965 (Public Law 89-147; 2 U.S.C. 43b-1), is amended by striking "\$300" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$750".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall take effect as of January 3, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this bill speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, for every month that the Congress is in session this bill provides a trip back home for the Members.

It is amazing how many people really believe that any Member of the Congress can take as many trips back home as he or she wants to and, of course, that is not so. As I said this bill will provide one trip for each month that the Congress is in session.

The bill also provides a minimum of \$750 for Members representing districts where the Member makes more frequent trips back to his district and where they may even go back and forth every day.

The bill was passed by the Committee on House Administration by an overwhelming vote.

One amendment was offered which would have made the bill effective in 1969 instead of 1967. That amendment was defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt that it is not fair that Members should have to dig in their own pockets to pay the expenses of carrying on their official business as Members of the House of Representatives. The provisions of this bill so far as helping to pay some of the traveling expenses back and forth to a Member's district would help to some extent in this situation where Members have to dig into their own pockets to carry on their work as Members of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

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

Mr. Speaker, none of us here has the right to be the conscience of other Members of the Congress. We all have to represent our own districts and do what we think is proper under a given set of circumstances.

Personally, when I flew into Washington this morning from my home district, it was my 473d flight between these two points during a period of 8½ years. I would say that I go home just about every week if not every other week during the session.

Of course, when I came to the Congress back in 1959 we had one round trip which was subsequently increased to three trips and now it is five trips. The current bill would increase it to about one trip per month in addition to one annual round trip.

As the gentleman from Maryland just said, an amendment was offered which rather than award ourselves these extra trips during this particular time, it would have amended the bill to make it effective January 1, 1969, so that it would apply to those persons elected to the 91st Congress. That amendment was defeated and, of course, cannot be offered at this time because we are considering the bill under suspension of the rules. It cannot be included in a motion to recommit.

Very frankly, I feel Members are entitled to more trips than they are currently getting under the present law. However, I think the timing of this is just atrocious. The President of the United States just about a week and a half ago in addressing the Nation said that the deficit would be approaching \$30 billion for this fiscal year and asked the American people and the Congress to approve a surtax of 10 percent to help hold this deficit down.

It seems to me that we are in an untenable position to oppose any such increase in a surtax if we, on the other hand, turn around and vote ourselves additional trips home even though they may be warranted in some instances.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against this bill.

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

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I shall not belabor this matter. As the chairman of the subcommittee said, the language of the bill is clear and precise and, as he very aptly said, "it speaks for itself."

I opposed this bill in committee and offered an amendment which would make the bill effective at the opening of the next Congress, January 3, 1969. That amendment was not adopted. The procedure under which the bill is now being considered precludes amending the bill on the floor.

My objection is based upon the sincere belief that at this time, when we face a huge budget deficit, when a request is pending for a substantial increased tax burden, when most Members are striving to curtail expenditures, we can best serve the country and this body by postponing any action of this kind, and by demonstrating some personal prudence. It has been said that the Members must get home to their districts regularly. I think it would be infinitely better if we would exert our proper influence to get back to a 7-month schedule for congressional sessions. How incongruous it is that we are still holding long sessions because we operate a never-resolved Korean war emergency clause. If we did follow the constitutional provision, if we did shorten our sessions, and the Members know how that might be done, then we would have the time to spend in our districts and, more importantly, we would have the proper time to spend in hearings and in research on legislative matters that are pending, time which we do not now have because of the uncertain schedule of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I presume that an effort will be made to try to deal quickly and expeditiously with this matter. I would like to quote from the President's message of last week in which he chided the House in regard to the insurance bill in this fashion. The President said:

The bill which finally passed the Congress was subjected only to brief debate. The roll was not called in either House on the passage of this bill. It was passed by a voice vote.

Following that, the majority leader said he thought the action of the President was wise because we did face a very serious fiscal situation, and one in which we had to watch the appropriations. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a good time for us to demonstrate what we mean by watching the fiscal operations of the Government.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have joined with two of my colleagues in the House Administration Committee in signing the minority views on this legislation.

We feel that this bill should be amended so that it will not be effective until the next session. However I would like to address myself now to another point. I hope that I can have the atten-

tion of Members because the point is important and material to the issue at hand.

The reluctance already expressed toward voting this increased travel allowance reflects a growing concern in this country about the manner in which Congress is conducting its business. I do not know how many of the Members realize this, but I want to be sure that all of those here do realize that contained in the provisions of S. 355, which passed the Senate last March by a vote of 75 to 9, there is a provision for additional travel—seven trips for each Member per session and additional travel for your staff. The principle is sound and I support it—see page 38 of the final report of the joint committee—Senate Report No. 1414.

I think this is a good time to remind the membership of this House that S. 355, which is a modest congressional reform bill, has been languishing in the so-called reformed Rules Committee for the last 5 months, and only 1 day of hearings were held on that bill. To me it is regrettable and even worse, that when a joint committee of this House and the Senate takes 2 years of their time and makes recommendations to this body for the reform of our procedures, that the bill is then locked up in the Rules Committee and not even considered, except for 1 day of hearings. Now we are duplicating part of that bill and we are rushing through to passage this legislation in a most untimely and unseemly manner.

Mr. Speaker, there is a loud, clear call in the country today for congressional reform. I think the time has come for us to answer this call. The first thing that could be done would be for the Rules Committee to bring out S. 355, so the matter of vacations and the matter of travel and the other matters of congressional reform can be acted on by this House. For us to pass this legislation today is another attempt to pass piecemeal the Congressional Reform Act, leaving out the really important provisions. For that reason, I join with those who oppose the resolution at this time.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield so that I may ask the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], a question. In view of the President's chastisement of the House in his veto of the insurance bill, for having passed that bill on a voice vote, may we assume that the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this bill will ask for a rollcall vote on final passage?

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, that is up to the House. I cannot answer that question. I was not happy with the veto message on the insurance bill on behalf of Government employees. But this is not an insurance bill. It will simply provide that Members of the House will not have to pay out of their pockets for one trip

each month to their congressional districts, which they feel is necessary during the sessions of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, that is neither here nor there. I am asking if the gentleman from Maryland is going to ask for a rollcall vote?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, that is up to the House.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H.R. 9837 and I have to wonder how the Democratic leadership can permit such a resolution to come to the floor for debate at this time. This resolution is retroactive to January 1967, and provides one trip back to a Member's district each month. This will cost more money for the operation of the legislative branch of the Government than was previously budgeted. It seems to me that this House cannot expect the other branches of the Government to reduce spending when it fails to do so itself. This is a time for cuts—not increases—in the spending in all branches of Government.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote against this measure and will insist on a rollcall vote.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I want to rise and associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from New Hampshire, who spoke in the well just recently about the hodag—and he used the words of the senior member, the cochairman of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress—that is going on here, wherein piecemeal we are assimilating many of the better parts of the bill and the report which has passed the Senate. He has served meritoriously on that bipartisan committee.

I would remind the House that the reason only seven trips to the district were recommended by that joint committee after 3 years of hearings, was that also there is a limitation in the joint committee report, and in the bill itself, as to Congress going on illicitly and illegally beyond the end of the seventh month of each year unless a separate emergency was declared. It is for this reason, plus the fact that many of the facets of the joint committee report have been extracted and have become individual legislative recommendations of this committee, that I shall oppose the bill in its present form at this time.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. I regret that the bill is not called up on the day that the 10-percent tax increase will come before the House of Representatives.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will see fit to stand and be counted in behalf of a rollcall on this bill when the final vote is taken.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS.]

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill and I hope that it passes.

I think every Member of the Congress ought to be reimbursed for at least one trip a month back to his district. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] said that many of us make many more trips than that. I would like to point out that the executive branch—and that includes the Army and Navy and Air Force—have no limitation on the number of trips they can make anywhere at any time. The only judgment that intervenes is their judgment about whether or not they should go.

The Congress polices itself very carefully on telephones. We are allowed only so many minutes a session. The executive branch has no limitation except on the amount of money they can get out of Congress.

Anybody down to a sub-sub-bureau chief can pick up a telephone and call any place, as often as he likes, and talk as long as he likes.

When I came here 19 years ago the Members of this body paid their own telephone bills, and some of the new Members can believe it or not. Members were furnished telephones in their offices, but if they picked them up and called outside the District of Columbia the tab was theirs.

There is not a State legislature in the country which does not provide its membership with telephone calls, postage stamps, and a trip a week home.

I just do not buy this argument about the executive branch. I do not buy this argument about the President vetoing the insurance bill, because they have unlimited things like that themselves, and they do not have any of this and do not police themselves like we do.

So far as the tax is concerned, or the increase in taxes, I believe that each Member can vote on that as he sees fit. I know how I am going to vote. It is not going to be consistent with the way the President would like to see me vote, so far as that is concerned. That is up to him and to me and to my constituents.

I believe this piece of legislation today can stand on its own merit. It has merit.

So far as I am concerned, the argument of the gentleman from Iowa about the 7-month session causes me to say nothing would suit me better, but the real situation is that we are not having 7-month sessions these days.

I believe the bill ought to pass. I hope it does pass.

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

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would like to say, that I support the gentleman. Some make it sound like we go home on weekends for a vacation. When I go home, I work.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how any Members of this Congress could go to his district and disassociate himself from his job and his membership in this House of Representatives. If there are those who might want to go somewhere on a lark, they would not go to their district.

Further, I would say, Mr. Speaker, for those who are concerned about economy, as I am concerned, that I sincerely believe it is in the interest of economy for Members, particularly right now, to get home and find out what the American people are thinking. If all Members got home more often they would know how disturbed our citizens are and we would save millions of dollars for the taxpayers.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, because he contributed in his usual forthright manner. I have known him a long time. That is the way he operates and I congratulate him.

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

Mr. HAYS. I promised the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] that I would yield to him, and if I have time remaining I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill, but I certainly hope it passes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be serious for a moment. Certainly I support this resolution. When the Members are called back to their congressional districts on official business, the Government should pay their expenses. Our constituents would want the Members' expenses paid, and if we would operate on that basis, doubtless there would be fewer testimonial dinners.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana has expressed the sentiments of several people who are opposed to the bill, I believe.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would add one thing. I am ready to stand up and be counted.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 9837, as amended.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused. The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPERTY HELD BY AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 281) to increase the amount of real property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome, with the title amended so as to read: "An act to increase the amount of real and personal property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome."

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 281

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to permit the American Academy in Rome to enlarge its purposes, and for other purposes", approved June 6,

1912 (37 Stat. 124), as amended (43 Stat. 635), is hereby amended by striking out "\$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill. There were companion bills introduced in the House. This is a bill that was reported from the full Committee on House Administration unanimously. It merely provides for increasing the amounts of property which may be held by the American Academy in Rome.

The act of March 3, 1905—33 Stat. 1044—created a body corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of the American Academy in Rome, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining an institution to promote the study and practice of the fine arts, and to aid and stimulate the education and training of architects, painters, sculptors, and other artists by enabling such citizens of the United States, selected by competition from among those who have passed with honors through leading technical schools, to develop their powers and complete their training under the most favorable conditions of direction and surroundings. As originally enacted the corporation was empowered to hold real estate and personal property in the United States and in the Kingdom of Italy for the necessary use of the organization to an amount not to exceed \$1 million. Subsequent acts of Congress, one in 1912, raised this amount to \$3 million, and another in 1924, which further increased the amount to \$10 million, enlarged the purposes of the Academy.

I want to emphasize the fact that this bill does not provide that the United States will be liable. It provides under no circumstances shall the United States be liable for any obligation incurred by this corporation. There is no cost to the Government involved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. This is simply a technical amendment to the incorporating legislation which permits the corporation to hold more property than is presently permissible. I am heartily in favor of doing everything we possibly can to support the outstanding work of this great organization. Over the years since 1905 when it was first established, it has been the channel of support for innumerable painters, architects, sculptors, and other artists during their formative years and through their efforts, these young Americans have been permitted to inscribe the classical culture of Rome at

its source. The resultant contribution to the culture of our own country, although not susceptible of exact measurement, has been considerable.

The Academy will receive substantial contributions or gifts in the future which will exceed the volume of property which it may now hold. This limit should be increased to \$25,000,000 in order to guarantee a continuance of the vital work of the American Academy in Rome.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the cosponsors of this measure, having introduced on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT], H.R. 10588. This is certainly the kind of approach that the U.S. Congress should take to the development of the arts as much as possible. The American Academy in Rome offers a perfect example of voluntary contributions and the free enterprise system working without any Government assistance.

The sole purpose of this bill is to amend the charter of the American Academy in Rome to raise the amount of real and personal property which the academy may take and hold from \$10 million to \$25 million. The American Academy itself is a privately endowed center for American creative artists and scholars located in Rome, Italy.

It was chartered by the U.S. Congress in 1905 "to promote the study and practice of fine arts and to aid and stimulate the education and training of architects, painters, sculptors, and other artists, by enabling such citizens of the United States as shall be selected by competition from among those who have passed with honor through leading technical schools or have been equally well qualified by private instruction or study to develop their powers and complete their training under the most favorable conditions of direction and surroundings."

Since that time, Congress has twice raised the amount of property which the academy is entitled to take and hold. In 1913 Congress raised the initial sum of \$1 million to \$3 million; in 1924 Congress raised the sum to \$10 million; today the House should vote to raise it to \$25 million to keep pace with the high cost of modern education. Congress should recognize the expanded activities and the increasingly broadening goals of the academy in promoting the study and practice of the fine arts.

The American Academy is partially maintained by contributions of \$250 to \$500 each from 79 American colleges and universities. As well, there are many private individuals who generously support this academy for Americans abroad.

The bill before the House today does not call for any appropriation from the U.S. Treasury, but merely enables private donors and universities to increase the capital endowment of the American Academy.

The American Academy as a cultural institution abroad has a tremendous impact on the image of our United States in the eyes of the educated world. As a longtime member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have seen what an important part of our foreign policy is related to cultural activities. Certainly

an institution with the stature in the arts of the American Academy does much to refute the allegation that the American culture is principally materialistic.

Also, it is significant to point out that the graduates of the American Academy in Rome number among themselves some of the great designers, writers, painters, and sculptors of our society. Many have worldwide reputations and look back on the valuable days of apprenticeship or practice at the American Academy in Rome.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask someone in connection with this bill, since we hear that there is no Federal money involved, if the donors to this academy in Italy pay taxes on the money that they donate?

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I could not answer the gentleman's question. I would imagine that the people from the United States who would make contributions would pay such taxes. But insofar as foreigners who contribute are concerned, I do not know.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I can answer that part of the question. As the gentleman knows, the American Academy is a U.S. corporation. It is not a foreign corporation. It is subject to the same laws as any other chartered institution in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. What is that? Are they exempt or are they not exempt from taxes with reference to the contributions which they make?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. A contribution to the academy is an educational contribution and would be treated as such by U.S. tax law. The people who have made contributions to this academy, the American Academy in Rome, have, through their contributions, established fellowships in archeology, literature, and history of the classical and later periods, landscaping, architecture, musical composition, foreign design, sculpture. Their contributions have constructed an academy for Americans to study and live in at the center of Western culture and civilization for a thousand years, the city of Rome. They have built, as well, a library of 72,000 volumes.

If the gentleman from Iowa thinks that the educational objectives encompassed under this legislation are not worthwhile, then the gentleman is privileged to vote his convictions.

Mr. GROSS. I am not passing upon the question as to whether it is good or bad. I am merely trying to ascertain whether they pay taxes on the money that goes to this academy in Rome, whether it is tax exempt. If it is tax exempt, the Federal Government is indirectly subsidizing this academy. That is all.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In answer to that, I shall have given to the gentleman the names of the contributing institutions, and the names of the

trustees of the American Academy in Rome:

AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME
CONTRIBUTING INSTITUTIONS

American Numismatic Society, Amherst College, Barnard College, Brandeis University, Brown University, Bryn Mawr College, University of California, Catholic University of America, University of Chicago, University of Cincinnati, University of Colorado, Columbia University, Connecticut College, Cornell University.

Dartmouth College, Duke University, Emory University, Florida State University, Fordham University, Hamilton College, Harvard University, Haverford College, Hollins College, Hunter College, University of Illinois, Indiana University, Institute for Advanced Study, University of Iowa.

The Johns Hopkins University, University of Kansas, University of Kentucky, Manhattanville College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Michigan State University, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of Mississippi, University of Missouri, Mount Holyoke College.

College of New Rochelle, New York University, State University of New York at Buffalo, University of North Carolina, Northwestern University, University of Notre Dame, Oberlin College, Ohio State University, University of Oklahoma, University of Oregon, Pennsylvania State University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, Princeton University.

Rhode Island School of Design, Rice University, University of Rochester, Rosary College, Rutgers—The State University, Smith College, University of the South, University of South Carolina, Stanford University, Swarthmore College, Temple University, Tyler School of Art, University of Texas, Tufts University, Tulane University.

Vanderbilt University, Vassar College, University of Vermont, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington University, St. Louis, Wellesley College, Wesleyan University, Wheaton College, Massachusetts, Williams College, University of Wisconsin, Yale University.

TRUSTEES (NEW NOMINATIONS) TO SERVE UNTIL
1969

Frederick B. Adams, Jr., library director; David T. Harris, banker; Otto Luening, composer; Ezio Martinelli, sculptor.

TRUSTEES (RE-NOMINATIONS AND NEW NOMINATIONS) TO SERVE UNTIL 1970

James S. Ackerman, Sherman Baldwin, Walker O. Cain, Mason Hammond, Lewis Ieslin, William H. Johnstone, Paul MacKendrick, Arthur Osver, Nathaniel A. Owings, Randall Thompson, William Thon, painter (new), Robert Venturi, architect (new).

ADDITIONAL LIST OF TRUSTEES

Edmund N. Bacon, city planner; Walter C. Baker, retired businessman; Edward L. Barnes, architect; Peter Blume, painter; Elliott Carter, composer; Lionel Casson, classicist; Gardner Cox, painter; Eric Gugler, architect; Walker Hancock, sculptor; Charles B. Harding, businessman; Rensselaer W. Lee, art historian.

Henry Allen Moe, foundation director; William Platz, architect; Michael Rapuano, landscape architect; Henry R. Rowell, classicist; Langdon S. Simons, Jr., businessman; J. Kelle Smith, Jr., foundation secretary; James Johnson Sweeney, museum director; Randall Thompson, composer; Landon K. Thorne, Jr., businessman; John Walker, museum director.

TRUSTEES EMERITI

Hoyt Ammidon, Louis Bouche, Gilmore D. Clarke, Dwight S. Beebe, retired businessman; William D. Dinsmoor, classicist; Wallace K. Harrison, architect; C. W. Mendell, classicist; Douglas Moore, composer.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Iowa questioned whether these people pay taxes when they are contributing. Of course they do not.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I will say to the gentleman that I agree, of course they do not. So the answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa is that, yes, they do not pay taxes. That is all the gentleman wanted to know. The gentleman from Iowa wanted to know whether or not indirectly they receive a tax exemption, and the answer is yes.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It sounded as if there were imputed to be something wrong with the fact that these institutions are contributing, so I believe it better to place the whole list of these institutions in the RECORD.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. There was nothing wrong with it, that is the way the law is. The answer to the gentleman is yes, and that is all he wanted to know.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Yes; but I wanted to be sure we have in the RECORD these fine institutions from all over the country of every type and variety that are contributing to the American Academy in Rome.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment these fine institutions are well worth contributing to, and I admire each and every one of them. They have contributed to the American Academy at Rome in order to secure the possibility of having these fellowships established for study, and for the library in Rome, so that we in this country will have the benefit of the great heritage of culture that has been in Rome and in Europe for these many centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the American Academy at Rome. It has been managed well; there has been no criticism of its operation all through the years, either in the Congress or otherwise, that I am knowledgeable about.

When Congress can foster such a significant impact on both the foreign policy of the United States, its image abroad, and on the state of the fine arts throughout the world, and do so without cost to the American taxpayer, I believe that it should do so most willingly. In this spirit, the Members of this House should support the bill before it today to increase the authorization of the American Academy from \$10 million to \$25 million in real and personal property.

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

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York office of the American Academy in Rome is located in my district at 101 Park Avenue. Distinguished members of its board of trustees and officers live in my district. This organization is one of the groups that makes the 17th Congressional District of New York one of the world centers of culture. Supporting, as it does, an academy in Rome with private funds, it gives an opportunity to absorb the teachings of the past for the art of the future without the Government spending taxpayer's money.

I am very pleased to support S. 281, a bill increasing the amount of real and personal property which may be held by

the American Academy in Rome. My own bill to the same effect, cosponsored with Senator JAVITS, is H.R. 6149. See House Committee Report No. 557 of August 16, 1967. The Senate Report No. 238 is dated May 17, 1967.

I originally introduced this bill in the 89th Congress shortly after my election to Congress. It was then H.R. 15502 and my comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 9, page 12444, are herein set forth:

INCREASE THE AMOUNT OF PROPERTY WHICH MAY BE HELD BY THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, during this period of growing interest both in the arts and humanities and in international education, I would like to remind my distinguished colleagues of an institution which has been one of America's finest and longest contributors to both of these fields—the American Academy in Rome. Since 1894 the academy has provided promising young American artists and scholars with the opportunity to spend one or more years in Rome undertaking independent creative work or research.

The American Academy in Rome was chartered in 1905 by the U.S. Congress to promote the study and practice of the fine arts and to aid and stimulate the education and training of architects, painters, sculptors, and other artists.

The original act in 1905 provided that the American Academy in Rome may hold real estate and personal property in the United States and Italy for the necessary use and purpose of the organization to an amount not to exceed \$1 million.

With the many endowments, gifts, and contributions from individuals and American colleges and universities—the original amount of real and personal property which the academy is authorized to hold was soon increased to \$10 million—Public Law 251, June 6, 1912.

The present bill would permit the American Academy in Rome to receive additional bequests and legacies to enable it to continue its work in Italy and America by authorizing an increase in the total amount of property it may hold to \$25 million.

Under an amendment to the charter in 1913, the academy was consolidated with the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, and its purposes were broadened to include the study of the archeology, literature, and history of the classical and later periods.

With the exception of a summer session, the Academy offers no coursework. Each year several distinguished artists, composers, and scholars are invited to be in residence, and they are always available to fellows for advice and consultation. The Academy draws its support from endowment funds, gifts from individuals, and yearly contributions of \$250 to \$500 each from American colleges and universities.

The atmosphere and setting of the American Academy in Rome, whose United States office is in New York City, provide an ideal setting for the growth of all who have an opportunity to live and work there. But the Academy's influence is not limited to those who are in residence. It reaches out to the citizens of Rome and each year welcomes many distinguished guests who travel to Rome from all over the world. Through concerts, lectures, and exhibits, the creative talents of those at the Academy and other special guests are shared with a wide range of individuals. Cooperative ventures with European artists, scholars, and institutions are another way in which the educational and creative endeavors of the Academy become truly international.

The significance of the Academy in nurtur-

ing some of America's greatest artists and humanist scholars and the growth of their worldwide reputation can scarcely be underestimated. The roster of former fellows shows that some of our most eminent artists and scholars studied there as young men and women. Among them, I am proud to say, are many New Yorkers. John Clardi, an editor of the Saturday Review, Howard Hanson, director of the Institute of American Music, Randall Thompson, one of our most prominent composers, writers Ralph Ellison and Richard Wilbur, and painter Joseph Lasker are just a few of the many from our State alone who spent some of their important early years at the Academy.

Mr. Speaker, as we look forward to the growth of the study of the arts and humanities in this country, and to a greater stress on international education, I pay tribute to the American Academy in Rome. The farsightedness of its distinguished founders, the efforts of its trustees and directors, and the creative work of its many residents and visitors over the past 70 years have been of great benefit to our country here and abroad and have provided us all with an example we should try to emulate.

I am pleased to be the sponsor of legislation which will enable the American Academy in Rome to continue and expand its splendid work and many contributions to the fields of art and humanity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 281, with the title amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, with title amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, S. 281.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 11565) to amend section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of peanut acreage allotments.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11565

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding after section 358 the following new section:

"Sec. 358a. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law for the 1968 and 1969 crop years, the Secretary, if he determines that it will not impair the effective operation of the peanut marketing quota or price-support program, (1) may permit the owner and operator of any farm for which a peanut acreage allotment is established under this Act to sell or lease all or any part or the right to all or any part of such allotment to any other owner or operator of a farm in the same county for transfer to such farm; and

(2) may permit the owner of a farm to transfer all or any part of such allotment to any other farm owned or controlled by him.

"(b) Transfers under this section shall be subject to the following conditions: (1) no allotment shall be transferred to a farm in another county; (2) no transfer of an allotment from a farm subject to a mortgage or other lien shall be permitted unless the transfer is agreed to by the lienholders; (3) no sale of a farm allotment from a farm shall be permitted if any sale of allotment to the same farm has been made within the three immediately preceding crop years; (4) no transfer of allotment shall be effective until a record thereof is filed with the county committee of the county in which such transfer is made and such committee determines that the transfer complies with the provisions of this section; and (5) if the normal yield established by the county committee for the farm to which the allotment is transferred does not exceed the normal yield established by the county committee for the farm from which the allotment is transferred by more than 10 per centum, the lease or sale and transfer shall be approved acre for acre, but if the normal yield for the farm to which the allotment is transferred exceeds the normal yield for the farm from which the allotment is transferred by more than 10 per centum, the county committee shall make a downward adjustment in the amount of the acreage allotment transferred by multiplying the normal yield established for the farm from which the allotment is transferred by the acreage being transferred and dividing the result by the normal yield established for the farm to which the allotment is transferred: *Provided*, That in the event an allotment is transferred to a farm which at the time of such transfer is not irrigated, but within five years subsequent to such transfer is placed under irrigation, the Secretary shall also make an annual downward adjustment in the allotment so transferred by multiplying the normal yield established for the farm from which the allotment is transferred and dividing the result by the actual yield for the previous year, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions, on the farm to which the allotment is transferred: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the adjustment made in any peanut allotment because of the transfer to a higher producing farm shall not reduce or increase the size of any future National or State allotment and an acreage equal to the total of all such adjustments shall not be allotted to any other farms.

"(c) The transfer of an allotment shall have the effect of transferring also the acreage history and marketing quota attributable to such allotment and if the transfer is made prior to the determination of the allotment for any year the transfer shall include the right of the owner or operator to have an allotment determined for the farm for such year: *Provided*, That in the case of a transfer by lease the amount of the allotment shall be considered, for the purpose of determining allotments after the expiration of the lease, to have been planted on the farm from which such allotment is transferred.

"(d) The land in the farm from which the entire peanut allotment has been transferred shall not be eligible for a new farm peanut allotment during the five years following the year in which such transfer is made.

"(e) Any lease may be made for such term of years not to exceed five as the parties thereto agree, and on such other terms and conditions except as otherwise provided in this section as the parties thereto agree.

"(f) The lease of any part of a peanut acreage allotment determined for a farm shall not affect the allotment for the farm from which such allotment is transferred or

the farm to which it is transferred, except with respect to the crop year or years specified in the lease. The amount of the acreage allotment which is leased from a farm shall be considered for purposes of determining future allotments to have been planted to peanuts on the farm from which such allotment is leased and the production pursuant to the lease shall not be taken into account in establishing allotments for subsequent years for the farm to which such allotment is leased. The lessor shall be considered to have been engaged in the production of peanuts for purposes of eligibility to vote in the referendum.

"(g) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the administration of this section which may include reasonable limitation on the size of the resulting allotments on farms to which transfers are made and such other terms and conditions as he deems necessary, but the total peanut allotment transferred to any farm by sale or lease shall not exceed fifty acres.

"(h) If the sale or transfer occurs during a period in which the farm is covered by a conservation reserve contract, cropland conversion agreement, or other similar land utilization agreement the rates of payment provided for in the contract or agreement of the farm from which the transfer is made shall be subject to an appropriate adjustment, but no adjustment shall be made in the contract or agreement of the farm to which the transfer is made."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to also demand a second, and I just wondered if the gentleman who demanded the second is opposed to the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentlewoman from Missouri is not timely, the Chair will state to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet waiting to be recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is very, very sorry the gentlewoman did not challenge the gentleman from Oklahoma prior to the time the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma to control the time after he had demanded a second. The Chair is sure the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Oklahoma will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet, and said that I demanded a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state the rule is that the gentlewoman should have challenged before the gentleman from Oklahoma had received the right to control the time after he demanded a second. Had the gen-

tlewoman done so, the Chair would have put the question of qualification to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I made the mistake. I did not know that I had to challenge as the Speaker has indicated, and that is why I made the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 11565 is to authorize the sale, lease, or transfer of peanut acreage allotments among farms within the same county.

Enactment of the bill would not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government, but it would serve to improve program operations for peanut farmers. It has the blessings of the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget, and the House Committee on Agriculture.

This legislation is needed primarily to permit farmers to increase the size of their allotment in order to realize a more reasonable return on their considerable investments.

There are many peanut acreage allotments too small to constitute an economic unit in view of rising costs of producing and harvesting the crop. The Department of Agriculture reports that in 1964—the last year for which complete statistics are available—more than one-fourth of all peanut allotments were five acres or less and more than one-half were 10 acres or less. This year the average size of established allotments is approximately 17.9 acres.

The problem of small allotments becomes more serious each year as the cost per acre to produce peanuts continues to rise steadily. A farmer with an allotment of five acres must use the same type expensive equipment, herbicides, and improved methods of cultivation as a farmer with 100 acres.

Allowing farmers to transfer peanut acreage allotments would permit the establishment of more economic-sized units of production. This in turn would result in more efficient production on individual farms and for the industry as a whole.

Small but capable and efficient farmers could increase their acreage of peanuts while others, who wish to discontinue growing peanuts, could transfer their resources to other crops, or retire from peanut production entirely and still receive remuneration.

Another very important benefit of the bill is that it would allow a new grower to acquire an allotment even though the national allotment is not increased by 1 acre. At present there is little or no opportunity for a young man who decides on a career in farming or a sharecropper who has long dreamed of the day he could own a farm because they were not fortunate enough to meet the requirements for a peanut acreage allotment in 1949 when they were reestablished after World War II. This legislation would permit a new grower to obtain an allotment up to 50 acres through lease or outright purchase.

In essence, this legislation will put

peanut production in the hands of those who want to grow peanuts while at the same time it guards against any geographical switch in peanut production which could conceivably damage the economy of many counties.

The committee felt that the authority to lease, sell, or transfer peanut acreage allotments should be accompanied by language in the legislation which would guard against any speculation or overproduction which might otherwise result from this new authority. Therefore, the following conditions are set forth in the legislation:

First. Under no condition may allotments be transferred across county lines.

Second. No allotment may be transferred from a farm subject to a mortgage or lien unless the transfer is agreed to by the lienholders.

Third. No sale of a farm allotment from a farm shall be permitted if any sale of allotment to the same farm has been made within the three immediately preceding crop years.

Fourth. No transfer of allotment shall be effective until a record thereof is filed with the county committee of the county in which the transfer is made and until the county committee determines that the transfer complies with the provisions of the law.

Fifth. If there is not more than a 10-percent difference in production per acre, transfers shall be on the basis of acre for acre; however, in cases where the transferred acreage goes to a farm where the production per acre exceeds that of the transferred acreage by more than 10 percent, there shall be a corresponding downward adjustment in the amount of acreage transferred to assure that no overproduction would result from the transfer.

Sixth. Where an allotment is transferred to a farm which at the present time is not irrigated but which within 5 years places the transferred allotment under irrigation, the Secretary of Agriculture shall then make a downward adjustment in the amount of acreage transferred to assure that there would be no increased production as a result of irrigating the transferred acreage.

Seventh. The land on the farm from which the entire peanut allotment has been transferred shall not be eligible for a new farm peanut allotment during the 5 years following the year in which such transfer is made.

Eighth. Leases of any portion of a peanut allotment shall not exceed 5 years.

Ninth. The total peanut allotment transferred to any farm by sale or lease shall not exceed 50 acres or any lesser amount prescribed by the Secretary.

Peanut farming has undergone very great changes in recent years.

When the present allotments were required in 1949, nearly all of the harvesting was done by hand labor using pitchforks to pile the newly plowed vines and nuts in stacks, so that the wind and sunshine would dry them in a process that might take many weeks.

Now the labor is scarce and the stacks are nonexistent.

Virtually every peanut farmer in America uses a windrow process that requires expensive machinery, and as a re-

sult an investment is required of many thousands of dollars.

The same allotment useful to the farm with labor in the family or nearby is "gone with the wind."

The farmer either has to buy this machinery himself or pay someone else who has bought the machinery.

So, he has virtually the same cost of harvesting 20 acres as he would 50 acres.

If this bill becomes law, it will not cause an increase in production. Extreme care has been taken to write in it language that will not cause it, but it will bring about a general reduction in costs per acre.

It will not affect the national volume, but it will permit a net profit to the individual farmer by merely reducing his cost per acre.

Many of these allotments are held by people who have inherited them with the land, but who do not farm them. They rent out the land and the allotment to active farmers who buy the big machines but who have no security because of changing whims of landlords affected by changing agriculture programs such as soil bank and cropland adjustment programs.

This will enable this man who was born 20 years too late to buy into his security by owning the allotment along with the machinery he has to invest in.

The provisions of this bill are virtually parallel with those of a bill permitting the sale and lease of cotton allotments—passed in 1965 by the 89th Congress.

And parallel with the provisions of a bill passed this year by the 90th Congress with reference to two or three types of tobacco.

The only difference is that this bill regarding peanuts is more restrictive—the committee recognizing clearly that the problems of commodities are different.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The gentlewoman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

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

Mr. ABBITT. 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. 225]

Addabbo	Donohue	Hungate
Anderson, III.	Dwyer	Irwin
Barrett	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Bell	Everett	Karth
Bingham	Fallon	Kastenmeier
Blackburn	Fino	King, N.Y.
Bow	Fisher	Kluczyński
Brock	Ford, Gerald R.	Leggett
Button	Fulton, Tenn.	Long, La.
Cederberg	Gettys	Lukens
Clausen,	Gialmo	McCarthy
Don H.	Gibbons	McCulloch
Coller	Grover	McEwen
Corman	Gubser	Macdonald,
Curtis	Hansen, Wash.	Mass.
Delaney	Hardy	Michel
Devine	Harsha	Morris, N. Mex.
Dickinson	Hicks	Murphy, N.Y.
Diggs	Hollfield	Nix
Dingell	Howard	O'Neill, Mass.

Philbin	Ronan	Stuckey
Pirnie	Rostenkowski	Teague, Tex.
Pucinski	Roubidoux	Ullman
Rarick	Satterfield	Walker
Resnick	St. Onge	Watkins
Riegle	Saylor	Williams, Miss.
Robison	Shipley	Willis
Rodino	Stephens	Wylder

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall, 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

TRANSFER OF PEANUT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to H.R. 11565 as it has been brought before the House today and I hope sufficient of my colleagues will join me in opposition to this legislation so that we can defeat its passage under suspension of the rules. This is a bill to amend section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of peanut acreage allotments. I do not think all of the implications of this legislation have been fully considered by the Committee on Agriculture. In any event, I am somewhat surprised by the form in which the bill has been reported.

The first thing about the bill which surprises me greatly is the fact that it would authorize the sale, lease, or transfer of these allotments for both the 1968 and 1969 crop years. If this legislation were to pass in this form it would mean that the Committee on Agriculture would not be required to take another look at this situation next year and thus the House also would not have an opportunity to amend or repeal this experimental program. How do we know it is going to work effectively over a period of 2 years? Is there not some danger in letting a new program of this nature run its own course for such a long period of time without mandatory congressional review by the appropriate legislative committee? Without an annual review by the Committee on Agriculture how will we know whether people are cheating? How will we know whether the consequences of this legislation will be different from those anticipated by its sponsors?

I am sure I may be excused for raising these questions because, as the Members remember, these were the main questions raised by the committee in connection with the food stamp authorization bill which we considered here in the House last June.

The Committee on Agriculture placed an amendment on my bill limiting the authorization for appropriations to the current fiscal year only. This was done in order to make sure that the committee would have to review the program again next year to find out whether there were any shenanigans, cheating, fraud, and so on. Even though the food stamp program has been in operation in essentially its present form for 6 years, and there has been no scandal and no waste or extravagance—even though it has been working

very well in fact—the Committee on Agriculture was fearful that if we should let it run for more than a year without legislative review, it might run wild.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM LIVING ON BORROWED TIME

Of course, I did not agree with that philosophy at the time the food stamp bill was before us, particularly since the Senate had already passed a bill for a 3-year authorization of appropriations. Most of us who supported the food stamp program felt that the difference between a 1-year bill and a 3-year bill was not of such monumental proportions that it could not be resolved in conference, perhaps on the basis of a 2-year compromise, but we were apparently very wrong in this estimate. We did not reckon with the depth and intensity of conviction of the House conferees on the principle involved in this issue, for it is more than 2 months since the food stamp bill went to conference and it is still there—deadlocked, stalemated—over the question of whether it should be extended for 1 year or 3 years or 2 years.

If the issue is of such vast importance in connection with the food stamp program, then certainly it is somewhat important—I would say at least as important—to the idea of letting peanut farmers sell, lease, or transfer their acreage allotments.

If we defeat the peanut acreage bill today, the worst thing that happens, or could happen, would be that the peanut farmers would have to continue farming their own acreage in order to make use of their allotments. The big farmers could not take over the allotments of the little farmers without buying their land.

But if the food stamp program dies—as it will, the moment the agricultural appropriations bill is signed into law, unless the authorization of it is blasted out of conference and passed first—more than 2 million Americans now eating properly—eating well and enjoying decent nutritional standards—will be deprived of the help which has meant the difference between undernourishment and proper nutrition.

WAS 2-YEAR PEANUT BILL AN OVERSIGHT?

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture has made such a point of the absolute and vital necessity for annual review of any and all programs under its jurisdiction that it has convinced me that if this policy is to be followed on the food stamp program, it certainly should be followed also on the sale, lease, or transfer of peanut acreage allotments. All sorts of things could happen in the next 2 years in this peanut acreage allotment transfer program. Yet the Congress would be powerless to do anything about it because the House Agriculture Committee will have surrendered its prerogative to review the program again next year before allowing it to continue, and the farmers will be buying and selling allotments without the kind of congressional scrutiny the Agriculture Committee considers so important.

I am sure that putting a 2-year instead of a 1-year time period on this peanut bill was an oversight on the part of the committee. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture assured us

last June when the food stamp bill was before us that it was his intention to limit to 1 year every single authorization bill approved by his committee. He even indicated, if I recall correctly, that he would be willing to put the section 32 program on an annual basis instead of having this open-end program, amounting to half a billion dollars a year, removed from annual legislation review.

I would love to have an opportunity to vote each year on whether we should continue to set aside one-third of all customs receipts for the benefit of the cattle ranchers, the chicken farmers, the lettuce growers, and others who raise perishable commodities, based upon the depression period census, which indicated that in those days one-third of our population lived on farms, instead of today's 6 percent.

SHOULD STATES SET UP FOOD STAMP FUND FOR EX-PEANUT FARMERS?

If there were some possibility or indication that the House conferees on the food stamp program would be willing to let that program run for at least 2 years, then I could perhaps be persuaded there would be no great danger to the Republic or to the economy or to the American way of life if peanut farmers could have 2 years in which to lease, sell, or transfer their acreage allotments. Even so, I would have some misgivings about this bill on the basis of the hearings on the peanut bill, because the transcript shows that in many areas peanut production is the only cash crop of any consequence. The fear was expressed in the hearings that small farmers having peanut allotments would sell them and then find that they could not farm profitably. So they would either come to our cities where we would have to try to figure out some way to help them exist, or they would have to go on the food stamp program where they are.

Generally, the food stamp program has operated properly, but in the case of the congressional district in Georgia represented by the author of H.R. 11565, Mr. O'NEAL, there is an indication that the food stamp program has not been operating properly. Mr. O'NEAL told us during the hearings on the food stamp bill that the people in his district were buying beer and whisky and cigarettes with the food stamps. This is clearly illegal. Apparently, some of the stores are conspiring with some of the people to take the food stamps meant for the nutrition of the children and diverting them instead to booze and tobacco. This worries me, for if we pass H.R. 11565 and some of the peanut farmers in Georgia sell their allotments, and spend the money foolishly for beer and whisky, then when they are broke again and have to go back on the food stamp program, they might continue with these same bad habits, only this time the taxpayers of the United States would be subsidizing their illegal purchases.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill must be defeated so that the Committee on Agriculture can correct its oversight and come back with a bill which limits the program to only 1 year and perhaps calls for sharing by the States of up to 20 percent in the

value of the peanut acreage allotments to be set aside in a fund to provide food stamps to those who sell their allotments and then are left with farms on which they cannot make a living.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentlewoman from Missouri has joined me in limiting these bills to 1 year. I was in favor of limiting the food stamp bill to 1 year, and I join with the gentlewoman in believing this bill should be limited to 1 year also, and I would be glad to support any amendment she might make for this purpose.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, under suspension of rules we are not allowed to amend a bill brought to the floor.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I am terribly sorry about that, but I am glad the gentlewoman changed her mind on this 1 year. I appreciate the argument she made in that regard. I think it is good for Congress to take a look at these programs every year. I think that was true of the food stamp program, and I believe it is true of this and many other plans. I think it undoubtedly was an oversight on the part of the Committee on Agriculture that this was made for 2 years instead of 1 year, because I know the attitude of the Committee on Agriculture is to limit them to 1 year.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think there may be one exception. We passed in committee the meat inspection bill with no limitation. I agree with the gentlewoman that we should keep a consistent review of these programs. I believe when that bill reaches the floor, we should be alert on that bill too.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman made that speech on the meat inspection bill?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I did not notice it.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman oppose the 2-year limitation on the meat inspection bill?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I was the first sponsor of an intrastate meat inspection bill. I am sorry the committee refused to take my bill. Of course, I was not able to participate in your executive sessions on that bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman say there is anything more important than a meat inspection bill to do away with dirty meat?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think that is one of the most important bills to be brought out of that committee, but it should have been a much stronger bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret the gentlewoman was not able to make that speech on that bill.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I hope the House will suspend the rules and pass it.

I certainly hate to find myself ever on the opposition side of any issue from the distinguished gentlewoman from Mis-

souri, whose contributions to this House and to progressive legislation have been manifold. I agree with what she has had to say about the food stamp bill. I sincerely hope that a conference report will be forthcoming on that bill. That program is working well in most places. It is working as well as any Government program I know anything about. The gentlewoman knows I am for the program.

But I believe that the argument on the pending bill should not turn on some other piece of legislation, and I believe this sincerely.

The Secretary of Agriculture, speaking through the Under Secretary, has strongly recommended this legislation. He said, on April 27 of this year:

The Department has, on a number of occasions, recommended legislation to authorize the transfer by lease or sale of acreage allotments, base acreages, and quotas for all commodities. Our most recent recommendation of April 17, 1967, is presently pending before your committee. This authority has been provided only for cotton, leases of certain kinds of tobacco, and transfers of producer rice allotments. Although we still favor authority to lease and sell all commodity allotments, base acreages, and quotas, we have no objection to such authority being considered on a commodity-by-commodity basis.

There is a difference between an allotment program and a food stamp program. I believe 2 years are needed to start this program. Thereafter, if it is extended, it should probably be extended on a year-to-year basis.

We are late in the year 1967. Allotments for 1968 will be prepared in the very near future.

I come from a district in which peanut production is quite important. I know something about the peanut program. Peanut farmers are, by and large, very small farmers. There are no large peanut farmers in my part of the country that I know anything about. There are very few large peanut allotments, and most of them, I am sure, are less than 20 acres.

There is to be a 50-acre limitation on transfers under this bill. It would be very difficult for anyone to build up a large acreage as a result of this program, particularly in view of the fact that the Secretary is being given discretion to make regulations governing the transfer of allotments. This is important. The Secretary has a statutory limitation of 50 acres. He would probably, by regulation, if anything, lower that figure.

I hope the gentlewoman will not push this matter. This is important to a lot of people. It is important to a lot of little people. It is important to an industry which, though in most areas is not a large industry, is very important to those in the industry.

In counties in which there are peanut shellers and other peanut processors who have their equipment, it is very important to them that peanut production continue in their area. It is important to their employees. It is important to the farmers who are their suppliers. It is important to the Nation that we keep a healthy peanut industry. This bill provides a program that will help do it.

The peanut industry serves a very im-

portant purpose, and those in it should be treated like the producers of other commodities. The Congress has seen fit to give this authority to the producers of cotton, who are much larger and involve a much greater responsibility on the part of the Government of the United States. It has seen fit to give this authority to the producers of certain types of tobacco, which, of course, is another crop which is under allotment.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is needed. The Bureau of the Budget supports it, the President supports it, the Department of Agriculture supports it. I hope that the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I have great respect for the knowledge and ability of our distinguished majority leader. I understand his argument for an opportunity for planning ahead on peanut allotments, but I think the Department of Agriculture will also tell you of the great need to plan ahead with respect to new counties coming in to the food stamp program. You do not put these food stamp programs into new areas overnight. There has to be extensive planning ahead for it. We used all of these arguments during the debate on the food plan authorization bill. We passed that stamp plan authorization bill. We passed that bill on the 8th of June, and it is still deadlocked in conference. Now, I do not like to resort to means of this type to force things to be done in this Congress any more than does any other Member, but I think that if we are to be blocked from more than a 1-year authorization for the food stamp plan, and the bill is in danger of dying in conference, then I give warning that on every bill coming out of the Committee on Agriculture authorizing a program for more than 1 year, I will fight it until we put the authorization of the Food Stamp Act on a more equitable basis. I think a 1-year limitation is too severe for the food stamp program and the Senate has taken the same position. There has to be compromise on both sides. I do not believe in doing all of the compromising.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the gentlewoman, I do not think that the two programs are comparable. I am for the 2-year program on the food stamp plan. I do not like to equate things, however, that are not comparable. I am sorry that a conference report on the food stamp bill has not been brought back to the House. However, I do not think we should penalize those who need the pending legislation. I am sure most of them are interested in the food stamp program, because peanut butter, peanut oil, and other peanut products can be sold under the plan. Peanut farmers are interested in anything that will help to move their products.

If the two programs had any direct relationship, I would certainly agree with the gentlewoman. Under the circumstances I hope that the gentlewoman does not press her position on this mat-

ter. I think this is a question of simple justice. The bill which she sponsored is a magnificent bill. It is one of the best bills that the Congress has passed in my time. I hope we get an agreement on that bill. I also hope that the gentlewoman will let the matter stand on its own merits and let this bill likewise stand on such merits as we think it has.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I think you understand as well as I, do you not, that the food stamp bill will die if something is not done before the agriculture appropriation bill is passed?

Mr. ALBERT. I think that is true. I am hoping something will be done, though. We have a very fine conference committee on the part of the House. I feel sure that after they have bargained awhile they will reach an agreement. At least I hope they will.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, do you not feel that 2 months of a conference stalemate on something as important as the food stamp bill is out of order?

Mr. ALBERT. I have seen stalemates go down to December 24. I hope that does not happen in this case, but I do not know. I cannot answer for the conferees.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not an expert on this subject, but we have a few small growers in my district. My question is perhaps better directed to the chairman of the committee, because it deals specifically with production. Does this 50-acre limitation apply to the transferor as well as the transferee or only to the transferee?

Mr. POAGE. It applies only to the transferee.

Mr. WATSON. When the transferee attempts to make a transfer then he becomes a transferor. Would that apply to him at that time?

Mr. POAGE. He cannot transfer the acreage he has purchased until he has held it, I believe, for 3 years or after the terms of this bill expire. The purpose of this limitation is to prevent speculation in the purchase of these allotments and to allow a man only to purchase for the filling out of his own operation.

Mr. WATSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I am certainly in favor of the bill.

One further question: You say that there is a 10-percent differential in production between the transferor and that of the transferee and that then the acreage will not be on an acre per acre basis, but will be on a proportionately reduced amount?

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. WATSON. Would that permit the transferor to transfer 5 acres to one farm and then transfer 5 acres, should he have a 10-acre allotment, to another farm?

Mr. POAGE. That particular provision does not allow it, but the bill as a whole does allow such transfers. He could transfer all of his allotment to one or

more individuals who are eligible to purchase or lease it from him. That is, if I have 10 acres of allotment, I could transfer 5 acres to you and I could transfer 5 acres to the gentleman from Oklahoma, or I could transfer all of it to you. However, you cannot buy or lease more than 50 acres.

This provision to which you refer is to prevent the transfer of low-productive acreage to high-productive acreage and, thus, increase the total yield of peanuts over the Nation.

Mr. WATSON. That is the concern that I have.

Mr. POAGE. The program is so worked out that it will not allow an increase in the total production of peanuts over the country.

As the gentleman knows, there are 1,610,000 acres of peanut allotment at the present time. If all of that could be concentrated upon highly productive land it would increase the production of peanuts substantially. However, this bill, if adopted, would not allow that. If your acreage is producing only 10 bushels of peanuts per acre and if I have land on which I can produce 40 bushels per acre, you would have to sell me 4 acres in order for me to get the right to plant 1 acre of my land.

Mr. WATSON. I thank the gentleman and, certainly, I am heartily in favor of his bill.

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

Mr. BELCHER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman for a question only because I have such a short amount of time.

Mrs. KELLY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Would the gentleman work for a compromise at the present time with the conferees in order to bring the food stamp plan out of conference with an authorization of 2 years?

Mr. BELCHER. In response to the question of the gentleman from New York, no, I am not in a position to make any trade.

Mrs. KELLY. I am not asking for a trade. I am asking for a conference report.

Mr. BELCHER. I am not in a position to trade. I shall tell the gentleman why. This involves a matter—the peanut acreage allotment—which is of little concern to the Members on this side of the aisle, because there is not a Member on this side of the aisle about whom I know who has a single acre of peanut allotment. All of the Members on that side of the aisle are interested in peanuts.

Therefore, I am a little surprised, and I find it hard to believe, that the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] would want to penalize a group of poor peanut farmers in order to get back at a group of members of the Committee on Agriculture who would not agree to a compromise on the food stamp plan. I just cannot believe that the gentleman would do that.

I hope, for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri, that the Members on that side of the aisle who are interested in peanuts do not oppose the food stamp plan simply because the gentle-

woman is trying to oppose the peanut acreage reallocation plan. If they should turn around and do to you what you are doing to them today, I think you are going to lose a whole lot of Members on your own side of the aisle in support of the food stamp plan. You will not lose or get any over here, because we are not on the peanut side of this House of Representatives.

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

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

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I believe if the gentleman listened to the statement I made on the floor a few minutes ago the gentleman would know that that is not my reason for opposing this bill.

Mr. BELCHER. Is the gentleman interested in peanuts? Does the gentleman have any peanut allotments in her district?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. No, my district is in the city.

Mr. BELCHER. What good reason would the gentleman have, then, in opposing the peanut farmers down there? Was it because the gentleman does not like the actions of those Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle that would not agree to more than a 1-year extension of the food stamp program?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will say in reply to the gentleman that I am afraid that some of these poor peanut farmers who have exceptionally small farms, and cannot make a good living on them, might come up to the city, and then we would have to take care of them up there.

Mr. BELCHER. That will only give you a few more customers for your food stamp program.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserves 1 minute.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 11565.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 146, not voting 78, as follows:

[Roll No. 226]

YEAS—208

Abbitt	Bolton	Clawson, Del
Abernethy	Brinkley	Colmer
Albert	Broomfield	Conte
Andrews, Ala.	Broyhill, N.C.	Corbett
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Cowger
Ashbrook	Buchanan	Cramer
Ashmore	Burke, Fla.	Cunningham
Aspinall	Burleson	de la Garza
Baring	Burton, Utah	Denney
Belcher	Bush	Derwinski
Berry	Byrnes, Wis.	Dickinson
Betts	Cabell	Dole
Bevill	Carter	Dorn
Blester	Casey	Dow
Blackburn	Cederberg	Dowdy
Blanton	Chamberlain	Downing
Boggs	Clancy	Dulski

Duncan	Kee	Rallsback
Eckhardt	Kleppe	Reid, Ill.
Edmondson	Kornegay	Reifel
Edwards, La.	Kuykendall	Reinecke
Evans, Colo.	Kyros	Rhodes, Ariz.
Everett	Laird	Rivers
Evins, Tenn.	Lennon	Roberts
Fascell	Lipscomb	Rogers, Colo.
Feighan	Long, Md.	Rogers, Fla.
Fisher	McClure	Roush
Flood	McDonald,	Ruppe
Flynt	Mich.	Sandman
Foley	McFall	Schadeberg
Fountain	McMillan	Scherle
Frelinghuysen	Machen	Schwengel
Fulton, Tenn.	Mahon	Scott
Fuqua	Mailliard	Selden
Gallfanakis	Marsh	Shriver
Gardner	Martin	Sikes
Garmatz	Mathias, Calif.	Sisk
Gathings	Mathias, Md.	Skubitz
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Slack
Goodell	May	Smith, Okla.
Gray	Mayne	Snyder
Gross	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Gude	Mills	Staggers
Gurney	Minshall	Steed
Hagan	Mize	Steiger, Ariz.
Haley	Montgomery	Stubblefield
Hall	Moore	Talcott
Hamilton	Myers	Taylor
Hammer-	Natcher	Teague, Calif.
schmidt	Nelsen	Thompson, Ga.
Hansen, Idaho	Nichols	Thomson, Wis.
Hardy	O'Konski	Tuck
Harrison	O'Neal, Ga.	Udall
Harvey	Passman	Vigorito
Hathaway	Patman	Waggonner
Hébert	Patten	Wampler
Henderson	Pelly	Watson
Herlong	Pepper	Watts
Holland	Perkins	Whitener
Hull	Pettis	Whitten
Hunt	Pickle	Wiggins
Hutchinson	Poage	Williams, Pa.
Jarman	Poff	Wilson, Bob
Johnson, Calif.	Pool	Winn
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Tex.	Wright
Jonas	Pryor	Wyatt
Jones, Ala.	Purcell	Young
Jones, Mo.	Quillen	Zion
Karsten		Zwach
Kazen		

NAYS—146

Adair	Friedel	Nix
Adams	Fulton, Pa.	O'Hara, Ill.
Andrews,	Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.
N. Dak.	Gilbert	Olsen
Annunzio	Gooding	Ottinger
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	Pike
Ayres	Green, Pa.	Price, Ill.
Bates	Griffiths	Quie
Battin	Halleck	Randall
Bell	Halpern	Rees
Bennett	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Hanna	Reuss
Boland	Hawkins	Rhodes, Pa.
Bolling	Hays	Rooney, Pa.
Brademas	Hechler, W. Va.	Rosenthal
Brasco	Heckler, Mass.	Roth
Bray	Helstoski	Roybal
Brotzman	Hicks	Rumsfeld
Brown, Calif.	Hosmer	Ryan
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	St Germain
Brown, Oho	Jacobs	Scheuer
Burke, Mass.	Joelson	Schneebeli
Burton, Calif.	Keith	Schweiker
Byrne, Pa.	Kelly	Smith, Calif.
Cahill	King, Calif.	Smith, N.Y.
Carey	Kirwan	Stafford
Clark	Kluczynski	Stanton
Cleveland	Kupferman	Steiger, Wis.
Cohelan	Langen	Straton
Collier	Latta	Sullivan
Conable	Leggett	Taft
Culver	Lloyd	Tenzer
Daddario	McClory	Ternan
Daniels	McDade	Tunney
Davis, Wis.	MacGregor	Utt
Dawson	Madden	Van Deerlin
Dellenback	Meeds	Vander Jagt
Dent	Meskill	Vanik
Devine	Miller, Ohio	Waldie
Dingell	Minish	Whalen
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	Whalley
Ellberg	Monagan	Widnall
Erlenborn	Moorhead	Wilson,
Esch	Morgan	Charles H.
Eshleman	Morse, Mass.	Wolf
Farbstein	Mosher	Wylie
Findley	Moss	Wyman
Ford,	Multer	Yates
William D.	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
Fraser	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—78

Addabbo	Gibbons	Pirnie
Anderson, Ill.	Grover	Pollock
Anderson,	Gubser	Pucinski
Tenn.	Hansen, Wash.	Rarick
Barrett	Harsha	Resnick
Bingham	Holfield	Riegle
Bow	Horton	Robison
Brook	Howard	Rodino
Brooks	Hungate	Ronan
Button	Irwin	Rooney, N.Y.
Celler	Jones, N.C.	Rostenkowski
Clausen,	Karth	Roudebush
Don H.	Kastenmeier	Satterfield
Conyers	King, N.Y.	St. Onge
Corman	Landrum	Saylor
Curtis	Long, La.	Shipley
Davis, Ga.	Lukens	Smith, Iowa
Delaney	McCarthy	Stephens
Diggs	McCulloch	Stuckey
Donohue	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Edwards, Ala.	Mass.	Ullman
Fallon	Michel	Walker
Fino	Morris, N. Mex.	Watkins
Ford, Gerald R.	Murphy, N.Y.	Williams, Miss.
Gettys	O'Neill, Mass.	Willis
Gialmo	Philbin	Wylder

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Stuckey and Mr. Jones of North Carolina for, with Mr. Riegle against.

Mr. Curtis and Mr. Davis of Georgia for, with Mr. Horton against.

Mr. Stephens and Mr. Edwards of Alabama for, with Mr. Gialmo against.

Mr. Fallon and Mr. Gettys for, with Mrs. Dwyer against.

Mr. Rarick and Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.

Mr. Landrum and Mr. Hungate for, with Mr. Delaney against.

Mr. Teague of Texas and Mr. Williams of Mississippi for, with Mr. Rodino against.

Mr. Willis and Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. St. Onge against.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee and Mr. Gibbons for, with Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts against.

Mr. Walker and Mr. Morris of New Mexico for, with Mr. Addabbo against.

Mr. Satterfield and Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holfield with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Button.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Wylder.

Mr. Ullman with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Pirnie.

Mr. Resnick with Mr. McCulloch.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Grover.

Mr. Irwin with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Robison with Mr. Lukens.

Messrs. FRIEDEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, WYLIE, MacGREGOR and SMITH of California changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

ACQUIRING APPOMATTOX MANOR

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 182) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Appomattox Manor, a historic property in Hopewell, Va., for addition to the Petersburg National Battlefield in Virginia, to provide for a revision of the boundaries of the battlefield, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 182

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in order to preserve the site of the headquarters of the Armies of the United States during the final nine months of the Civil War, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire the property known as Appomattox Manor together with improvements thereon, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. The property consists of approximately eighteen acres in Hopewell, Virginia, bounded by the Appomattox and James Rivers, Cedar Lane and Pecan Drive, and comprises the estate held historically by the Eppe family. The property shall be administered as a noncontiguous part of the Petersburg National Battlefield.

(b) In acquiring property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property described in subsection (a) of this section and in exchange therefor convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the Commonwealth of Virginia under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require.

Sec. 2. (a) In order to facilitate the administration, protection, and public use of the Petersburg National Battlefield, the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia or any political subdivision thereof, in consideration of acceptance by the Commonwealth of legislative jurisdiction and responsibility for maintenance but subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to not to exceed two hundred and fifty-eight acres of land, consisting of portions of roads and other lands which the Secretary determines are not needed for purposes of the national battlefield. Property so conveyed shall thereupon cease to be a part of the Petersburg National Battlefield.

(b) Upon the simultaneous acceptance by the Commonwealth of Virginia of the conveyance of the lands and roads authorized by subsection (a) of this section and legislative jurisdiction over such roads and lands, there is retroceded to the Commonwealth any jurisdiction the Commonwealth heretofore ceded to the United States over such property.

Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 2 of the Act of August 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 403; 16 U.S.C. 423h-2), is amended by striking out the words "twelve hundred" and substituting the words "six hundred."

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than \$1,000,000, as are necessary for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and for development in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the honorable gentleman from Colorado [WAYNE ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill and the two other bills that will follow come out of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs without any objection.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for part of our national park system which is made up of a wide variety of areas which appeal to a wide variety of interests and tastes. Some of these areas—the national park proper, for instance—have been set aside primarily because of their great scenic beauty and natural wonders. Others, including many of our national monuments, are principally important because of their scientific or archeological importance. Still others, like most of our national seashores and lakeshores, are dedicated to outdoor recreation. And a fourth category, made of the national historic sites, national historical parks, national battlefields, and the like, appeals most of all to those of us who are intrigued with our country's history and who are not satisfied merely to read about it in books but wish to see some of the places intimately associated with it preserved so that we and those who come after us may visit and, in a sense, relive history on the very spots on which it took place. These areas, if I may put it this way, are little islands of history in our contemporary world.

The bill with which we are concerned now, H.R. 182, deals with just such a little island of history as this. It proposes the acquisition of two tracts of land—one comprising 14 acres, the other 4 acres—for addition to the Petersburg National Battlefield, Va. This national battlefield was first denominated a national military park when it was created in 1926. It was then administered by the War Department, but it was transferred to the Department of the Interior for administration in 1933. It currently attracts nearly 1,200,000 visitors a year.

Appomattox Manor, the name by which the land to be acquired is commonly known, is intimately connected with the remainder of the area in the national battlefield although it is about 5 miles distant from it. It was General Grant's headquarters during the campaign at Petersburg and President Lincoln had his office there during 2 of the last 3 weeks of his life.

In addition to being important during the Civil War, Appomattox Manor had a long history before that time. It was part of a land grant made in 1635 by King Charles I to Capt. Francis Eppe. The main house on the land is over 200 years old and the outbuildings—a kitchen, dairy house, and smokehouse—date from 50 years earlier than this.

The ownership of Appomattox Manor is divided between a life tenant and her brother who is the remainderman. Neither of these parties, however, is actually

living in the house. The life tenant wishes to sell her interest, the remainderman does not wish to sell his. The author of the bill has advised us that, notwithstanding this situation, he is enthusiastically in favor of this bill.

The National Park Service has estimated at \$478,000 the cost of acquiring Appomattox Manor and at \$548,000 the cost of constructing a parking area, administrative facilities and so forth, and for essential rehabilitation and repair work. Our committee does not necessarily endorse either of these figures individually but it believes that expenditure of \$1,000,000 for both combined is not out of line. An amendment proposed by the committee limits the amount authorized to be appropriated to this amount.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues who will follow me will go into more detail about the bill than I have. It is enough at this time for me to say that I strongly recommend passage of H.R. 182.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 182, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Appomattox Manor, a historic property in Hopewell, Va., and to provide for an addition to and a revision of the boundaries of the battlefield and for other purposes.

H.R. 182, provides for the acquisition of Appomattox Manor, consisting of approximately 18 acres located on the banks of the Appomattox and James Rivers in the town of Hopewell, Va. This property is part of the original land grant made by King Charles I to Capt. Francis Eppes in 1635. The property has been continuously owned by the Eppes family for 330 years.

The historical significance of this area goes as far back as the colonial and revolutionary days of this Nation. However, it was during the Civil War period of our history that Appomattox Manor achieved its greatest national significance. From June 15, 1864, to March 29, 1865, it served as the general headquarters for the Armies of the United States, sustaining the forces of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant against Gen. Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia. From March 24, 1865, to April 8, 1865, Appomattox Manor served as Executive Office of this Nation under President Abraham Lincoln.

The estimated costs of acquiring the manor house and surrounding acreage is \$478,000. The estimated costs of rehabilitation and development are \$548,000.

In addition, H.R. 182 provides for the conveyance of 258 acres and roads thereon to the Commonwealth of Virginia or any of its political subdivisions. These lands were acquired by donation for inclusion in the Petersburg National Battlefield and are no longer required or needed for park purposes. These lands are being conveyed subject to the restricted use that their parklike character be maintained and at an estimated value of \$17,500.

H.R. 182 also amends the act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands at the site of the Battle of Five Forks for addition to the Petersburg National Battlefield by reducing the

acreage to be acquired from 1,200 acres to 600 acres.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. TAYLOR. 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 North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before the House involves an area extremely important in the history of the War Between the States.

H.R. 182, introduced by our colleague from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] affects the existing Petersburg National Battlefield, located near Hopewell, Va., in three ways: First, it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire Appomattox Manor and related buildings and grounds; second, it provides for the disposition of 258 acres of land associated with, but unnecessary for, the Petersburg National Battlefield; and third, it reduces the amount of land authorized to be acquired at the site of the Battle of Five Forks from 1,200 acres to 600 acres.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has been thoroughly reviewed by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation. During the course of our hearings on this bill, many of the members of the committee were impressed with the historical significance of Appomattox Manor.

The bill proposes the acquisition of two tracts of land—one comprising 14 acres, the other 4 acres—for addition to the Petersburg National Battlefield, Va. This national battlefield was first designated as a national military park when it was created in 1926. It was then administered by the War Department, but it was transferred to the Department of the Interior for administration in 1933. It currently attracts nearly 1,200,000 visitors a year.

Appomattox Manor, the name by which the land to be acquired is commonly known, is intimately connected with the remainder of the area in the national battlefield. It was General Grant's headquarters during the campaign at Petersburg and President Lincoln had his office there during 2 of the last 3 weeks of his life. The addition of these tracts will therefore give the National Park Service an important addition to its existing installation.

In addition to being important during the Civil War, Appomattox Manor had a long history before that time. It was part of a land grant made in 1635 by King Charles I to Capt. Francis Eppes. The main house on the land is over 200 years old and the outbuildings—a kitchen, dairy house, and smokehouse—date from 50 years earlier than this.

Another provision of the bill, section 2, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia or its political subdivisions, about 260 acres of land which are within the present boundaries of the national battlefield, but do not serve any useful purpose in that connection. This land is mostly made up of a right-of-way for 7 miles of road. At the time the military park was created in 1926, it was expected that this road would serve for tours

through the entire original battlefield. This plan did not materialize and conveyance of this land to the State will save the United States about \$22,000 a year in maintenance and operating costs of a commercial road which do not result in any benefits to it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 182 reduces that authority of the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands at the site of the Battle of Five Forks. Present law—76 Stat. 403—authorizes the Secretary to acquire 1200 acres of land at the Five Forks area; we are now advised that the Department considers only 600 acres to be needed to preserve and present the historical setting; hence the committee is recommending this reduction.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 182, as recommended by the committee, contains the usual language limiting the amount authorized to be appropriated. In this bill, we are recommending \$1 million.

Another amendment by the committee provides that any exchange for Federal lands must be within the Commonwealth of Virginia. This amendment is consistent with other bills of this nature.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to support H.R. 182 and I recommend its favorable consideration by the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 182, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO THE TIWA INDIANS OF TEXAS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10599) relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Indians now living in El Paso County, Texas, who are descendants of the Tiwa Indians of the Ysleta (Isleta) del Sur Pueblo settling in Texas at Ysleta in 1682, shall, from and after the ratification of this Act, be known and designated as Tiwa Indians of Ysleta, Texas, and shall continue to enjoy all rights, privileges, and immunities enjoyed by them as citizens of the State of Texas and of the United States before the enactment of this Act, and shall continue to be subject to all the obligations and duties of such citizens under the laws of the State of Texas and the United States.

SEC. 2. Responsibility, if any, for the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur is hereby transferred to the State of Texas. Nothing in this Act shall make such tribe or its members eligible for any services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians nor subject the United States to any responsibility, liability, claim, or demand of any nature to or by such tribe or its members arising out of their status as Indians, and none of the statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall be applicable to the Tiwa Indians of Ysleta del Sur. Nothing herein

shall preclude the application to the people of the Tiwa Indians of programs undertaken pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 508), as heretofore or hereafter amended.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think in the very few minutes that we take to explain this legislation that the Members who are present will be intrigued with a very novel situation.

First, I wish to thank my friend and coworker, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], and those who worked with him, particularly the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY] on the minority side, for the extent to which they went into what appeared to be a very unique matter, the solution of which I believe is in the legislation which we bring before the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10599 is a bill introduced by our colleague, Congressman WHITE, to recognize the Tiwa Indians of Texas as an Indian tribe without in any way committing the Government of the United States to perform for them any services that it does not perform for citizens of the United States in general.

I want to emphasize at the outset two facts about this bill: First, its enactment will not cost the Treasury any money. Second, the bill follows almost verbatim a formula adopted by the Congress for the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina 10 or 11 years ago in the act of June 7, 1956.

All that the proponents of this bill are asking is that we, in some official manner, recognize the Tiwas for what they are—a band or tribe of American Indians—and that we transfer any trust responsibilities that the United States may have over them to the State of Texas which has promised to give them aid and assistance.

This may sound like an unnecessary gesture on the part of the Congress. People may ask, why does the State not just give them this aid and assistance without going through the rigmarole of a Federal act?

I cannot answer the question of Texas law that this involves from a firsthand knowledge, though I am sure that Congressman WHITE can, but I am told that the attorney general of Texas has advised the Governor in effect that the Texas constitution forbids the State to deal with Indians as Indians unless there is such a transfer of jurisdiction of H.R. 10599 will provide.

From all we have learned about the status of history of the Tiwas, I am convinced that they deserve whatever benefits H.R. 10599 will confer upon them. They moved, or were moved, to Texas from New Mexico in 1682. They have kept their tribal customs all these years. They are an agricultural people but are desperately poor. The city of El Paso has grown up around them and is threaten-

ing to swamp their holdings. They have, in the past, rendered good service—including military service—to the United States and have never been in enmity to it as many other tribes, for good reasons or bad, have been. Except for a combination of pure chance factors—their location remote from other Indian tribes, the insistence of Texas when it entered the Union upon keeping all its public lands for itself, the existence of the Civil War at the time other Pueblo bands to which they are related were being recognized, and so on—they would long since have been recognized by the United States and have been taken under the wing of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the legislature of Texas and its Governor for the interest they have taken in the Tiwas and for their willingness to accept trust responsibilities for these people and to assist them in getting along in a modern world without losing their cultural inheritance.

I urge favorable action on the bill.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10599, a bill relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before this House, H.R. 10599, relates a most impressive story. One which is almost unbelievable in this day and age.

The purpose of this legislation is to give Federal recognition to the Tiwa Indians of the Pueblo of the Ysleta del Sur in El Paso County, Tex., and to transfer to the State of Texas any responsibility the United States may have to these people.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Tiwa Indians can be traced back to prehistoric times. It is known that these Indians are a branch of the Tiwa-speaking Pueblo Indians of central New Mexico. The Tiwa Indians are known to have established the first permanent settlement in the State of Texas in 1682 at Ysleta, where they still reside today.

The early history of the Tiwa Indians indicates that they have consistently aided and assisted the Armies of the United States in settling this area of our Nation. The Tiwas served as scouts, guides, and laborers.

At the present time there are approximately 167 Tiwa Indians in Ysleta del Sur, in El Paso County, Tex. Throughout their history the Tiwa Indians have maintained their own cultural and tribal identity. At the same time the Tiwa Indians have developed as extremely proud and withdrawn people. As a result, the Tiwa Indians have become isolated from the mainstream of today's economic and social structure. The consequence has been that the Tiwa Indians have suffered extreme conditions of poverty and hardships. Many of the Tiwa Indian children are uneducated and in most instances lack the normal bare necessities of life such as shoes and clothing.

The most unbelievable fact surrounding the history of the Tiwa Indians is that they have never been recognized as a group of Indians by the Bureau of In-

dian Affairs of our Government. H.R. 10599 provides that recognition at this time. The reasons explaining why the Tiwa Indians have not been so recognized is to say the least, somewhat reasonable under the circumstances.

H.R. 10599 also transfers to the State of Texas any responsibility the Federal Government may have to the Tiwa Indians. The State of Texas, by its legislative action has agreed to assume this responsibility and thereby attempt to provide the Tiwa Indians with the same living standards applicable to all the people of the expanding county of El Paso, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 10599.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is anything I can add to what our chairman has so very well and capably outlined in his explanation of this bill.

I simply rise to say that I wholeheartedly endorse this legislation. I hope that, as the chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee has said, this will be passed unanimously.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WHITE], the author of the legislation.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, before I mention the bill itself, I want to mention how appreciative I am of the people who came from my county to present this bill and for the generosity and courtesy extended to them by the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. Speaker, my bill (H.R. 10599) designates the Tiwas as an Indian Tribe and transfers responsibility, if any, from the United States to the State of Texas. This legislation does not extend any Federal programs to these Indians because of their status as Indians; it merely recognizes them as a tribe and transfers the trust responsibility to the State of Texas.

The Tiwa Indians are a displaced branch of the Tiwa-speaking Pueblo Indians of central New Mexico. The Tiwa Pueblo Indians are believed to have migrated from the Wetherill Mesa County of southern Colorado. Archaeologists date their initial occupation of the area at approximately A.D. 200.

Nearly three centuries ago, a ragged and weary band of refugees straggled into El Paso from the North, fleeing the horror of the Pueblo Revolt of 1680 which wrested the entire area of New Mexico from the Spanish. With this band was a handful of Tiwa Indians from the Isleta Pueblo of central New Mexico.

The Tiwas were the first permanent inhabitants of the State of Texas—they founded the first permanent settlement in Texas at Ysleta in 1682, where they still reside today. Throughout their history they have been the allies of their benefactors. In the Indian wars these proud people served as guides and scouts for the U.S. troops. They have never been hostile to the American settlers or troops.

Their reward to date has been to be ignored. Now they are impoverished and the State of Texas wants to help them.

Tiwa labor is said to have raised the first European structure in Texas, the Ysleta Mission, which is still in daily use today.

There are presently 167 Tiwa Indians in Ysleta and despite their isolation from others of their heritage, they have maintained a surprising degree of tribal identity. Each year the Tiwas participate in St. Anthony Day festivities at the Ysleta Mission, which they celebrate in a manner peculiar to the Pueblo Indians of the Southwest. The festivities consist of a distinct mixture of Catholicism and ancient Indian religious rites. The Tiwas have remained faithful to the Catholic religion and are devout members of the church.

Dr. Bernard L. Fontana, ethnologist from the University of Arizona, conducted a study of the Tiwas and has stated:

The fact these Indians have survived as well as they have is indeed a minor miracle. And there can be no mistake that they are Indians. Part of the aboriginal politico-religious structure has survived.

Dr. Fontana further states:

That words of Tiwa have survived is obvious, as is the fact that Tiwa songs—including songs of war and of the hunt—have lasted since these people left their homeland some 285 years ago.

The State of Texas stands ready to help the Tiwas—to give the tribe the opportunity to be educated and self-sufficient. Two bills relating to the Tiwas were passed by the 59th Texas Legislature and were signed by the Governor on May 23, 1967. The first, house bill 654, extends to the Tiwas the services and benefits of the Commission for Indian Affairs. According to the bill:

A responsibility of the Commission is the development of the human and economic resources of the Tiwa Indian tribe located at El Paso County, Texas, and to assist the Tribal Council in making the community self-sufficient. Specifically, the Commission shall assist the Tribal Council in improving the health, educational, agricultural, business, and industrial capacities of the community.

A companion bill, one bill, which passed both houses of the legislature unanimously, gives the Governor of the State of Texas the authority to accept on behalf of the State a transfer of the trust responsibilities of the United States respecting the Tiwa Indian Tribe, if the Congress passes legislation to this effect. Those trust responsibilities are to be administered by the Commission for Indian Affairs. Because of an interpretation of the law and the Texas constitution, the State must possess the trust responsibility before it can administer a program to the Tiwas.

In addition, the State legislature appropriated some \$35,000 for programs to benefit the Tiwas. Such benefits would include a school lunch program, shoes for the children, vitamins, and much-needed medical attention. The State is ready to begin its efforts to help the Tiwas become self-sufficient, but the Con-

gress must take action before the State can administer its program to them.

The average annual income of these people is \$400 per year. The State of Texas would be able to provide a tax shelter for the Tiwas. They are now faced with the problem of paying between \$80 and \$100 per year city taxes on their small adobe shacks. It is impossible for them to pay these high taxes and as a result every Tiwa home is in tax foreclosure.

This action is imperative before the pressures of modern society extinguish their existence and lose for mankind their culture and links to the past. Studies of the Tiwas indicate that assistance initially extended them must be on a group basis oriented specifically to the Indians.

The State of Texas has indicated its willingness to try to help these people and it is now our responsibility to enact this legislation to insure that these programs can be extended to the tribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 10599, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1964 (78 STAT. 983), ESTABLISHING THE PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12121) to amend the act of September 9, 1964 (78 Stat. 983), establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission, and for other purposes, with a title amendment as follows: "A bill to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 983) establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12121

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 983), establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission is amended—

(1) by striking, in section 4(b), "December 31, 1968" and substituting therefor "June 30, 1970".

(2) by striking, in section 4(b) "June 30, 1969" and substituting therefor "December 31, 1970".

(3) by striking, in section 9(a), "\$4,000,000" and substituting therefor "\$7,390,000".

(4) by substituting for the present text of the first sentence of section 8(a) the following: "The Commission or, on authorization of the Commission, any committee of two or more members, at least one of whom shall be of each major political party, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings, take testimony or receive evidence under oath, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such authorized committee may deem advisable. The member of the Commis-

sion presiding at any such hearing is authorized to administer the oath to witnesses."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12121 is a very simple bill. It would do three things: first, extend the life of the Public Land Law Review Commission for 18 months beyond the present reporting date of December 31, 1968, and the termination date of June 30, 1969; second, increase the authorization for appropriations from the present level of \$4 million to \$7.39 million; third, provide authority which would permit the Commission to take testimony or receive evidence under oath.

The Public Land Law Review Commission was created by the act of September 19, 1964—Public Law 88-606—for the express purpose of looking into and examining all statutes, regulations, and policies governing the use, management, and disposal of the public lands of the United States. The Commission was further charged with the responsibility of compiling data and conducting studies necessary to determine the demands for, and the use of, resources of the public lands and, finally, it is the Commission's responsibility to recommend to Congress and the President such modifications and changes in existing laws, regulations, and practices as would best serve the public interest.

Just by way of illustrating the magnitude of this task, the lands involved in this review make up approximately one-third of the total land area of this Nation. The value of the natural resources, including timber, minerals, forage, and water, as well as the recreational value of the millions of acres involved, are well known to everyone in a general sense, but to date no one has attempted to put an exact dollar value on these resources. Estimates have been made that run from a few billion to many billions of dollars. Indeed some of these values, such as the preservation of the scenic and recreation value of these lands for the enjoyment of future generations, are beyond estimation. Other resources, such as minerals, forage, water, and timber, are absolutely vital to the well-being of this Nation in time of peace and to its survival in time of war. These, then, are the values with which the Commission is involved and on which it will make recommendations.

The Commission is composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members from the House divided equally between majority and minority Members. It also has six members not associated with the Federal Government appointed by the President, as well as a 19th member chosen as chairman by the other 18. There is also, at the present time, a 33-member Advisory Council made up of interested Federal agencies and major citizen groups. Each of the 50 Governors has also named a representative to work

closely with the Commission. The representation on the Commission is broad geographically and politically as well as from a resource and user viewpoint. So far as can be determined, all interested groups are represented and have appeared at public meetings held by the Commission throughout the Nation.

It has always been understood that the majority of the Commission's study program would be accomplished under contract. Of the overall list of some 34 studies, approximately 24 will be contracted out. As a result of experience gained from the five studies now under contract, it is apparent that both additional time and funds will be required to permit the Commission to adequately complete its assigned task. Not only is the magnitude of the task considerably greater than originally anticipated but the cost of obtaining qualified contractors to undertake the studies is proving to be considerably more expensive than forecast in 1964. To handle the increased workload, some additions to the Commission's staff will also be required as well as funds for general housekeeping operations.

Of the \$3.39 million additional funding requested in H.R. 12121, \$1.79 million will be required for contract work and general operating funds. The remainder, \$1.6 million, will be necessary for an increase in Commission personnel and will provide an addition of 10 man-years in fiscal year 1969, 54 man-years in fiscal year 1970 and 11 man-years in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I will close by saying I am convinced that the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission is of utmost importance, and that the review it is making of our existing hodgepodge of conflicting and, in some cases, outmoded and antiquated public land laws is long overdue. The additional time and funds requested in H.R. 12121 are necessary for the Commission to complete its assignment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of H.R. 12121.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend and coworker, a member of the Commission, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to add a voice from this side of the aisle in support of the Commission and in commendation of the gentleman who is Chairman of that Commission. This Commission has worked hard and as it has worked the magnitude of its task has become very apparent. This is a matter which is of great significance to the Members of every State and every citizen, because these public lands are not owned by certain States or certain areas but are the property of all the people. There are many, many intricate questions and conflicts which have to be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the amount of value to the citizens of the United States, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question prefaced in this fashion:

It is true that there are untold resources on the public lands and that there will have to be a great amount of in-

vestment by private interests and by the Government and, perhaps, by both in concert, to take advantage of that resource.

But is it not true that with what we already know about the resources, if we can develop the proper scientific sophistication, these values might run into trillions of dollars rather than into billions of dollars?

Mr. ASPINALL. Of course, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct.

On the other hand, may I say that in figuring these values, we have to take into consideration what we put into the operation in order to get the values out.

Insofar as I am concerned, I am a firm believer in developing all of the values that it is possible to develop, without unduly dislodging other values present in the same area. And, where private enterprise is willing to do the job and where it can be done under the procedures of private enterprise, I do not believe that the Government should step into the industrial development of our values.

On the other hand, I want to see that every landowner of our public lands—and that includes every citizen of the United States—gets his fair share from the returns from these areas and these values.

I do not desire to see any undue or any unconscionable profits go to anyone in the development work, and neither do I in the research work which is necessary. I think the research work is perhaps the best place at which Government and private enterprise can work pretty well together. Perhaps, it will be necessary for the Government to have quite a bit to say as to the procedure to be followed by the private enterprise developers in order to see to it that the other values which our citizens enjoy are taken care of at the same time we are developing the primary natural resource values.

Mr. KYL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for his response.

Many decisions with respect to these resources by the Public Land Law Review Commission are, in effect, an oversight action in order to guarantee that all activities, both public and private, are in the best interest of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. ASPINALL. As we make our recommendations to the U.S. Government.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. First of all I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, for having seen to it that Public Law 801 was observed in connection with this Commission. I want to say to him that not all committees of the Congress comply with the provisions of Public Law 801. So I do commend him for that.

Now I would like to ask the gentleman why this Commission did not become operative on December 19, 1964, when the law was enacted, why it was

mid-July 1965 before the Commission even started to begin its work?

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall reply to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] as frankly as I possibly can.

There was a little difficulty in the beginning between Members from the other body and Members from this body who sat on this Commission as to the selection of the chairman. I think I shall go no further than that at the present time. But the compromise was finally arrived at when it was suggested by a Member of the other body that the gentleman from Colorado, now speaking, serve as the chairman and permit one of the finest staff consultants that I have ever worked with, Mr. Pearl, the present director, to be director of this Commission.

We lost this time and unavoidably so. I am sorry that the delay took place but that it happened is a fact. The final decision was the only way it could be resolved.

The present chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, who is now the chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission, never had one single thought that he would ever be chairman of this Commission. He wanted to be a member of the Commission, but he did not want to load himself up with the great number of duties that is necessary to actively and effectively serve as chairman of the Commission.

I can advise my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], that I am not just a chairman who sits idly by and sees the staff do the work.

I keep my finger on this operation, and make the decisions that a chairman must make.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, this is becoming costly, or will with the enactment of this bill. And I presume—and I do not quarrel with the gentleman's statement—that this land review is necessary, but this is becoming a costly enterprise with the enactment of this bill. This will raise the cost of the Commission to \$7,390,000, and I would certainly hope this will be the end of any further financing on the part of the Federal Government.

Mr. ASPINALL. I continue to lower my eyes when the gentleman puts his statement that way, but it is my opinion that we will not be back here for additional time or for extra money.

May I just say—and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] brought it to our attention—that we are talking in values that cannot be estimated, and such values belong to the people of the United States.

We are talking in terms of 5,000 laws, 50,000 rules and regulations. For all of the years, we have made three attempts to properly and effectively review our public land laws. One of them was fairly successful. The other two are on the shelf. We do not want this public land law division study to end up on the shelf, although there is much of value to be found in each of them. We want something of value to come out of this work.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.

PRICE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12121, a bill to amend the act of September 9, 1964 (78 Stat. 983), establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission and for other purposes.

The two principal purposes of H.R. 12121 are: First, to extend the life of the Public Land Law Review Commission by 1½ years; and second, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to finance the Commission's work by \$3,390,000.

The Public Land Law Review Commission was established for the purpose of making a comprehensive review of all policies applicable to the use, management, and disposition of the public lands of the United States. The Commission held its organization meeting in mid-July 1965 at which time a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and a director were chosen. The Commission then began its work more than 10 months after the bill establishing the Commission had become law.

The Commission is composed of six Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, divided equally between the majority and minority parties, plus six members appointed by the President from outside the Federal Government, and a 19th member chosen as Chairman by the 18 appointed members.

There is an Advisory Council made up of representatives of interested Federal departments and agencies, eight at the present time, and 25 individuals chosen by the Commission to be representative of the major citizens groups interested in problems related to the retention, management, and disposition of the public lands. In addition, the Governor of each of the 50 States has named a representative to work closely with the Commission and its staff and with the Advisory Council.

The executive departments and agencies currently represented on the Advisory Council are the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, Defense, Justice, and Housing and Urban Development, the Atomic Energy Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the General Services Administration.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 12121 on August 16, 1967. These hearings impressed the committee with the complete coverage embraced by the study program that has been developed by the Commission staff. The 34 subjects identified for study or analysis are so arranged and structured as to assure that all facts required for the Commission's deliberations will be before the Commission when it arrives at its conclusions and makes its recommendations.

The committee was also pleased with the program undertaken by the Commission to permit all persons to be heard who have views as to the retention, management, or disposition of the public lands. In meetings across the Nation from the eastern seaboard to the west

coast and from the gulf coast to Alaska, hundreds of witnesses have already been heard.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission has been fulfilling the legislative intent behind its establishment and, since its organization, has been moving diligently and effectively to accomplish the purposes of the act establishing it.

Under the act of September 19, 1964, establishing the Commission, the Commission is required to submit its final report to the President and the Congress not later than December 31, 1968. The act also provides for dissolution of the Commission by June 30, 1969, at the latest and limits to \$4 million the appropriations that may be made for all of the Commission's work.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is convinced that, if the Commission is to complete the comprehensive review envisioned when it was established, additional time will be required, beyond December 31, 1968, for submission of the Commission's report and recommendations. Completion of the studies that should be made under its direction will require the expenditure of funds in excess of the existing \$4 million ceiling on appropriations.

The bulk of the Commission's study program is being accomplished under contract pursuant to specific authority granted to the Commission by the act of September 19, 1964. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs also believes that the Commission's estimate of first, a requirement to have until June 30, 1970, to submit its report and second, \$7,390,000 for all expenses are reasonable.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was advised that of the existing appropriation authorization of \$4 million, there have been appropriated to the Commission \$2,867,000. This leaves unappropriated within the current authorization ceiling, \$1,133,000, an amount that is obviously not sufficient to fund all of the remaining contract studies and related work at the level planned by the Commission.

Accordingly, the authorization for increased appropriations is essential if the Commission's study program is to continue as planned. This study program should proceed as planned.

Also included in H.R. 12121 is a provision to permit the Commission, at its hearings, to take testimony or receive evidence under oath. This authority, the Committee believes, is desirable.

The enactment of H.R. 12121 will necessitate a Federal expenditure of \$3,390,000. Of the additional funds to be authorized, \$1,790,000 will be for contract and related costs and general housekeeping expenses other than personnel; additional personnel costs are estimated at \$1,600,000.

Mr. Speaker, the value of the work this Commission is doing cannot be over-emphasized. My colleagues residing in the so-called public lands States realize the importance of the Commission's work. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 12121.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYATT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I would like to say as a member of the Commission who was at the first meeting and also the last meeting, when we embarked upon this project a couple of years ago, none of us really were aware of the tremendous job we were taking on. I think that is illustrated by the fact that when the Commission asked some legal firms for estimates as to how much it would cost to make merely a compilation of the public land laws, one legal firm estimated there were 5,000 different, separate ordinances and laws passed affecting the public lands. Another firm estimated there were as many as 15,000 separate laws and ordinances. So it is a tremendous job and in my judgment, the additional time and appropriation is justified.

Mr. WYATT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs' Public Lands Subcommittee, and also a member of the Committee on Agriculture's Subcommittee on Forests, I rise in support of this legislation.

Earlier this year, our Subcommittee on Forests held a series of hearings in the Pacific Northwest concerning the problem of the apportionment of forest receipts to affected local governmental units. Following these field hearings, further hearings were held in the subcommittee in Washington, D.C.

There was general agreement that the present formula for distribution of funds is causing serious concern and is in need of revision. However, it was agreed that further consideration of legislative action should be postponed until the Forest Service has completed its study of problems related to the retention, management, and disposition of the public lands under their jurisdiction in conjunction with the Public Land Law Review Commission, the extension of which we are considering today. I would hope these studies will be expedited so as not to further delay needed corrective measures.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE].

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the statements that have been made here concerning the importance of this Commission not only to people who live in the public land States but to the people of the United States as a whole.

I think there is a tendency on the part of too many Members of this House to think that the functions of this Commission are limited to the interest of those people who dwell in States that are most directly affected. I think it takes only the most rudimentary kind of perusal of the job of this Commission and the laws it is reviewing to realize that the entire United States is vitally affected and all of its citizens are vitally affected by the work of this Commission.

Certainly, the modest extension and increase in funds required by the extension of their work is amply justified

by the importance and scope of their labors.

It certainly is my pleasure to be able to present to the House the commendation of many of the people of my State for the work of the Commission and the hopes it has for the future under the work of the Commission, and I urge the acceptance of the bill.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in urging support of the pending bill, H.R. 12121, amending the act establishing the Public Land Review Commission to extend the life of the Commission for an additional year and to provide additional funding for the operation of the Commission.

I would certainly like to echo the remarks of my colleagues, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], and others concerning the tremendous work that has been done by our chairman, work which I think is very vital. Chairman ASPINALL is unquestionably one of the most hardworking Members of the Congress. To add to his many other responsibilities this burden as Chairman of the Commission, I think is really asking a great deal of a man who is now so fully participating in the affairs of Congress. He has indeed done a commendable job.

I think the work of this Commission is vital to the people of my State of Alaska as well as to every part of the Nation.

There is a tremendous amount of legislation on the books which is antiquated, outmoded, and very badly needs to be reviewed and overhauled.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to lend their overwhelming support to this legislation which I think so important. I would like to see the House pass this bill by a very strong vote.

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

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

Mr. KYL. I think the distinguished Speaker and the Members of the House may be interested in having the gentleman from Alaska remind them as to the percentage of the land area of his State which is still owned by the Federal Government and not owned by the people or the State of Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. At the time we of Alaska received the status of statehood, the U.S. Government owned 99 percent of our land. We were given authorization to select 104 million acres of land under the statehood enabling legislation. We still have a great deal of selection to accomplish, for at the present time the U.S. Government still owns 95 percent of the land of Alaska.

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

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

Mr. HALL. I have only two questions. I do not specifically direct them to the gentleman who has the time. I would like to know if this \$3,390,000 is within the Presidential budget for this year.

Mr. POLLOCK. I think Chairman ASPINALL would like to respond to that question.

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

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. It has the blessing of the Bureau of the Budget and, if necessary, the money will be placed in a supplemental appropriation bill to take care of what is needed of this authorization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the chairman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I finished with that question.

Mr. HALL. I heard the statement of the distinguished chairman. I am not trying to make an issue of this, one way or the other. But I would think that when we have 34 percent of the acreage of the United States in public domain, or 21 times the size of the State of Iowa, we should perhaps have a Land Review Commission. But is the answer to my original question affirmative or negative?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is affirmative.

Mr. HALL. It is affirmative. The item is in the budget, then, for the current year?

Mr. ASPINALL. A part was in the budget for the current year. The Appropriations Committee cut it back until the second supplemental appropriation bill was brought in, because we were not able at that time to make a case for the contract operations.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I was confused about the question of the supplemental budget.

The other question is, Would it be possible for the Members of this House to have the names of the Commission? I do not find them in the report or elsewhere. I understand that the distinguished chairman is the Chairman of the Commission. I also understand there are Members from both bodies of Congress and members-at-large appointed to the Commission.

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

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Members from the House side are: WALTER S. BARING, ROY A. TAYLOR, MORRIS K. UDALL, JOHN P. SAYLOR, LAURENCE J. BURTON, and JOHN H. KYL.

The members from the other body are: HENRY M. JACKSON, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, ALAN BIBLE, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, GORDON ALLOTT, and LEN B. JORDAN.

The three members on the majority side on the Commission, of course, are new members to the Commission because the three other members did not return to the 90th Congress.

The lay members are as follows: Laurance S. Rockefeller, Gov. Philip Hoff, H. Byron Mock, who serves as Vice Chairman, Dr. Robert Emmet Clark, Dr. Maurice Goddard, and Mrs. Nancy E. Smith.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I am sure the chairman would agree with me that the members are primarily from the public lands States. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct, although we have Governor Hoff from Vermont, we have Laurance Rockefeller from New York and we have Maurice Goddard, director of natural resources in Pennsylvania. Also, we have Congressmen JOHN P. SAYLOR and ROY A. TAYLOR from the East.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, and appreciate the gentleman from Alaska yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12121, with a title amendment.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 909 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 909

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. 12048) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed five hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make a 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. 227]

Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Gialmo
Anderson, Ill.	Delaney	Gibbons
Anderson, Tenn.	Diggs	Grover
Barrett	Donohue	Gubser
Bingham	Dulski	Hanna
Bow	Dwyer	Hansen, Wash.
Brock	Everett	Harsha
Button	Ewins, Tenn.	Hollifield
Celler	Fallon	Howard
Clausen, Don H.	Fino	Hungate
Corman	Ford	Irwin
	Gerald D.	Jones, N.C.
	Gettys	Karth

Kastenmeier	Philbin	Shipley
King, N.Y.	Pirnie	Smith, Iowa
Long, La.	Pucinski	Stephens
Lukens	Rarick	Stuckey
McCarthy	Resnick	Teague, Tex.
McCulloch	Riegle	Ullman
McEwen	Rodino	Walker
Macdonald,	Ronan	Watkins
Mass.	Rostenkowski	White
Michel	Roudebush	Wiggins
Morris, N. Mex.	Satterfield	Williams, Miss.
Murphy, N.Y.	St. Onge	Willis
O'Neill, Mass.	Saylor	Wylder

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 909 provides an open rule with 5 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 12048 to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12048 authorizes the appropriation of \$3,158,916,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and \$3,576,545,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Speaker, it is with some mixed emotions that I discuss this particular bill on this occasion, because for the last 12 years I have supported the Foreign Assistance Act. In the light of recent events, and in the light of the deficit, which, for a certainty, will exceed \$20 billion and possibly up to \$30 billion for this year, I think this is a bill that the House should give very close and careful consideration to.

There are several rather controversial aspects about this bill this year in addition to those that the House has considered on Foreign Assistance Act proposals before. One is that the bill carries a 2-year authorization.

There is some concern by a great many people as to whether or not, in the light of world events, we can look ahead sufficiently to determine what the 1969 authorization should be. I am sure this is a subject that will receive a great deal of consideration during the 5 hours of general debate and probably will be subject to some amendment.

There is another very controversial provision in the bill, which I am sure we will hear a great deal about, regarding a jurisdictional question, because, in the bill which will be before us if this resolution is adopted, there is a provision that the Foreign Affairs Committee takes jurisdiction over Public Law 480. This is a subject which has for the past, I believe, 14 years been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. It is my understanding that some members of the Agriculture Committee will have some comments to make with reference to this change in jurisdiction.

Let me say that as one Member of the House, I would have little concern about this transfer if we make certain that the funding of the Public Law 480 program

be done under the auspices of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the total amount of money involved be a part of the Foreign Assistance Act. I think one of the things we should bear in mind is that if that were true for this year, instead of \$3 billion or more we would probably be talking about a bill in the amount of \$5 billion or more.

As I said a moment ago, I have some concern about this proposal in the light of our budgetary situation, and in the light of world conditions. I, for one, expect to be on the floor and listen to the debate that will develop. I would here today urge the adoption of this resolution in order to permit the House to work its will, but in addition I would certainly urge that the Members of the House be in attendance during the consideration of the bill in order that when we finally do vote, we will vote with as much knowledge and understanding as it is possible to have concerning this very controversial matter.

There has been a lot of talk over the years, and I have listened year after year to discussions about the pipeline and the amount of money in the pipeline. It is my understanding that the figures set forth in the report show there is approximately \$6 billion in the pipeline. It would seem that this could be going a long way toward carrying the program when we find ourselves in an emergency when there are more calls for dollars than there are dollars to go around, in face of the fact we are being asked today to increase taxes on the American people.

I, for one, having spent some 2 weeks in California and in my district recently, can assure my colleagues that the American people are concerned about the tax burden, and just how far and how much further we can go in increasing that burden. In spite of the fact that at today's rate of income we have reduced taxes on the American people by almost \$25 billion in the last 4 years, we have to realize that to a large extent those reductions at the Federal level have been absorbed by local and State increases in taxes, so the American people today are heavily burdened.

These again are matters that I think we should consider as to how much, if any, of this bill could be put off or could be held over until such time as we might have been able to solve the Vietnam situation and some of the other problems that confront our country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 909 in order that the House might consider more fully this subject.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. When the gentleman speaks of two programs, the foreign aid and the other giveaway programs on wheat and so forth, and says that is approximately \$5 billion, there are many other spigots in this foreign aid program, and if all of them were lumped together would it not come nearer to \$8 billion or \$9 billion, rather than the \$5 billion the gentleman spoke of?

Mr. SISK. Of course, as my colleague from Florida has indicated, there are a variety of other programs which involve themselves certainly in foreign assistance of one kind or another. For example, there are things like the Peace Corps and a number of our other programs which certainly fall within that general category.

Actually, what the total would amount to is a figure the Member from California does not have in hand, but I am sure it would be substantially above \$5 billion.

Mr. HALEY. And if we apply the interest we are paying on the approximately \$125 billion or \$140 billion that we have borrowed to put forward all of these programs, would not the gentleman hazard the guess that probably the foreign aid program today is costing as much as \$10 billion, \$12 billion, or even as much as \$15 billion?

Mr. SISK. Let me say to my friend that I agree it is costing us a lot of money. The American taxpayer today is having second thoughts.

In line with what my good friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said the other day, with reference to the cost of certain programs, if we do not take a good look at them and make certain that the moneys are properly spent and waste eliminated, then the people some of these days are going to elect a Congress which will do that. I believe that we, as Members of this 90th Congress, have a responsibility to try to make as certain as possible that these dollars are well spent and to cut out those not well spent.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Is it not true that we are now spending \$12 billion in Vietnam? Is this not extending our national security? If we had Vietnam situations elsewhere, we could be spending more than \$25 billion for national security.

Would not the gentleman from California agree that our foreign aid program is in the national interest and for our national security?

Mr. SISK. That certainly has been the intent of it. Certainly that has been my justification, I might say to my good friend from Wisconsin, over the years in supporting the program, because to me it was part of our defense. It was a part of our national security.

I am sure and I am confident, because I have great respect for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. MORGAN, and for all of the members of his great committee, that it is in their continued belief and dedication to the purpose of national security and national defense that this bill is brought here.

At the same time, I say I believe we as individual Members have a responsibility to dissect, to listen, to discuss and to try to know as much as we can about it. If there are areas in this bill which can be put over or carried over, which we can do without, certainly this is the year we should do so. This is basic to my plea.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. May I say to my friend and good colleague from Wisconsin that we are continuing to spend moneys that we do not have trying to buy friends all over the world, and we have fewer friends today, after the tremendous outpouring of the taxpayer's money of this country, than we have ever had in our lives. We do not have any friends. To say that this is for national security or to build up friendship just does not go over, because we do not have it.

Mr. SISK. I can only answer my good friend and colleague by saying I know of his personal dedication. As I said, this was the intent of the program. I believe there is no question about it. We would hope it would do that.

I agree with my friend that in many instances, unfortunately, it has not done that.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MORGAN. I was very interested in hearing the gentleman mention that some part of the program for this year could be put over because of the \$6 billion carryover figure he mentioned.

I should like to call attention to page 7 of the report. If we are talking about the obligated and unreserved funds for all agencies, including the foreign aid program and the Department of Defense, we have \$50 billion unreserved and unobligated. The amount unexpended for these agencies was \$125 billion.

If the gentleman merely wants to draw on unexpended and unobligated funds to cut down the deficit he should not concentrate on the foreign aid program. There are many other programs in the Federal Government we could take into account, and we would not have to be worried about a \$30 billion deficit if we could take over the \$50 billion of unobligated and unreserved funds available as of June 30, 1967.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would again, as I have suggested before, hope that wherever we have funds we can use and it is unnecessary to appropriate new funds, that now is the time to cut back on those appropriations.

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

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with practically everything that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] said in presenting this rule for the majority side and especially the comments he made concerning the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, particularly its chairman.

As the chairman of the committee indicated when he was before the Committee on Rules, he has always envisioned he would have a fight whenever he brought a foreign affairs bill to the floor of this House. I think this year he is probably going to have more of a fight than ever, because at a time when we are faced with the prospect of a \$28 bil-

lion to \$30 billion deficit, at a time when the President of the United States is asking the citizens of this country and the taxpayers, if you please, to come up with an additional 10-percent tax, or surtax, at a time when this Congress has already raised the debt ceiling so we can pay our bills and the prospect is that even before we adjourn this Congress we might have to raise it again, it seems to me this is the year when the good chairman of this committee and the members of this committee are going to have more of a fight than perhaps they bargained for in years past.

It seems to me, as one who has not supported this program, that it really has not paid off in friends. It has already been indicated here if this is what the purpose of the program is—namely, to buy friends around the world—that it just has not been doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been one of the individuals who believed you cannot buy friends, because they do not stay bought. If you will turn to the minority views on page 131 of the report of this committee, you will find it says:

Never has the futility of foreign aid been more obvious.

In 20 years of do-goodism, the United States has spent 130 billion U.S. taxpayers' dollars. There are 122 members of the United Nations, nearly 90 percent of whom at one time or another have received U.S. assistance. Yet recent events in the Middle East and at the U.N. have shown we have little or no influence with member countries of that organization. This raises an obvious question as to the effectiveness of foreign aid as an arm of U.S. foreign policy.

After 20 years of U.S. foreign aid, we should inventory the situation as it exists today.

The failure of our foreign aid program to win friends for America was demonstrated anew during the most recent world crisis—the Arab-Israeli conflict. When the key vote was taken at the United Nations on the resolution calling for Israel to withdraw unconditionally from captured territory, such U.S. "friends" as France and India voted with the Soviet Union. Yet during the past 20 years, France alone received over \$9 billion in U.S. economic and military aid. It has yet to repay its World War I debts. India through fiscal 1966 had received \$6.7 billion in economic assistance.

So it goes in this report. It seems to me that if this is really a program to win friends, the history of the foreign aid program does not support it.

Now, this bill is for a 2-year authorization, for fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

This House has always prided itself since I have been here in attempting to come up with a bill that the other body would accept. We have been under the other body in every instance that I can recall.

I read just recently where the other body has already acted on this bill. They cut it some \$800 million. We have not made those substantial cuts in this bill. I would hope that under the 5-minute rule, when this matter is open for debate for amendment, that some sizable cuts could be made.

As pointed out by the gentleman from California, we have over \$6 billion in the so-called pipeline. Surely these funds might be obligated to some extent. But it seems to me at a time when we are asking the taxpayers of this country for

\$3,158,919,000 for 1 year, we had better take a look at this pipeline and see whether or not there are not some sources where we can make up for this money.

The pipeline is as follows:

THE PIPELINE—ECONOMIC AND MILITARY—UNDER THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

[In thousands of dollars]

	Unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1966	Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1967
Development loans.....	\$1,924,530	\$1,842,752
Technical assistance.....	267,062	266,341
Alliance for Progress:		
Loans.....	1,091,064	1,074,962
Grants.....	86,152	81,060
IDB trust fund.....	265,179	210,543
Supporting assistance.....	537,861	656,173
Contingency fund.....	151,611	68,364
International organizations.....	158,862	191,582
Other programs.....	27,891	26,728
Undistributed.....	(40,595)	36,015
Total, economic assistance....	4,469,617	4,454,520
Europe.....	2,270	1,160
Africa.....	438,065	436,065
Near East and South Asia.....	1,501,681	1,374,834
East Asia.....	400,011	438,700
Vietnam.....	432,679	484,679
Latin America.....	1,499,642	1,414,048
Nonregional.....	235,863	269,019
Undistributed.....	(40,595)	36,015
Total, economic assistance....	4,469,617	4,454,520
Military assistance pipeline.....		1,628,400
Total available for expenditure from funds appropriated in prior years.....		6,082,920

Also, Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California pointed out, there are some jurisdictional questions involved here. That will be debated, because in two instances, as the gentleman has pointed out, we have already crossed that threshold during this session of Congress. We have already taken care of the matter of Public Law 480 over which the Congress has jurisdiction and on the matter of military assistance, this Congress has already acted.

The foreign assistance bill, as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, includes an authorization not requested by the President for appropriations of \$84.1 million, of which \$60 million is to pay the U.S. share of the construction of NATO multilaterally financed infrastructure and \$24.1 million is for the U.S. share of the operation and maintenance costs of international military headquarters throughout the world. As the House is aware, the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1968, H.R. 11722 which has already been passed by the House, also provides for this same \$60 million infrastructure, and the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968, H.R. 10738, which has also been passed by the House, similarly includes the same \$24.1 million for the U.S. share of the operation and maintenance costs of international military headquarters.

With respect to these two items, the foreign aid bill as reported out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is accordingly in direct conflict with the actions already taken by this House. The Committee on Foreign Affairs asks that the House annul its prior actions and retransfer these programs back to the for-

economic assistance program. The arguments advanced by the Committee on Foreign Affairs in its report for doing so may be summarized as follows:

First. The authorization for these programs have always been part of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Second. The Foreign Affairs Committee is in a better position than the Armed Services Committee to assure that the U.S. share of these costs is kept at a reasonable percentage, since the judgment as to how much the share of the various NATO members should be involves economic and political considerations rather than military.

Third. A greater effort would be made to secure NATO multilateral financing of military installations in Europe for the use of NATO forces, including our own, if such funds continued to be made available from the military assistance program than if Defense Department funds are used because it is easier for those responsible for the Defense Department to allocate Defense Department funds for our own construction than to have these requirements go through the processes necessary to obtain NATO financing.

Fourth. In addition it was argued before the Committee on Rules that the funds for these programs could be better identified if they were part of a small bill such as our foreign assistance bill rather than being a part of a large Defense Department budget. But really—really, my colleagues—the primary reason for bringing military and economic assistance together again in this bill was given by the good chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when he was before the Committee on Rules, he indicated some doubt that the economic assistance program could pass without it.

That is the real reason, in my humble judgment, for bringing them back together again.

The counterarguments are as follows:

First. These programs were originally included in the Foreign Assistance Act because at their inception the U.S. share of the cost of these programs was disproportionate of our use of the facilities, and hence in fact constituted foreign aid.

This situation no longer exists.

At the present time our share of the infrastructure cost is equivalent to our use of these facilities and accordingly it can no longer be considered foreign aid.

Second. The argument that the cost-sharing formula involves economic and political considerations goes too far. As the House well knows, economic and political considerations play a significant role in the decisions to deploy our Armed Forces overseas. It would be accordingly logical under this line of reasoning for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to claim jurisdiction over much of the Defense Department budget.

Moreover, at this stage in the history of NATO, we can be quite confident that, even without the considerable influence of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the cost—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The cost-sharing formula is not likely to be subject to any significant changes. Further, it is not correct to say that the military consideration plays no role. Indeed, as pointed out last October in the 45th report of the Committee on Government Operations in House Report No. 2323, page 10:

The Department of State is not involved in deciding whether projects are eligible for cost-sharing under the NATO infrastructure program. This is strictly a military responsibility.

Third. The argument that there will be tighter control of Defense Department expenditures for construction of U.S. facilities in the NATO area, if the military assistance appropriation continued to fund the multilaterally financed facilities, is on its face self-defeating. A better means could be adapted for U.S. Defense Department funds through the use of unilateral projects that could have multilateral financing, then placing jurisdiction for both in the committee which is responsible for the Defense Department expenditure.

Fourth is the argument advanced to the Committee on Rules that the infrastructure had to be lower in a military construction bill. The fact, however, is that the infrastructure program is a line item in a military construction bill, but is lumped with a grant-aid program in the foreign aid bill.

So much for that jurisdictional dispute that the House has already acted upon, as I said earlier, but will have power to act on again in this bill.

On the matter of who should have jurisdiction in Public Law 480, having served on the Committee on Agriculture and being very close to this program, I have watched its progress, and in my very humble judgment the Committee on Agriculture is the proper committee with reference to Public Law 480, and to transfer its jurisdiction now to the Committee on Foreign Affairs seems to me the wrong thing to do. This was ill considered—or perhaps I should say not considered, when this matter was being debated in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

This was an item that was stuck in, if the information comes to me correctly, at the last moment, after all public hearings had come to an end.

This is a very vital program, and I agree with the gentleman from California when he says that if Public Law 480 is to be transferred over to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then agriculture—the farmers, if you please—should no longer be charged with this foreign aid giveaway program.

You know the farmer always gets the finger pointed at him about the high cost of the Department of Agriculture. But under that budget there are a lot of Public Law 480 expenditures where the school lunch program is directly charged by the Department of Agriculture. Then there is the new breakfast program. So it goes—a long list of expenditures and programs completely unrelated to the farmers or what the farmers are getting out of the Department of Agriculture. But the farmer is still being charged with all this.

I agree with the gentleman from California when he says that if this is going to go over to the foreign aid field and is going to go to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, then take that \$2 billion plus out of the Department of Agriculture budget and put it where it belongs.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] said before the Committee on Rules when he testified in opposition to this proposal to put Public Law 480 under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

They want the cow without furnishing the feed.

I believe that was a very apt way to put it—if they want that cow, let them also furnish the feed and no longer charge the American farmer for its keep.

Mr. Speaker, much can be said and much will be said as to whether or not this program, as it is presented to us now, should pass at all. But certainly I think the Committee on Rules did the right thing when the committee granted 5 full hours of debate with an open rule so that this House could be fully and completely heard not only as to these jurisdictional questions but also on the questions as to merit of passing this bill at all.

I asked the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when they appeared before the Committee on Rules what would happen if we did not pass this bill—would the world fall apart? No, it would not—no, it would not.

I think if we would do exactly that and not pass this bill at all, we would be doing the right thing not only for ourselves but also for these so-called friends—who cease to exist when we need them and we would be putting it on the record that no longer are we going to buy their friendship.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman speaks of our national security. Let me ask the gentleman this question. If this is security for the United States, military assistance, would not the gentleman at the present time like to have the \$130 billion we poured out in the rat holes of this earth in military hardware so that we could really defend this country and so that no combination of nations would dare to attack us?

Mr. LATTI. Let me say to the gentleman, it would be nice to have the \$130 billion.

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

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would just like to add for the record that it depends on how you look at it as to why we spend this money. I have listened to the testimony brought out before our committee now for some 9 years and I have never heard the point made that we were trying to buy friends. Of course, according to one's point of view, it might appear that that seems to be the case. But really what we are trying to do is merely to participate in a program of mutual security and if our friends stay with us, then that is fine. If they do not remain

our friends, then I think what is really important is that we try to maintain peace.

Mr. LATTI. Let me just say in answer to the gentleman that he has been on the committee a good many years and if he has not come across the phrase he can find it in the minority report.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have heard the phrase but I say that that is not the thrust nor the crux of the program—the purpose of the program is our mutual security.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a rather remarkable provision. Very close to the end of the bill you will find on page 45 where it provides as follows:

Sec. 403. The Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, is amended—

(1) by redesignating such Act as part IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended;

I make no charges, but I do suggest that it is rather unusual procedure for a committee to come in and take a program of another committee that has worked real well—and I believe that Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Assistance Act, has been about as successful as any of our foreign operations of which I know. In fact, I believe that it has a good deal more general acceptance and support than the foreign aid program has. I wonder if the Foreign Affairs Committee is simply seeking to go out and grab up somebody else's "children" and march them down the street to make a good appearance. Are you trying to use our children to get on relief? I do not know just what you are trying to do. But I want to know who is going to support our little Sue.

For the RECORD, I wonder if the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who I see is present, will repeat here, so that it may go in the RECORD—and I know he will repeat it—what he said before the Rules Committee when I asked if it was the intention of the Foreign Affairs Committee that hereafter all of the costs of Public Law 480 should be charged to foreign assistance and not to agriculture?

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. That is my intention. The funds for Public Law 480 should be included in the foreign assistance request and in the foreign aid appropriation. I want to say to the gentleman, the foreign aid program has been fragmented. It is now spread around about five different executive agencies. I personally want it all back under the same umbrella where we can watch it.

Mr. PASSMAN and I were talking today about it. He said, "We have a \$9 billion foreign aid program." I agree with him that our assistance to other countries includes much more than is in this bill. If we are ever going to get this program to the point at which the people and the

Congress can evaluate it, we will have to have it in one package.

Mr. POAGE. Does the gentleman say he is going to pay the bill and not ask us to pay for it?

Mr. MORGAN. I certainly will. The money ought to come out of the same packet as foreign aid.

Mr. POAGE. We have the answer—Mr. MORGAN. We are speaking of the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. POAGE. We have the answer. The gentleman says that his committee is going to feed the cow as well as milk her. I want that remembered next year. I want that remembered because this program, rather than being a fragmentation, or getting something back, as the gentleman says, this Public Law 480 program originated in the Committee on Agriculture. It did not originate in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has never been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has always been under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture. It has a pretty good reputation. If we are going to continue to be responsible for the "old girl," we want to protect that reputation. If you want to take over the responsibility and care for the program, that becomes your responsibility and not ours; but we feel that having done a creditable job, this House might be well advised to keep this part of the program right where it is.

We submit that this program has met the test of public favor, and we submit that there are other programs that have not.

I would also suggest that when you add approximately \$2 billion to your already rather heavy bill, it is going to be pretty difficult sailing to carry it through. But that again is the problem of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I merely want to put this House on notice that, as we get into the discussion of this bill, we expect in fairness to have an opportunity to present our views. We cannot do anything about this under the rule until right at the end of the bill, and I want again to ask the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee if he is going to give us time to discuss this amendment along in the late wee hours when everyone is calling "Vote, vote, vote." I want to know how much time I will get to discuss this subject, because I know we are going to be crowded. I know that we are going to be making motions to cut off all debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SISK. I yield the gentleman from Texas 2 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. I want to hear what we are going to get in the way of an opportunity to discuss this subject.

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

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

Mr. MORGAN. I assure the gentleman that I am not going to make any motions to cut off debate, because I am sure that this matter ought to be discussed fully. I was not enthusiastic about putting this provision in the foreign aid bill, but since the committee voted 24 to 0 to

include it, I must tell the gentleman that I intend to defend the committee's position on the floor, and I certainly intend to try to answer the questions of the gentleman from Texas fully.

Mr. POAGE. We want an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. MORGAN. As far as I am concerned the gentleman will have full opportunity for debate.

Mr. POAGE. We are not so interested in the time allotted for the answer of the gentleman as in the time we can expect to ask our questions.

Mr. MORGAN. When the time comes for general debate, I would suggest the gentleman should refresh his memory about the origin of Public Law 480. Public Law 480 actually had its genesis in section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1953. Mr. BURLISON and Dr. Judd were the originators of section 550. Certainly, the subject matter of Public Law 480 began with the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I want the gentleman to refresh his memory on it before we come back to debate it.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, I want to say that I had the pleasure of sponsoring this amendment. One of the main reasons for this amendment in the Foreign Affairs Committee was what Dr. MORGAN has pointed out; namely, many of these programs should be coordinated in one committee.

In 1954 there was a tremendous abundance of surplus food. This is what prompted our former colleague, Dr. Walter Judd, and Congressman BURLISON from Texas to come up with Public Law 480. Dr. Judd thought at that time it was a mistake to put it into the Agricultural Committee. Today we do not have the agricultural surpluses we had in 1954. On May 3 of this year, Mr. John C. Lynn, the legislative director of the American Farm Federation, appeared before our committee to express his views and those of his organization. He made this statement:

Mr. Chairman, we recommend that the Public Law 480 operation be transferred to this Committee and to AID, and that we take it out of the agricultural budget and handle it as a part of the foreign assistance budget, because with the amendment to this law last year, with the word "surplus" removed, it is truly an arm of the Foreign Aid Program and should not be geared solely to the domestic farm program objective.

Mr. Lynn also said—and this is on page 780 of our hearings:

If food aid, economic assistance, and technical assistance are to be coordinated, it seems apparent that they must be administered by the same government agency.

U.S. assistance should be offered to less-developed countries as a unified program containing those elements that will best fit each country's developmental needs.

I think the amendment is very appropriate. I agree with Mr. POAGE that this amendment should be fully discussed. I hope every Member will think about it very carefully.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2

minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise because some of the Members were not present at the first fracas we had on the use of our agricultural products in connection with foreign aid. In the early 1950's we felt very strongly in the Foreign Affairs Committee, about this matter, so strongly that Mr. Judd gave all his time to it, but I recall that there was a time when everybody wanted to cut the acreage for agricultural crops. Everything went beautifully until cotton came in with its steamroller and it rolled right over everything and took an additional million acres for cotton.

I have great respect for the ability of the Agriculture Committee, but I would like to suggest what my colleague, Mr. BROOMFIELD, has suggested, that inasmuch as there is no surplus, I fail to understand the thinking of the Agriculture Committee that it should continue with Public Law 480. We would have to go out on the market and buy the stuff. There used to be a surplus. If that is gone, what can be done about it?

I agree very much with the chairman that it is high time that the Foreign Affairs Committee just put out its arms and took its children back home. A good many of them have slipped out from under this committee. I have found with my young that I let them go a certain distance and then say, "Boys, you had better come home."

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, at this point, I should like to enumerate a few points with regard to Public Law 480.

In the first place, I should like to re-emphasize the fact that the use of surplus farm commodities to advance our foreign policy objectives was initiated in 1953 by Mr. BURLESON and Mr. Judd, within the framework of our foreign aid program.

Then, in 1954, this program was enlarged and adopted by the executive branch to help solve a domestic problem: the problem of disposing of our farm surpluses. That problem has now been solved.

The food-for-peace program, which is the present name for Public Law 480, deals primarily with issues of foreign policy—issues relating to economic development and the avoidance of world famine. These problems are of a foreign policy nature.

I wish to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the President's budget recognizes the fact that Public Law 480 expenditures today are related to international affairs, not to domestic farm programs. In the fiscal year 1968 budget, part 1, page 88, food for peace is listed under the heading of "International Affairs and Finances."

Since our committee is designed by the rules of the House to deal with issues of foreign policy, this amendment is fully proper. Public Law 480 should be brought back under the oversight of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time to make these few observations.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, slice it thick or thin, Public Law 480 in the Foreign Affairs Committee, as well as military assistance, is vital to the promotion and continuance of this monstrosity known as foreign economic aid. Without these elements in the bill it would be like that well-known dead mackerel in the moonlight—the bill would smell and shine, and shine and smell.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. POLLOCK was allowed to speak out of order.)

FLOOD DAMAGE IN ALASKA

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a 10,000-mile round trip to Fairbanks, Alaska, over the weekend to make a firsthand inspection and assessment of the damage caused by the greatest flood in the history of Alaska. I did not have an opportunity to visit the village of Minto and the city of Nenana, both of which are still under water and desolate and totally evacuated.

Contrary to early reports concerning the flood, the water system throughout the city of Fairbanks is in full operation and the water is potable. Although there are some breaks in the waterlines, the water has not become contaminated by reason of the fact that very high pressure in the system has prevented introduction of foreign matter and contaminated floodwaters.

The sewage system is badly damaged and out of operation, and, unfortunately, the floodwaters which are still quite high have become contaminated as a result. The population is being given typhoid shots to prevent an epidemic.

The police and fire radio systems are out of commission, as is the telephone system in town so that there is no intracity communications other than radio station KPAR, which is located on relatively high ground and has managed to keep in operation on a 24-hour basis throughout this catastrophe.

The International Airport is operable and in operation, although the railroad system is out between Fairbanks and Nenana.

Many families are transporting their children out to relatives so that the husband and wife can commence the Herculean task of repair and preparation for early winter.

Senator BARTLETT, Governor Hickel, and I flew over the entire area, and drove through many of the submerged streets in a heavy 6-by-6 powered military vehicle viewing the massive wreckage to real and personal property.

Saturday was the first day of good weather since the beginning of the long rain period which caused the floods, although it appeared to be still raining heavily in the mountain areas outside of town from whence much of the flood waters emanated. I was struck by the serious fact that from the air much of the water appeared to be standing still earlier in the day, with virtually no

drainage to cause the flood waters to subside. However, in the afternoon there was some subsidence. Some bridges and road areas which had been totally submerged at least partially reappeared. Much of the road system is severely damaged, with great fractures and potholes of varying substantial depths, and road edges have been fragmented or washed away, cutting deeply into the streets or highways at numerous locations.

The very serious aspect of this slow drainage is the impending winter which is only 5 or 6 weeks away. Once the freeze comes it will remain until spring. Somehow all of the surface water and subsurface water must drain off and the water table go down substantially; otherwise, there will be enormous damage to roads and public and private building and home foundations from the frost heaves in the spring. Thus, there is a great possibility that the major damage to structures has not yet occurred.

Virtually every basement in town is flooded with water, and it is considered dangerous to the basement structures to pump the water out until the flood waters outside have subsided, for the flood water pressure might cause the basement and foundations structure to collapse inward if there is no countervailing water pressure on the other side of the basement walls. Somehow each of these basements must be pumped out and dried before freezeup if such is possible, and the heating systems and electrical circuit-breaker systems in the basements completely repaired and made workable.

The hospital, railroads, and highways have all been damaged, and the entire military establishment of Fort Wainwright, outside of the city of Fairbanks, is without power or heat except for the hospital. The hospital is on emergency power, and victims have been evacuated, some to Fort Wainwright, some to Eielson Air Force Base, 26 miles away, and some to the military and civilian hospitals at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Fort Richardson, and Anchorage. At Fort Wainwright other than the emergency power at the hospital, not only power but the water and sewer systems and entire utilidor systems are out of commission.

The attitude of the citizens is absolutely amazing. They are courageous and determined, even though the damage to many homes is enormous. People are struggling to carry out soaked and muddied personal effects to somehow salvage what can be saved, and to bend to the enormous task of cleanup and repair. Many of the individuals who were initially evacuated to the University of Alaska campus on high ground not too many miles away have now returned to the desolation in their homes. Many families are actually living in tents on the tops of their flat-roofed homes, or wherever else they can find to subsist.

All of the Federal agencies which are or should be concerned are deeply involved and rendering most commendable assistance. At this time it is impossible to determine the full magnitude of the losses either to the public or private sectors; however, the damage is quite extensive. The economy has been deeply shaken, and it is incumbent upon all

forces of the public and private sector to restore normality as soon as possible.

I am advised that the Small Business Administration will immediately function to receive and process disaster loan applications for the private sector, and will have experienced and capable assessors review the damage and restoration requirements so that emergency disaster loans might be immediately processed and funded. These loans will be made at 3 percent for up to 30 years, so long as there is a capacity on the part of individuals involved to repay.

Because the remaining equity balances owed by individuals on their homes plus the extensive damage repair costs will very often exceed the total original or current value of the home involved, it is my fervent hope that the SBA Administrator will authorize that these disaster loans be made not only sufficient to cover the disaster repair costs, but also, on a basis of individual need, to include all or part of the original mortgage balance, so that the impoverished individuals will not be compelled to make two mortgage payments, and at different rates of interest, but in appropriate cases can make one payment to cover the entire obligation concerned with the purchase mortgage and repair costs. If this can be accomplished at the 3-percent rate for up to 30 years, where the situation requires, it is possible for some individuals to hang on and survive in these almost impossible circumstances instead of giving up and wandering aimlessly elsewhere in search of another beginning.

Senator BARTLETT and I are meeting this afternoon with Mr. Clarence Cowles, Director of the SBA disaster relief program, to encourage such an administrative determination. It can spell the difference between economic recovery and chaos. If the private sector can be helped in this manner, it is believed that most of the recovery can be accomplished under existing law and programs without the need of additional special legislation. I certainly hope this can be the case.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Ohio have any further request for time?

Mr. LATTI. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I only have one additional request for time and I would appreciate it if the gentleman would yield back his time, if the gentleman has no further request for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Does the gentleman from Ohio yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. LATTI. I reserve the balance of my time. I have no further request for time. However, if the gentleman has additional requests for time, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the American people to be advised of the situation that exists

throughout the world in connection with the national interests of their own country.

It is my opinion that we are in better shape today throughout the world than we have been for many of the past years.

We find the situation in Indonesia and, certainly, the internal situation in Indonesia, would never have happened unless we were in South Vietnam.

We find the other countries of Southeast Asia strengthened in their desire to be free and independent from Communist domination, either directly or indirectly.

We find only a few weeks ago Israel engaged in a conflict which amazed, astonished and pleased the greater part of the world. The Arab-Israel conflict took Moscow by surprise. The work over the years by the Soviet Union to gain a dominant position in the Middle East was inundated and collapsed in a matter of a few days; in fact, a matter of a few hours. For years the Soviet Union has thrown its full weight and strength as well as diplomacy behind the Arab cause.

Most of the Soviet satellite nations in Europe are in disarray. If we look underneath the surface we see it, if we only want to look, some hedging and some refusing to support the Soviet Union in its efforts to bring back some of its destroyed influence among the Arab nations. While they are not saying anything openly, as they want to get all they can from the Soviet Union, and knowing what human nature is and what human beings are inwardly, there is no question but what the Arabs no longer trust the Soviet Union.

This is the time when we should continue with strength. This is not a time for us to evidence weakness on the part of our country.

I can remember years ago when the question of foreign assistance was first up for consideration in this body, the argument was advanced that it would only last for a year or two. I took the well of the House and the floor of the House and stated at that time that the national interest of our country, as I saw it, called for foreign assistance for many years to come.

The argument was advanced at that time that it would only last for a year or two. I took the well of the House at that time and stated that the national interest of our country, as I saw it, called for foreign assistance for many years to come.

Like some of my friends who have spoken, I want gratitude, and I join with them in their expressions, but I never expected gratitude to be lasting, although I do not expect ingratitude.

What we did then and what we are doing now is in the national interest of our country. Paramount in every nation, including our own, is the national interest of one's own country.

I have stood in the well of this House throughout the years, back in the thirties, when I was one of the few voices who dared talk against Hitler, who dared try to warn the people of America of the dangers of arrogant aggression. Yes, I stood in this well, and I heard some of

my friends refer to me and others who spoke as I did as "warmongers" when we saw Hitler take over the Saar and then Austria, then the Sudetenland, then the rest of Czechoslovakia, then came Poland and the war.

There are a few of us who tried to warn and to awaken the people of the United States, but we were like voices "speaking in the wilderness." While I am referring to that, there was a great man in England who in the 1930's was also speaking like a voice "in the wilderness," the late Winston Churchill, and England in desperation had to turn to him when it was almost too late.

Yes, I have stood in the well of this House, and I stand now, and I will continue to stand and say it is of paramount importance that our country be strong; that while we hope for the best, we be prepared for the worst.

My voice has been expressed along such lines throughout the last 30-odd years, and as long as the imminent danger exists my voice in that direction will continue to be uttered, and expressed.

The only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess themselves. Furthermore, the Soviet Union, as we read about it in the newspapers and listen about it on television, we would think that they possess all the strengths and none of the weaknesses, and that all that our country possesses are the weaknesses and no strengths. I might make the passing observation that the leaders of the Soviet Union within the Kremlin must be seriously concerned about the next 10 or 15 years at the most, in connection with their relationship or possible relationship with Red China. The situation there is tense and taut, and it is for us to capitalize and exploit.

Sure, we have dangers. Certainly we have to be on our guard. We must be eternally alert. We cannot afford to lower our guard for one second, but on the other hand we should not fail to recognize the situation that exists throughout the world as compared with only a few years ago, and the advantages that are pointed in our direction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

My purpose on this occasion is not to get into anything that is controversial at this time but to ask my colleagues to think of the future. It is hard to look into the future and to see history in the making. I know because I have sat at every important conference with every President that we have had since 1940—and I supported them.

There is a calculated risk of action involved in every decision. On the other hand, there are the calculated risks of inaction. I think it is fair to say and it cannot be challenged that during the 1930's that the calculated risks of in-

action as a result of decisions made by the free nations, Britain and France at that time, were of greater danger not only to those countries but to the world than the calculated risk of action, if action had been taken.

So we are looking into the future. The national interest of our country is involved. Let us discuss this bill on that high plane which the House of Representatives is so capable of doing. But over and above everything I ask my colleagues: Let us never forget that our primary duty is the national interest of the United States.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRATTON BILL INTRODUCED TO APPROPRIATE \$5 MILLION TO EISENHOWER COLLEGE, SENECA FALLS, N.Y., AS A LIVING NATIONAL MEMORIAL TO DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, 34TH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize the appropriation of \$5 million by this Congress as a living national memorial on behalf of a grateful Nation to former President Eisenhower.

This memorial would, under my bill, be in the form of financial assistance for both scholarship aid and normal operations for Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y., in my congressional district. Eisenhower College is a newly developing small, liberal arts college, chartered by New York State and scheduled to open its doors to its first class of students in June 1968.

Eisenhower College not only bears President Eisenhower's name, but it also has his full blessing and support. And he has frequently indicated his own belief that if there is to be any memorial to him he sincerely hopes it will take the form of assistance and encouragement to this new institution.

Mr. Speaker, since Eisenhower College is located in my congressional district, I have been honored to have been invited to serve as a member of its board of trustees. Also included on the board of trustees of Eisenhower College are retired Col. John S. Eisenhower, son of the former President; Dr. Kevin McCann, former president of Defiance College in Defiance, Ohio, and a former Eisenhower White House aide; and Armory S. Houghton, president of the Corning Glass Co. and U.S. Ambassador to France during the Eisenhower administration. The chancellor of the new college is Dr. Earl J. McGrath, U.S. Commissioner of Education during the Truman administration and also during a

portion of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Speaker, in view of President Eisenhower's great service to our Nation and to the world, I think it makes good sense for us to create this material evidence of our esteem and affection for him now, while he is still with us and still enjoying his well-earned retirement, so that we can show it to him personally rather than waiting until he is gone.

Of course there is ample precedent for the appropriation of public funds to create a memorial honoring a former President of the United States. Memorials have already been erected with the help of public appropriated funds to honor Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In addition Congress has appropriated funds for construction of the John F. Kennedy Center for the performing arts here in Washington, D.C., as a memorial to the late President Kennedy.

No such memorial of course has yet been created for President Eisenhower. But I believe this living memorial, in the form of aid to a college which bears his name; which will embody his ideas of public service, wider education, and international understanding; and to which he has repeatedly given his wholehearted interest and support, would be an especially meaningful memorial and one most nearly likely to be in conformity with the former President's own wishes and preference.

I therefore sincerely hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will join in supporting this legislation and that it will be speedily enacted into law by this 90th Congress in behalf of all the people of America.

BANK SUPERVISORS SHOULD ISSUE CEASE AND DESIST ORDERS AGAINST BANKS ENGAGING IN UNSAFE AND UNSOUND CREDIT CARD PRACTICES—LEGISLATION TO BE INTRODUCED

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the issuance of credit cards by our federally insured banks is an unsafe and unsound banking practice. Just consider the fact that hundreds and thousands of banks, including many holding Federal and State Government deposits, are sending out millions of credit cards not only to people whose financial responsibility has not been checked, but even to people who did not request the cards and who do not even want them. There is no dollar limit on the amount that can be charged on most of these cards; yet, these banks are willing to guarantee to any and all merchants patronized by their cardholders that the bank will make good on the customer's debt even though no loan application has either been submitted or approved.

So not only are members of the public being enticed into living beyond their incomes and into usurious finance charges, but our federally insured banks are incurring liabilities without knowing how much credit is involved, without knowing how much in special reserves need be set aside, without knowing when and if they will be repaid, without knowing the impact on their liquidity position and without knowing the impact on their legal reserve requirements.

Even Federal Reserve Governor Brimmer suggested as much in his recent speech to a group of San Francisco bankers. How can the bank examiners render an accurate and reliable opinion of a bank's solvency if its liabilities are unknown and its assets questionable?

How can public depositors know their money is safe if a bank is on the hook on thousands of unlimited credit cards? It is no great secret that banks normally keep on hand only about 10 cents on every dollar to pay off depositors. The rest is out in loans, including credit card transactions. Yet, while no sound bank can operate in the dark with respect to its liabilities and liquidity position, this is exactly what so many of these card-crazy banks are doing—operating in the dark, along with the bank examiners themselves.

The risks inherent in these credit cards are absolutely contrary to sound banking principles applicable to a deposit institution. Bear in mind, colleagues, that at yearend 1966 our federally insured banks were holding deposits aggregating nearly \$200 billion, payable on demand. So if a bank has untold millions of its assets tied up in credit card transactions it knows absolutely nothing about from one month to the next, how can that bank know that its depositors can actually get their money out when they want it?

So while I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that credit cards are illegal for national banks—a matter I will go into a greater length in the very near future—credit cards are a dangerously unsafe and unsound practice for all banks. Therefore, within the next week I plan to introduce legislation to prohibit the issuance of unsolicited open-end credit cards and to persons of unknown financial responsibility and to minors.

It is rather disheartening that this credit card craze must become a legislative problem due to the failure of the bank supervisors to use their cease-and-desist powers authorized in the Financial Institutions Supervisory Act of 1966, and due to their failure to bring a test case in the courts. Bankers may not insulate themselves from personal liability on the ground that the Comptroller of the Currency or some other agency failed to do its duty—*Atherton v. Anderson*, 99 F. 2d 883. But of greater concern to the Congress is the safety of deposits insured by the Federal Government.

TIGHT MONEY AND HIGH INTEREST RATES RUINOUS TO FARMERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I received a most interesting letter from Mr. Tony T. Dechant of the National Farmers Union. These farmers passed a resolution last week, on August 10, asking to be relieved of high and rising interest rates. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the letter and resolution from the National Farmers Union:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Denver, Colo., August 15, 1967.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, House Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought you might be interested in the interest rates resolution adopted by our Executive Committee here in Denver last week. It urges action by the President, the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury to arrest and reverse the recent upturn in interest rates.

Farm people, as you know, probably feel the full consequences of tight money and high interest rates more than any other economic group.

I want to say again how much we in Farmers Union appreciate your effective leadership in the banking and credit areas.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

TONY T. DECHANT.

Enclosure.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, AUGUST 10, 1967, DENVER, COLO.

Farmers are observing the new trend of advancing interest rates with much concern because they are acutely aware from long experience that high interest rates are promptly and inexorably reflected in higher costs of all of the things farmers must buy in order to produce the Nation's food.

Farmers have no opportunity to reflect these increased costs of production in the sale of the products they bring to market. In fact, increasing interest rates tend to depress the price of farm commodities in the market place because they reduce the purchasing power of all consumers.

The damaging effects of the excessive interest rates initiated a year ago by the Federal Reserve Board continue to be felt on the farms and in the cities and towns which serve farmers.

We urge, therefore, that immediate steps be taken by the President, the Federal Reserve Board, and the Treasury to arrest and reverse the present interest rate increase trend.

Mr. Speaker, in this year's Joint Economic Report on the January 1967 Economic Report of the President both the majority and the minority discussed the plight of the farmers.

The Joint Economic Committee had to illuminate their plight because the President's report had given such superficial treatment to their problems.

Year after year the small farmer is being eliminated from his chosen pursuit of income. All too frequently the small farmer goes to the local banker and discovers that he is no longer a good credit risk. This farmer's likely income from farming for the coming year is assumed to be insufficient to cover the cost of his requested loan. Higher inter-

est rates make it even more difficult for the small farmer.

Once all the small farmers are eliminated we will find that the corporate farmers start setting prices to be paid by consumers.

Mr. Speaker, think of the letters we would have to answer if corporate farmers raised their prices so that all a consumer could buy with a dollar would be either one loaf of bread, or one dozen eggs, or one quart of milk. These rising interest rates have consequences on the small farmers who at present keep the farm sector highly competitive but eventually these rising interest rates, through elimination of the small farmer, will influence the consumer adversely, once again. Last year's decline in the farm population of almost 1 million should not be accelerated this year with higher interest rates.

On July 27 I submitted a detailed statement on what higher interest rates have cost our economy. I would like to ask the distinguished Members of this body to have one of your staff members calculate how many homes could have been purchased with these excessive interest rates. You will be shocked by the numbers produced by your staff. As a postscript to that statement I want to add that interest charges as a percentage of agricultural production expenses have risen from 3 percent in 1951 to almost 7½ percent last year. The interest rates paid by farmers doubled between 1950 and 1958. They doubled again by 1965 and they rose by about 15 percent last year alone. Interest rates paid by farmers have increased fourfold since Harry Truman was President.

To fight higher interest rates today will mean to fight less tomorrow over rising food prices. You have a choice.

GALBRAITH'S "NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE" RAISES AGAIN THE QUESTION OF WHO CONTROLS THE GREAT CORPORATIONS OF AMERICA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, John Kenneth Galbraith's "New Industrial State" not only is and promises to be one of the alltime bestsellers, but also is stimulating much needed rethinking on the part of observers with a wide spectrum of viewpoints. In my opinion, Professor Galbraith's thoughts are so provocative that they call for a new investigation by the Congress comparable to that of the Temporary National Economic Committee in the late 1930's. The latter investigation, it will be recalled, resulted in substantial part from many of the ideas contained in another important book, "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," authored by Adolph A. Berle and Gardiner C. Means, and published in 1932.

Among the numerous reviews of Mr.

Galbraith's book, one of the most scholarly is that recently written by John M. Blair, the noted chief economist of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee. Dr. Blair's review appears in the Progressive of August 1967, and I am including it at the end of my statement. Among Dr. Blair's observations, one in particular strikes me as most pertinent, as follows:

Also, mention should be made of Galbraith's unfortunate tendency to be didactic on points on which not even he can claim omniscience. Thus he is even more certain of the divorce between ownership and control in the modern corporation than were Berle and Means when they first promulgated the thesis more than thirty years ago. Yet it is at least within the realm of possibility that only the form of ownership interest has changed. *Fortune* magazine of June, 1967, contains a provocative article, "How Mutual Funds Influence Management." *The enormous power, whether exercised or not, of a handful of New York banks which are regularly selected to vote the impressive stockholdings of mutual funds, pension funds, and investment trusts is a reality, the significance of which is simply not known.* (Italic added.)¹

TNEC FAILED TO PROBE EXTENT OF BANKER CONTROL

The plain fact is that Congress has not met its responsibilities to the public interest in this area. The TNEC nearly 30 years ago made a study of stock ownership in the 200 largest industrial corporations of the Nation—see TNEC Monograph No. 29, "The Distribution of Ownership in the 200 Largest Non-financial Corporations." Yet, no comparable investigation was made of the ownership of the largest banks. Gardiner C. Means, himself stated that:

No study of stock ownership in banks, such as the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has carried out for rails, utilities, and communications, has ever been made. It would be very desirable that this should be done.²

HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CURRENTLY INVESTIGATING BANK STOCK OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

As a matter of fact, recognizing this void in our knowledge, several years ago I directed the staff of the House Banking and Currency Committee to make a comprehensive investigation into the ownership and control of commercial banks. This stemmed from a preliminary study which I made just prior to becoming chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, entitled "Chain Banking: Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks." Upon my recommendation, the Banking and Currency Committee itself authorized a reprinting of this important document, as well as a followthrough study of the implications developed in that study.

HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE HAS ISSUED A NUMBER OF BASIC REPORTS REVEALING SCOPE OF CONTROLS CENTERING IN LARGE BANKS

Because of the tremendous importance of the documents produced in the course of this inquiry, I should like to list the

¹ John M. Blair, "Galbraith's Two Hats," *The Progressive*, August 1967, p. 37.

² "The Structure of the American Economy: Part I. Basic Characteristics," National Resources Committee, 1939, fn. p. 311.

reports by name, so that interested readers, concerned with the problem of who controls our great corporations, might give them detailed study. These reports are:

First. "Chain Banking—Stockholder and Loan Links of 200 Largest Member Banks," 1963.²

Second. "Bank Holding Companies: Scope of Operations and Stock Ownership," 1963.

Third. "Twenty Largest Stockholders of Record in Member Banks of the Federal Reserve System," 1964.³

Fourth. "The Structure of Ownership of Member Banks and the Pattern of Loans Made on Hypothecated Bank Stock," 1964.

Fifth. "Bank Stock Ownership and Control," 1966.

Sixth. "Acquisitions, Changes in Control, and Bank Stock Loans of Insured Banks," 1967.

Seventh. "Control of Commercial Banks and Interlocks Among Financial Institutions," 1967.

BANK TRUST DEPARTMENTS EXERCISE MUCH GREATER CONTROLS THAN MUTUAL FUNDS

In transmitting the staff report on "Bank Stock Ownership and Control," I pointed out the importance of the controls lodged in bank trust departments, pointing out that—

The study shows that commercial banks hold in excess of \$215 billion in their trust departments. This, by any standard, is a fantastic accumulation of wealth and economic power. This vast sum is used for a variety of investments apparently involving every major segment of the economy, a fact which gives the bank trust departments tremendous economic leverage. Other holdings are dwarfed in comparison to the \$215 billion held by the trust departments. For example, the total assets of the mutual fund industry stand at just under \$40 billion. If it is good public policy to have regulation of the mutual fund industry, then it would seem logical that similar regulation be imposed on the investment of the \$215 billion held by bank trust departments. Yet, these bank trust departments are virtually unregulated either at the State or Federal level, and there is little public control over the manipulations of this immense accumulation of wealth. This fact would appear to recommend itself to immediate legislative remedy.

In short, our studies have revealed two important bits of information: First, the top stockholders of the Nation's leading banks—just as the TNEC found in the case of the big industrial corporations—are usually the nominees of the trust departments of the big banks; second, piercing behind the facade of bank nominee stockholdings, it was found that bank trust departments exercise considerable direct voting rights in the so-called publicly owned banks—by which is meant corporate entities whose stock is so widely held in small amounts by the general public that only a fraction of the total outstanding stock held by the top stockholders may be the source of con-

control over the selection of corporate management.

The staff of the House Banking and Currency Committee is continuing to explore this matter—but more data are needed. Only as the people's representatives in the Congress probe into these unknown areas will we gain an appreciation of the real functioning of the "New Industrial State." Americans have a right to know who controls industrial America—whether it be a few important mutual funds, the pervasive tax-exempt foundations, or the tremendously influential trust departments of a group of powerful commercial banks. At present the staff has underway a new phase in this important inquiry, designed to determine two things: First, the extent to which the trust departments of major banks hold and vote large blocks of stock in major industrial and commercial corporations; and second, the extent to which the officers and directors of these commercial banks are interlocked with the management of the leading nonbanking corporations. In addition, the overall size of trust holdings of major banks will be determined with accuracy for the first time.

I append herewith Dr. Blair's most enlightened review of Galbraith's "The New Industrial State":

GALBRAITH'S TWO HATS

(By John M. Blair)

After more than a quarter century of preoccupation with other subjects, there are signs of a reawakening of interest among economists in the original subject of the profession—the nature and behavior of business enterprises, the determination of price, the structure of industry, and so on. One can only hope that this interest stems at least in part from a growing concern over the effects of our increasingly organized society on the rights, life, and opportunities of the individual.

For this reason alone, John Kenneth Galbraith's book, *The New Industrial State*, would be welcome since it constitutes an addition to the small but growing body of literature in which economists are combining their interests in the profession's original subject matter with a recognition of the reality of the modern corporation. Moreover, it is a logically organized and, in part, quite original work. And, as the author obviously intended, it should prove to be highly controversial.

Recognizing the limitations inherent in extreme compression, the key points of Galbraith's argument may be summarized somewhat as follows: The free market of classical economic theory has been replaced by the great corporations, which, for all practical purposes, are free from any outside force of influence. Their size frees them from the constraints of the market, while their ability to raise capital from retained earnings frees them from the influence of investors. Producing their own raw materials, they are free of concern over supplies. And what is most remarkable, they are able through modern advertising and other forms of non-price competition to "manage" their demand. In this "revised sequence," the consumer is no longer king; the new sovereign is the corporation which by managing its demand determines what and how much will be produced; and through the artful use of the means of communications the consumer can be induced to like what is proffered.

The savants of the University of Chicago notwithstanding, this is a not inaccurate—though largely familiar—description of much of our industrial economy. As to just

how much of the economy, there is room for a considerable difference of opinion. In Galbraith's view the description applies to all areas except agriculture, services, the professions, handicrafts, a few retail trades, and "some vice." But the free market functions tolerably well in such additional fields as construction, most foods, most textiles, apparel, lumber, furniture, printing, some paper products, stone and clay products, non-ferrous metals (except aluminum), fabricated metals, most machinery, many electronic products and some chemicals. The area of the economy in which competition is very much alive is certainly as large as the area in which it is quiescent.

When it comes to public policy, Galbraith's principal contribution is a series of negative constraints. Thus, any direct governmental intervention in corporate affairs is to be avoided, since it will only interfere with the ability of the corporation to plan. Anti-trust action is also to be eschewed; the reason advanced is the hoary old chestnut, "It would require that we have simple products made with simple equipment from readily available materials by unspecialized labor."

As to affirmative proposals, the Government must shore up demand through deficit spending. Governmental expenditures can most easily be justified if they are for military purposes which, given the nature of modern weaponry, make it essential to find an acceptable solution for the arms race: "A simple increase in consumer spending resulting from tax reduction or in public spending for housing or pensions would be no substitute. . . . In relation to the needs of the industrial system, the space competition is nearly ideal." Then, there should be applied to such public needs as urban and interurban transportation the kind of overall planning which AT&T has brought to the telephone. And, of course, there is always the hope inherent in increased emphasis on education, particularly in the liberal colleges.

It is one thing to offer such an argument as a provocative challenge to received wisdom, particularly the wisdom associated with the economists of the University of Chicago. It is something else again to assert that its fundamental premise is well rooted in inexorable economic forces—that, specifically, bigness is machine-made, not man-made. Referring to those among his colleagues who specialize in narrow fields, he states: "I have drawn on their work, quantitative and qualitative, at every stage." Yet anyone who contends that the giant corporations of today are largely the inevitable result of the "imperatives of technology" is merely reflecting his ignorance of the literature.

While this is not the occasion to summarize the state of knowledge on the relationship of size to efficiency, it can be said that in most of our concentrated industries the size of the optimal plant has been demonstrated to be far below the size of the largest company, that the gains in efficiency of operating many plants under common ownership and control appear to be at least offset by the losses arising from the cost of excessive bureaucracy and the like, that even with their greater monopoly power the largest firms do not show the highest profit rates in three industries out of four, that in most industries the largest plants are of declining importance, and that new technological developments such as computers, plastics, fiberglass, and prestressed concrete promise further reductions in the size of the optimal firm.

To the best of my knowledge, this is the first work which can justifiably be accused of defending bigness per se, since at one point Galbraith concedes that General Motors at least is beyond any size required by efficiency. Moreover, he fails to mention the newer Schumpeterian "invention-innovation" rationale which sees in the research of the large companies the fountainhead of new

² For an analysis of chain banking operations as revealed by this earlier committee study, see Darnell, "Chain Banking," *The National Banking Review*, March 3, 1966, p. 307, and by the same author, "Chain Bank Ownership and Operation," *The National Banking Review*, December 4, 1966, p. 193.

products and processes, even though he was vigorously urging it upon us only a few years ago; perhaps Galbraith is aware of the hard times which this justification for bigness has suffered at the hands of empirical investigators.

But in Galbraith's view there is a *summum bonum* of bigness, transcending considerations of efficiency or innovation; this is the ability to plan: "The size of General Motors is in the service not of monopoly or the economies of scale but of planning." And just how does a corporation such as General Motors plan? We are informed only that the "mature corporation" sets prices "not where they maximize profits but where they best contribute to the security of the technostucture and to the growth of a firm." The available empirical studies, however, enable us to be far more precise. For many of the industrial leaders, General Motors among them, planning consists of setting their prices in relation to their costs at such a level as to yield a rate of return on investment of fifteen or twenty per cent, after taxes, or about three times the level permitted public utilities.

The question is whether such planning, admittedly good for General Motors, is also good for the country. The same question would also apply to drug companies whose planning enables them to earn profit rates of thirty per cent or more, after taxes; or to U.S. Steel, which has been able to break even operating at less than a third of capacity, or to concentrated industries, in general, whose typical reaction to a falling off in demand is to reduce production and employment while maintaining or even increasing their prices.

This is the fundamental question which Galbraith ignores except to warn against governmental interference on the grounds that it injects "control . . . at the expense of competence." Management and stockholder groups may applaud the skill with which, through planning, these and similar objectives have been accomplished. Those with broader horizons might wonder if the public interest would be better served if the planning were less successful.

Also, mention should be made of Galbraith's unfortunate tendency to be didactic on points on which not even he can claim omniscience. Thus he is even more certain of the divorce between ownership and control in the modern corporation than were Berle and Means when they first promulgated the thesis more than thirty years ago. Yet it is at least within the realm of possibility that only the form of ownership interest has changed. *Fortune* magazine of June, 1967, contains a provocative article, "How Mutual Funds Influence Management." The enormous power, whether exercised or not, of a handful of New York banks which are regularly selected to vote the impressive stockholdings of mutual funds, pension funds, and investment trusts is a reality, the significance of which is simply not known.

Another case in point concerns the reports of increasing use by the Soviet Union of the market mechanism: "This has been widely hailed as a return by those countries to the market. That is a mirage." On the basis of my own study of the subject in Europe last year, I am not sure that it is a mirage. By its very nature planning requires foreknowledge of what consumers want and what the instruments of production can supply. As long as their unmet wants are so great as to make consumers satisfied with practically any type of merchandise, and as long as the nature of technology is relatively standardized and stable, planning, whether private or public, can be made to work. But when both consumers and technology become sophisticated and unpredictable, attempts at planning, whether public or private, may prove to be

far less efficient than the market in bringing demand and supply together.

At least, such appears to be the conviction of those who have had the greatest experience with planning and are finding it less and less suited to the realities of the day. It would be a typical Galbraithian paradox if planning were to prove as obsolete and outmoded in the future as he regards competition today.

Finally, a word on Galbraith's celebrated style. Any writer who can infuse economics with so much ironic wit, wry understatement, and elegant aphorisms just deserves to be celebrated. Some economists, such as Veblen, have deliberately practiced obfuscation as a means of protective coloration. A good many, particularly among today's younger mathematical economists, do not write well because they have never learned to write at all. But there are other reasons which are inherent in the nature of the subject itself. Like all social sciences, it is not and cannot be an exact science. Moreover, it affects more directly than any other discipline that most sensitive part of the human anatomy, the pocketbook nerve. Only the Stylian pit reserved for those considered to be "technically incompetent" awaits the luckless soul who in the interest of clarity dispenses even momentarily with a protective clutter of caveats.

Galbraith's solution is the wry commentary and ironic understatement. Unhappily, what is gained in readability is all too often at the expense of clarity. Mocking the views of others conveys only imprecisely the nature of one's own beliefs. Equally unclear is where an author's real view lies above that which is deliberately understated.

In this book the difficulty of ascertaining meaning is compounded by the fact that Galbraith wears two hats which are constantly being interchanged; he is both the objective, disinterested observer and the advocate of particular types of public policy. To recommend a course of governmental action with the same sardonic amusement which is employed in describing some of the industrial system's least attractive features is certainly not the best way to distinguish what ought to be changed from what must be accepted. It is also not likely to gain many converts.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New Catholic Encyclopedia, produced by the Catholic University of America, contains numerous excellent articles dealing with a wide variety of subjects. One of these articles was written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University. The article is titled "Communist Economic Systems," and in reprint form is being circulated here and abroad.

The article is a comprehensive, critical analysis of the so-called Communist economic systems, and interprets current changes in the Red empire as necessary adjustments for the expanding cold war commitments of Moscow and its syndicate members. I earnestly commend this article to the reading of those who would liberalize East-West trade and accommodate the Red states in the fulfillment of this objective. Because of the many unique perspectives, insights, and

contents, I include the article in full text in the Record:

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

Strictly speaking, no Communist economic system with an industrial base exists anywhere in the world. Although the term Communist is generally and uncritically used as a point of political reference, it has no comprehensive objective application in the field of economics. The economies of the U.S.S.R., of mainland China, of the so-called satellites in central Europe, of Yugoslavia, and of other areas claim to be socialist and are ostensibly in the process of creating the foundations for a Communist society. In fact, they are not even socialist in the traditional, democratic meaning of the term. A precise definition of these economies underscores the concept of economic totalitarianism with a primary orientation toward global imperio-colonialism in the more powerful states.

In the vast totalitarian empire, the most formidable economic power is centered in the U.S.S.R. and is the very foundation of the totalitarian dominion. Any essential change in this economic power, or even more, its destruction, would spell the collapse of the empire, for, in a fundamental sense, all other parts of that empire ultimately depend for their collective and individual survival on this power base. Ideological scuffles and rifts cannot conceal this reality.

Common Characteristics. A systematic analysis of these totalitarian economies must rest on recognition of several prominent facts pertinent to all of them. One is the increasing amount of data released by the totalitarian governments concerning almost every sphere of their economies. There have been notable differences, and the material, both statistical and empirical, still falls quite short of acceptable standards of economic reporting. But since the mid-1950's, and particularly from the U.S.S.R., the annual releases of economic data that have appeared contrast sharply with the dearth of information that characterized previous periods. Analysis of these data results in deeper understanding of the workings and problems of these economies, in a steadily growing capacity for checking the accuracy of totalitarian economic claims, and in the easier confirmation of conclusions reached by independent critical research. Some of the disadvantages of relying on such controlled data, however, are a proneness to accept statistical material as definitive of the progress achieved by these economies, and indulgence in economic generalizations formed in a void of political and cold war contexts.

Second, to appreciate the nature and functions of these economies, it is imperative to maintain a constant long-range view of their developments, one that balances the transiency of short-run movements and all the unfounded optimism or pessimism associated with them. The long-range view necessarily encompasses an institutional analysis of the structure, character, basic operations, and paramount tendencies of these systems. All too often a pragmatic shift in economic policy or an economic reversal in these economies is mistaken for a major structural or institutional change.

The third prominent fact about the totalitarian systems is their basic concept of the meaning of political economy. In all cases heavy ingressions of political motivation, control, and objective color the performances of these systems. Although distinctions must be drawn in abstract analysis between political and economic components, in operational analyses (holistic and concrete treatments taking all determining factors into account) it is extremely difficult to separate these forces. From the viewpoint of the Red totalitarian conspiracy, the economy itself is an institutional means for the accomplishment of the global objective. The totalitarian character of these economies is derived from

this fundamental fact. Socialization, for example, has for them come to be an essential instrument of political control rather than an agency for socioeconomic betterment. To designate these economies as examples of "state capitalism" (a self-contradictory term) would indicate a complete misunderstanding of the philosophy and nature of capitalism itself.

False Comparison with Free World Economies. Finally, these guiding facts lead to a point of the utmost importance, namely, the need to avoid false comparisons between the so-called Communist economies and those in the free world. For instance, the economy of the U.S.S.R. is by character and composition different from that of the U.S. The former is an empire-state, the latter a nation-state economy. In addition, comparisons on the bases of production and growth rates can be most misleading if they are not properly qualified by determining considerations of structural economic change and the product-mix of the compared economies. Relevant questions of quality, precision, and ordered specification complicate such comparisons to the point of practically worthless speculation.

THE EMPIRE-STATE ECONOMY OF THE U.S.S.R.

One of the gravest errors with regard to the U.S.S.R. has been to conceive it as nation, nation-state, or homogeneous country. This common error flouts both the history of the area and the inescapable truth, upheld even by Moscow itself, of the multinational composition of the U.S.S.R. The fallacy has unfortunately led to various misinterpretations of economic as well as of other developments. It precludes, for example, any thoughtful consideration of the constant economic friction and jockeying for investment resources between the non-Russian republics of the U.S.S.R. and the Russian center in Moscow, and it arbitrarily excludes the highly important phenomenon of Soviet Russian imperialism within the U.S.S.R. itself.

The U.S.S.R. is more than twice the size of the U.S. In 1965 its population was slightly more than 230 million, against 194 million in the U.S. The average annual population increase in the U.S.S.R. has been 1.7 per cent since the 1930s, although there are marked differences between the rural and urban populations and also between the non-Russian and Russian. Excluding the heavy losses in World War II, which amounted to 25 million actual deaths and about 15 million lost births, if there had not been the many genocidal onslaughts on the non-Russian populations in the 1930s and 1940s, the non-Russian component of the U.S.S.R.'s population would substantially exceed its estimated 117 million people. It is important to bear in mind that the U.S.S.R. is in reality made up of a dozen compact national entities and well over a 100 different ethnic groups. The nominal existence of the non-Russian republics in some measure reflects the fundamental fact.

Under expanding industrialization and urbanization, the U.S.S.R. has been encountering problems similar to those in the West. Increased concentration in the cities, smaller urban family units, congestion and pressures for adequate living accommodations, evidences of juvenile delinquency, and a shifting labor supply are only some of the problems facing the totalitarian planners. Meanwhile, supported by the still extensive rural section, the total population continues to increase, and though the density of population in the U.S.S.R. is one of the lowest among the major countries, much of its territory is hardly suitable for normal habitation. These problems threaten to increase in the years ahead.

Natural Resources of the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. is even richer in soil and mineral resources than the U.S. A major portion, such as the agricultural basics, oil, manganese, coal, iron ore, and a variety of

metals, is located in the non-Russian territories of the U.S.S.R. The Ukraine is especially rich in agriculture, and Turkestan in central Asia in mineral resources. The exploitation and disposition of these and other resources at the command of Moscow raise the fundamental issue of imperio-colonialism in the U.S.S.R. Related to this is the gross mismanagement of these resources, for, despite their overall abundance, there are critical shortages in tin, copper, nickel, and lead. A progressive exhaustion of high-grade ore deposits has been noticeable for some time. The economic consequences of recurring mineral crises in the U.S.S.R. have become quite evident in the lower quality of manufactured goods. Moreover, the pressures emanating from a basic policy of self-sufficiency and the increasing raw material demands from the so-called satellite economies have tended to accentuate the critical aspects of the U.S.S.R.'s position with respect to minerals. A major result of these developments is the significance of Moscow's policy regarding minerals in the cold war. Moscow still strives for self-sufficiency, but seeks to overcome critical shortages through bilateral trade and development, particularly with the underdeveloped areas of the free world.

Economic Priorities. Moscow's capacity to resolve such problems without undue concessions rests in large measure on the totalitarian nature of the economy in the U.S.S.R. With all the essential industry in the hands of the state and with agriculture extensively collectivized, the economy is frequently referred to as a "command economy," one centrally directed, the highest priorities being determined by political objectives. There is no mystery about Moscow's scale of priorities; it is (1) military superiority, with emphasis on nuclear arms and rocketry; (2) supremacy in space flights; (3) the highest advancement in technology and heavy industry at strained tempos of development; (4) steady infiltration of, and the displacement of the Western powers from, the underdeveloped countries; (5) rapid increases in agricultural output; and (6) substantial improvements in the living standard. To realize each satisfactorily requires enormous amounts of capital, which the U.S.S.R. has not had. It has thus been compelled to concentrate its allocations on the top priorities.

For over 40 years official promises to meet the lowest priorities have been frequent. It is safe to say that, by virtue of the nature of the U.S.S.R. and its fixed global objective, the first four priorities will continue to be emphasized. In precise terms, the U.S.S.R. economy has always been a war economy.

Agriculture and General Living Standards. Since 1956 sporadic efforts have been made to satisfy in some degree the demands implicit in the lowest two priorities. The economic benefits of Nikita Khrushchev's so-called liberalization program occasioned much discussion. The plan envisioned the doubling of the house-building rate, increased investments in food production, fewer hours of labor, greater job mobility, the institution of installment credit, and augmented pensions and peasant incomes. The projection of these marginal concessions has led some to hope that they presaged an evolution that would somehow transform the U.S.S.R. into a more democratic and peaceable state. On the basis of decades of evidence, however, it would be a misreading of long-run trends to expect the Moscow regime, under whatever leadership, seriously to sacrifice its global political positions by a major diversion of resources.

Again, although it is not a decisive directive force, the pressure for a higher living standard in the U.S.S.R. is an important factor with which the Kremlin is attempting to reckon by means of balanced calculation and pragmatic control. The pitifully low standard of living in the U.S.S.R. has always been

a sore spot in the propaganda. Past and even future concessions in the area should be viewed as a pragmatic adjustment in a continuous plan to win over the underdeveloped areas and to overtake the West. For Moscow's own global objectives, as well as for a correlative impact on the underdeveloped countries, the emphasis has been and will indefinitely continue to be on more production for expanded industrial capacity in a hectic rush for recorded "growth" and as a clear proof that the U.S.S.R.'s is the type of system the underdeveloped countries should adopt. This emphasis stands to provide additional resources for Moscow's worldwide cold war operations. The staggered concessions, in addition to concealing somewhat the propaganda sore spot, function as a carrot dangling before an exploited donkey in the expectation that more intensified efforts may be exacted from the laboring populace.

This perspective should be borne in mind when seemingly radical changes are proposed in the U.S.S.R.'s planning process. Historically the U.S.S.R.'s inner councils have always debated the most effective means of maximizing production and consumption. The alternation of administrative centralization and decentralization is nothing new. Stalin's regime in the 1930s and 1940s was punctuated by such zig-zags, as was Khrushchev's in the 1950s and 1960s. It should be noted that the most radical departure from totalitarian economic control occurred in the 1920s with the New Economic Policy, an expedient retreat that ensured the survival of the regime. Such shifts, however, do not signify any real change in the totalitarian framework, least of all a change in the direction of a consumer-oriented free market economy. The crucial fact is that centralization or decentralization is only a means chosen to effect most economically the ultimate decisions on priority performances made at the center, i.e., by the Council of Ministers, the leaders of the Communist party of the U.S.S.R.

Khrushchev's widely heralded reform of 1957 was of this kind. Many in the West mistook the creation of 102 regional economic councils—the *soznarkhoze*, whose jurisdiction was roughly coincident with the territories of the republics—as a significant drift toward a more liberal, decentralized economy. Actually, this administrative change in no way altered the basic economic pattern of centralized decision-making on the allocation of investment funds and the pursuit of established priorities. Because of the disturbing growth of "localism" (non-Russian economic nationalism) and the unsolved problems of shoddy products, cost-price maladjustments, disjointed distribution, quota racing, misplaced investments, and even admitted statistical fabrications (not to mention a startling deceleration in production rates), the Khrushchev regime reversed itself in 1962. Outdoing even Stalin, it launched a program of party economic surveillance, dividing the party into industrial and agricultural branches for this task, and aimed to reduce the economic councils in favor of fewer, but ever more regionalized, bodies closely attached to the central planning agencies in Moscow.

This new scheme was not fully carried out, although a long-run trend toward an economic, and thus a smothering political, regionalization seems assured in the Baltic, Caucasian, and central Asian republics. In fact, the succeeding Brezhnev regime scotched the policing part of the scheme in 1964, only a month after Khrushchev's downfall, and reaffirmed the policy of executing economic improvements without radical changes in the framework of the system. The intention then appeared to be to restrict the regional councils to industries producing consumer goods and foods for the local market and to allow such production to be determined by market supply-and-demand condi-

tions. Industries considered to be of "Union importance," such as heavy industry, iron, steel, fuels, chemicals, and machinery, would fall under the jurisdiction of specialized central agencies. In theory, this change constitutes a compromise between the highly centralized situation before 1957 and the more decentralized condition that prevailed to the end of 1964.

Continuing Top Priorities. Whatever the changes, administrative and other, centralized decision-making, particularly in connection with top priority state requirements, is still obvious.

The basic planning process remains intact, following the experience of the past 4 decades. The method of balances is the chief technique used to synchronize the flow of materials, goods, labor supply, funds, and other economic units according to planned objectives. If the basic scale of priorities is to be maintained, this technique will become increasingly important as some areas for free market determination are experimented with. In a totalitarian economy, inflation is far more dangerous than in a consumer-oriented free market economy, and thus the policy of neutralizing the role of money is fixed and fundamental. The financial plan, which consists of cash and credit plans and an all-comprehensive budget, reflects the economic plan and is designed both to lubricate it and to prevent the incubation of inflationary pressures. The economic history of the U.S.S.R. is rife with such pressures. Moreover, to make the planning process as efficient as possible, Moscow has placed a heavy premium on the use of computers and the advancement of automation. It has also come to recognize that growth for growth's sake, regardless of the quality of goods, the availability of spare parts, or a harmonious coordination of plants, enterprises, and industries, is not the measure of a sound and strong economy.

Whatever its time length, no economic plan in the U.S.S.R. can be compared with a railroad timetable. The different plans—and there are several, such as a 15-year developmental one, 7- or 5-year ones, and concurrent annual and quarterly plans—are in the nature of attainable goals of economic performance. Since the first Five Year Plan was launched in 1928, flexibility in their realization has always been allowed for, with quotas in certain items being exceeded and in others falling below targets. Top priority items are usually supported successfully to the end of the plan. The 7-year plan embarked upon in 1959 was in part a cover-up for the failure of the sixth 5-year plan, which had set goals far beyond the capacity of the U.S.S.R. to meet. Even this plan was subjected to a number of revisions when it had become obvious that a 40 per cent increase in average real income was unrealizable, largely because a projected 70 per cent increase in total agricultural output by 1965 turned out to be fictional. In line with the percentage distribution of investment by economic sector for the preceding period, the original 3 per cent allocation of investment in light industry under this plan gave further evidence of the planned neglect of consumer goods even up to 1970.

Role of Non-Russian Areas. In addition to being wedded to a totalitarian war economy, the U.S.S.R. is also essentially committed to an empire or imperiocolonial economy, not a national one. Conceptually, to compare this economy seriously with that of the free world makes as much sense as comparing the U.S. economy at the beginning of the 20th century with that of the British Empire. The captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. have long been subjected to the economic colonialism of Moscow, and without their resources, the U.S.S.R. would be a second- or third-rate power. Without the Ukraine, Turkestan, White Ruthenia, the Baltic nations, and the Caucasus, the U.S.S.R.'s agricultural base would be no more than that of a united Germany. The loss of

coal deposits in the Ukraine's Donets Basin, Turkestan's Karaganda, and in other non-Russian territories would seriously deplete the U.S.S.R.'s annual coal output. The iron ore of eastern Ukraine and Transcaucasia, the oil of Azerbaijan and Idel-Ural, the manganese of Georgia and the Ukraine (over 90 per cent of the U.S.S.R.'s total) the copper, lead, zinc, silver, and other resources in Turkestan (over 50 per cent)—all these and more of colonial resources play a major role in colonialist Russia's position as a great power.

Estimates of the net value extracted from these non-Russian colonies range from 20 to 45 per cent, depending on the area and the nature of the products. Despite Moscow's misapplication of the term "national economy" to the U.S.S.R. as a whole, the non-Russian republics properly report their respective annual economic performance under the caption of the national economy of the Lithuanian S.S.R., Georgian S.S.R., or Ukrainian S.S.R. The Ukraine, for example, the largest non-Russian nation in the U.S.S.R., accounts in all-Union production on the average for over 50 per cent of pig iron output, 55 per cent of ore mining, 30 per cent of manganese, 41 per cent of hard coal, 52 per cent of coke, 25 per cent of mineral fertilizer, 44 per cent of caustic soda, 23 per cent of tractors, 75 per cent of long-haul locomotives, over 25 per cent of meat and milk, and 70 per cent of sugar beets. In per capita production of wheat, sugar beets, potatoes, milk, and butter, this nation of over 40 million has exceeded production even in the U.S.

Accented stress on metallurgy, chemicals, and natural gas production has attached a higher economic significance to this non-Russian republic in terms of all-Union product percentages. In exports, the national economy of the Ukraine sends products to more than 50 countries, with percentage ratios of total U.S.S.R. exports ranging as high as 93 per cent in pig iron exports, 57 per cent in rolled steel, 97 per cent in iron ore, 54 per cent in coke, and 69 per cent in sugar. It is evident that Moscow utilizes its internal colonies to the utmost in implementing its global objectives. Their role is extremely crucial in the type of economic warfare developed by Moscow against the free world. The protracted ignorance of the West concerning these colonies is one of the mysteries of the cold war.

U.S.S.R. Product a Gross Imperial Product. In light of the above, it is more accurate to classify the annual gross product of the U.S.S.R. as a gross imperial product (GIP), rather than a gross national product (GNP). For years there has been much controversy about the scope and growth of this GIP, controversy occasioned largely by the doctored character of Soviet Russian statistics. The vulnerable apologia offered in 1963 by J. Malyshev, deputy director of the Central Administration for Statistics, and the outbursts in 1964 of the Soviet press and officialdom against the unprecedented disclosures of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency amply confirmed the spurious elements found in Moscow's statistics.

Following World War II, the U.S.S.R., with additional annexed territories, speedily undertook a reconstruction program that was completed by 1953. Operating from a base comparable to that of 1939, the economy progressed rapidly along the scale of priorities indicated above. Despite the disputed growth rates of 11 per cent per annum for industrial production and 7 per cent for GIP, the advance was as remarkable as that in Japan, West Germany, or Yugoslavia, though by no means so well balanced. In the short run, particularly after a war, such industrial and total gross product advances appear spectacularly impressive; in the long run, by far a more realistic measure, the growth trend of the U.S.S.R. economy at

about the annual 3 per cent increase since 1928 assumes the more normal proportions of a maturing industrial economy.

U.S.S.R. GIP and U.S. GNP. As was anticipated by a few Western economists, the Soviet GIP slowed down markedly at the beginning of the 1960s. In both 1962 and 1963 the growth rate slipped to about 2.5 per cent, or one half the rate of the U.S. In terms of absolute value the U.S.S.R. has lagged substantially behind the U.S. Its 1964 GIP hovered at about \$270 billion, or roughly 43 per cent of the U.S. GNP of some \$630 billion. Since the U.S. output of goods and services exceeds the U.S.S.R.'s by more than two times, the U.S.S.R. would have to maintain a rate of over 10 per cent in order to realize an annual growth product equal to that of the U.S. Barring the most unforeseen circumstances, this feat over a period of time would be virtually impossible, and this for the many reasons explained so far, as well as for others that have accounted for the U.S.S.R.'s industrial stagnation, agricultural fiasco, and poor showing in improved living standards in the early 1960s.

Turning to industry, overall Soviet development is at a stage that the U.S. had reached by the 1920s. This area, particularly the light goods sector, has been affected as have all others, by an acute shortage of capital and skilled labor. For manufacturing, mining, electric and gas utilities, the U.S.S.R. product in 1962 was \$86.7 billion, while that of the U.S. totaled \$180.2 billion. Some Western analysts have estimated Soviet industrial production as low as 35 per cent of the U.S. output. To produce its industrial goods, the U.S.S.R. employs 20 per cent more labor than does the U.S. and its productivity is approximately one-third of the latter. The 7-year plan aimed at a 47 per cent increase in per capita industrial productivity. But this was an overambitious, unattainable goal negated by the fact that, just as extensive mechanization is no complete substitute for a fair remuneration of workers, the process of expanding capacity and increasing capital per worker cannot in itself guarantee necessary changes in the training, skill, and application of labor and management. Time is capital, too.

Where top priority items are concerned, certain plants in the U.S.S.R. are as efficient as any in the world. When viewed as a whole, however, Soviet industry lacks depth, as do agriculture and other activities. The leading-link principle operative in the successive plans, i.e., forced concentration for the accomplishment of top priority requirements, has been instrumental in shaping this state of affairs. As evidence of this super-concentration, the gross imbalance of Soviet industrial production is seen in the fact that nearly 70 per cent of it is devoted to capital and producer goods and the remainder to consumer goods. Emphasizing the bias against the latter, capital goods output rose in 1963 by 10 per cent, consumer goods by only 5 per cent. Careful item-by-item comparisons with the U.S. also indicate the relatively backward state of overall Soviet industry. Steel in the U.S. is no longer "modern," having given way to synthetic materials, but in the U.S.S.R. it still is over-emphasized. Coal has been largely displaced by natural gas in the U.S., but it still bulks large in U.S.S.R. production. Electric power production in the U.S. exceeds that of the U.S.S.R. by almost three times, and when it comes to motor vehicle production, the U.S.S.R.'s is only a 16th of the U.S. output. The U.S.S.R. is far from being an automotive economy. The total mileage of its paved roads scarcely measures up to Great Britain's. Instead, it is a thoroughly overtaxed railroad economy, with steam locomotion in command.

In 1962 and 1963 Soviet industry suffered a sharp decline, down to about a 4 per cent rate. This was no surprise: capital had been

severely overstrained, the growth rise of investments increased by no more than 5 per cent, far less than in preceding years, and diminishing returns from existing plants had to set in sooner or later. Moreover, the diversion of investments from comparatively simple operations, such as raw materials and power production, to far more complex sectors has also contributed to this inevitable slowdown. The U.S.S.R. has been woefully inadequate in the chemical industry and only in 1964 inaugurated a \$2 billion accelerated program. Unreproductive investments in armaments and space exploration are another source of industrial drain. Then, of course, the perennial drags of a totalitarian economic system take their toll.

Of the perennial problems, U.S.S.R. agriculture has been plagued in every decade since the 1920s with serious crises. The discriminatory food prices of the 1920s, the collectivization and man-made famine of the 1930s, the war in the 1940s, and the uneconomical virgin lands policy and inefficient farming of the 1950s and 1960s are only some highlights of failure in this basic economic activity. In 1963 a most serious decline in production occurred, the output being only 3 per cent above the 1956 level, the per capita output 7 per cent lower than 1956, and wheat production dropping 10 million tons from the 1962 level. Moscow was compelled to purchase from the free world some 7 million tons of wheat to feed its increasing populations and to meet commitments in its external empire. It is noteworthy that in that year almost every so-called Communist economy was in serious agricultural trouble.

Normally, when such trouble crystallizes, concessions are temporarily made, particularly with regard to garden plots. Soviet agriculture is among completely collectivized, with some 39,700 collective farms and 3,570 state farms, the latter cultivating more land. The private garden plots of the collective farmers account for only 3 per cent of the cultivated land and yet produce about 33 per cent of the gross agricultural output and 50 per cent of livestock output. These plots generally do not exceed an acre.

The unbalanced condition of U.S.S.R. agriculture may be gleaned from these dominant facts. Agricultural output makes up about 17 per cent of the GIP. The agricultural productivity of the U.S. is ten times that of the U.S.S.R., where about 40 per cent of the total labor force is engaged in agriculture, as against 10 per cent in the U.S., which nevertheless produces 33 per cent more. Meat production amounts to only 40 per cent of the U.S. production. The same lag applies to milk, eggs, and butter. Comparisons in farm equipment are equally startling; for example, in 1964 the U.S. used 5.2 million tractors to the U.S.S.R.'s 1.3 million, and four times as much fertilizer. Indeed, so retarded have conditions been in U.S.S.R. agriculture that new plans were initiated for 1964 and 1965, providing for a redistribution of investment funds for the chemical industry and farm machinery and greater incentives for the collective farmers.

Living Standards in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. Under this pattern of an essentially technocratic, Spartan, and totalitarian economy, it is not difficult to visualize the standard of living. Differing from nation to nation in the U.S.S.R., the average amount of goods and services available is approximately one-third that of the U.S., and on a per capita basis, one-fourth. Although aggregate income has increased on an average of 3 per cent a year since 1928, the real income has remained virtually the same, with the Soviet real wage about one-quarter of the American. The average monthly wage of the Soviet worker was estimated at \$90 per month in 1964. The minimum wage for unskilled workers has been slightly more than \$40 per month, if one accepts the dubious ruble-

dollar ratio, and the minimum pension has amounted to \$30 per month. For some time more than 6 million farmers had been excluded from pensions, but in 1964 Khrushchev announced plans to include them at a monthly minimum rate of \$13.20 and a maximum of \$112.20.

Disregarding the unavailability of many consumer items and pronounced quality differences, cost estimates for 1963 showed that for a hypothetical weekly food basket a family of four in Moscow had to pay \$36.38 against \$18.43 by its counterpart in New York. But to earn this basket the Russian household head had to work nearly 65 hours, the American less than 9. As for housing, this has been a crisis area since the inception of the U.S.S.R. Whereas in the U.S. there are 28.5 square meters per person, in the U.S.S.R. there are scarcely 10, and it is not uncommon for families to share such limited space. In 1963 the construction of urgently needed dwelling units even decreased. In the area of services and appliances, the U.S.S.R. is notably behind. Conspicuously a service economy, the U.S. produces more than three times as many TV sets, refrigerators, washing machines, and a host of other items as the U.S.S.R. The disparities are even worse when it comes to automobiles, vacuum cleaners, and numerous other goods. The Soviet populace continue to be exploited by a harsh program of forced saving executed through a turnover tax averaging 46 per cent of every ruble value.

Despite the tremendous economic advantage of the U.S., however, nothing could be more disastrous than to lapse into complacency. To do so would indicate a continued misunderstanding and ignorance of the totalitarian system—an economy based on the empire concept, inextricably given to centralized decision-making, technocratically devoted to those expansive power elements found in the top priority requirements, successfully concentrating on military, space, rocket, and heavy industrial accomplishments at the extreme cost of human needs and wants, and tightly dominated by a new class of vested interests with fixed global objectives.

In 1965 Moscow was faced with a dilemma. Industrial production had slowed down, agriculture lagged badly, pressures for improved living standards increased, and the issue became one of sharply reducing investments channeled into the top priority categories, such as an annual \$50 billion outlay into the military, of cutting back consumption still more or trading to procure the necessary machinery, plants, and other equipment to build up further the type of economy described here. Upholding the principle of empire autarchy, about 70 percent of U.S.S.R. trade is with its external empire and in 1962 totaled a \$7 billion turnover. In the period from 1954 to 1963, U.S.S.R. economic aid, which really has not been aid but rather a low-cost commercial undertaking, amounted to \$3.3 billion, with only \$1.2 billion drawn upon mainly by countries in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. The U.S.S.R. has never been a major trading state, and its exclusive bilateral trading arrangements are normally facets of its economic warfare. It has little to offer the Western powers in return for the requisites it seeks, and with a gold reserve of approximately \$2 billion it can scarcely pay to cover the full value of these requisites. The alternatives are long-term Western credits and the opportunity for industrial copying and reproduction. The paramount question is whether the West again, as it has in the past, will assist the further rapid buildup of this empire-state that makes no pretense about its determined goal of eventually overtaking the West.

THE TOTALITARIAN ECONOMY OF RED CHINA

The important, but not generally recognized fact, is that if all the other so-called Communist economies are combined with

that of the U.S.S.R., the total aggregate gross product is still substantially less than the U.S. GNP. Red China's \$90 billion, the \$110 billion for the minority captive states in central and southern Europe, the approximately \$3 billion for Outer Mongolia, North Korea, and North Vietnam, Yugoslavia's \$7 billion, and Cuba's \$2 billion fall short of even the U.S.S.R. GIP. Add to the U.S. GNP the gross products of the most advanced free world economies in Western Europe and Asia, and the ratio becomes almost 3 to 1. The total industrial production of the Communist Empire is only about 25 per cent of world output. It is therefore no exaggeration to maintain that, on the scale of genuine economic progress, it, including the U.S.S.R., is a conglomerate of basically underdeveloped economies. This is conspicuously clear in the totalitarian economy of mainland Red China.

Reform Programs. Upon seizure of power in October 1949, the Red Chinese announced a rapid industrialization program designed to build up modern industry in the short span of 18 years. Structural changes started that year, with land reform as the first step. This involved more than land redistribution; it aimed at eliminating the rural ruling classes. An estimated 10 million households belonging to the landlord and rich peasant classes and those regarded as "reactionaries" were liquidated. About 700 million *mou* (116 million acres) were confiscated and redistributed among 300 million peasants.

Collectivization of Peasants. When the land reform was concluded in 1952, the regime immediately commenced to collectivize the Chinese peasants in three consecutive moves. The first was to organize individual peasant households into "mutual-aid teams," each team consisting of 6 to 8 households accumulating common property, such as implements and cattle. This "embryonic socialism" was followed in 1953 by the elementary cooperative, characterized by land pooling according to share under single management, while the ownership of land and other means of production continued to be private. As the third step, in 1955 the elementary cooperatives were reorganized into the advanced cooperatives, in which, as in the Russian *kolkhoz*, a peasant's land and other principal means of production were transferred from private to collective ownership and payment for the land shares was abolished. Each peasant household was allowed to keep a small plot of land not to exceed 5 per cent of the total land. By the end of 1957, China's 120 million peasant households had been organized into 752,000 cooperatives.

People's Communes. In April 1958, the radical program of the people's commune was launched. By October, 90 per cent of the peasant households were merged into 24,000 communes. All property and belongings, including the small plots of land, were surrendered to the commune. Peasants ate together in public mess halls, placed their children in communal nurseries, and worked under a central management. After a year of experimentation the system proved to be unworkable. In the summer of 1959 Peking began its grand retreat, which lasted through 1963. The small plots of land were returned to the peasants, mess halls were disbanded, and the authority of the commune was shifted to the production brigade, a unit equivalent to the former advanced cooperative, and later to the smaller production teams. The whole system reverted to the position prevailing before 1958. After some restoration of agricultural output by 1964, Peking has again placed considerable amounts of peasants' private plots under collective cultivation and has extended state control over the limited free agricultural markets.

Control of Industry. After the 1949 seizure, state ownership and control over industry moved with equal swiftness. Private

enterprises in any way connected with the ousted Nationalist government were immediately confiscated. By 1952 almost all foreign enterprises were seized. In the next 5 years approximately 70,000 private enterprises were reorganized under joint state-private management; nearly 2 million commercial establishments were converted into state-private or cooperative stores; and the banking system was basically nationalized. In short, private ownership gave way to state ownership. Moreover, these structural changes facilitated the concentration of all available resources for a high-speed industrialization program.

Under each of the two 5-year plans (1953-57 and 1958-62), gross industrial production was to be doubled, whereas gross agricultural production was to rise by about one-quarter during the first plan and by about one-third in the second. This divergent rate of increase was designed to elevate the proportion of gross industrial production to total gross production from 42 per cent in 1952 to 52 per cent in 1957. To permit this high rate of growth, the first 5-year plan called for an \$18 billion capital investment, or about 14 per cent of the total national income in the same period. As one would expect in this type of economy, of the total industrial investment, 89 per cent or \$9.3 billion was for heavy industry and only 11 per cent for light industry. The investment ratio between industry and agriculture was 7.5 to 1.

During the first 5-year plan, the average annual growth of industrial output reached 19 per cent, but that of agriculture was only 4.5 per cent. The growth of industrial production in physical terms was quite impressive, as pig iron increased four times to 5.9 million tons, steel 4 times to 5.4 million tons, and coal doubled to 130 million tons. Light industry lagged behind heavy, and growth in agriculture was even more moderate. Food grain, for example, increased by only 14 per cent to 175 million tons. The annual growth rate of food production was as low as 2.6 per cent, barely more than the natural rate of increase in population, which was officially reported at 2.2 per cent a year.

The Big Leap. In 1958, the first year of the second plan, Peking suddenly advocated the "Big Leap Forward" movement, and production targets for the same year were double those of 1957. This fantastic leap proved to be catastrophic. The regime first confirmed the success of the Big Leap and then admitted the falsification of published figures. The movement also had a disastrous effect on agricultural production, because approximately 60 million rural workers were transferred to participate in the backyard furnace campaign to produce low-grade steel. Thus, agricultural output began to decline in 1959 and fell to its lowest point in 1961. A critical shortage of food forced Peking to use its scarce foreign exchange to import 6 million tons of grain in 1961, 4.5 million in 1962, and 5 million in 1963. The agricultural collapse not only slowed down the industrialization program, but also offset a great part of the economic achievements of the period from 1953 to 1958.

By suddenly suspending all economic assistance to Peking in the summer of 1960, Moscow further and seriously weakened the Chinese economy. Aid from the U.S.S.R. represented the most important source of support for the first 5-year plan; the 156 major projects constituting the backbone of this plan would not have been possible without it. In the period from 1950 to 1959 Moscow dispatched more than 10,000 technicians and specialists to work in Red China. It supplied more than 21,000 sets of scientific and technical documents, including over 1,400 blueprints for large enterprises. Trade between the two totalitarian states increased constantly, reaching a turnover of \$2 billion in 1959. With the rift, this declined sharply, so

that by 1962 the turnover was only a third of the 1959 high and the lowest since 1950.

Revision of Program. All these economic adversities forced Peking to revise its program for economic development drastically. The tempo of industrialization was decelerated in 1960 in order to concentrate all available domestic resources on agricultural recovery. In primitive economic fashion, a "whole country support agriculture" movement was pushed by the government, as 20 million laborers, city dwellers, bureaucrats, and students were mobilized for work on the agricultural front. The Big Leap Forward was suspended. Almost all heavy industrial resources were assigned to the increase of agricultural production. In 1962 the output of chemical fertilizer and steel products for farm purposes exceeded the 1961 levels. To stimulate initiative, private land plots were returned to the peasants, who now, although but temporarily, could sow whatever they chose and market the produce freely. In short, this Red Chinese retreat resembled the New Economic Policy of the U.S.S.R. 40 years before.

The outcome of these extreme readjustments was a slow agricultural improvement, virtual industrial stagnation, and sharp decreases in foreign trade in the period from 1961 to 1964. From a low of about 155 million tons in 1960, grain output rose to 165 million in 1961 and 182 million in 1962, which still was behind the 1957 figure. Cotton production stood at 1.55 million tons in 1960, dropped to 1.45 million in 1961, and slowly rose to 1.56 million in 1962, but it, too, was below the 1957 mark of 1.65 million. On the industrial front, steel output declined from 13.3 million tons in 1959 to 10 million in 1962; coal decreased from 347.8 million tons in 1959 to about 240 million in 1962. Sparse official statistics for 1963 and 1964 indicated marginal agricultural increases while heavy wheat imports continued and substantial progress was achieved in the production of chemical fertilizer, petroleum, and farm machinery. All of this suggested a critical shortage of raw materials as well as of capital for industry.

Foreign Trade. Red Chinese foreign trade was markedly affected by these various developments. In 1958 its total value reached \$5.5 billion; by 1963 it sank to \$2.3 billion, lower than that of Malaysia and India. Red China's position improved in 1963 with a trade turnover of \$3 billion and a favorable balance of \$300 million. Trade with Japan soared to \$158 million, but mainland China still received 40 per cent of its imports from other parts of the Red empire and sent 48 per cent of its exports there. However, since Chinese exports are composed chiefly of agricultural products, unless agriculture shows immense progress, the outlook for the Red Chinese market must not be overestimated.

At the beginning of 1965 Peking was faced with three major problems: the restoration of planned economic processes, the promotion of peasants' incentives, and the generation of capital formation. The basic pattern of the Red Chinese economy is to follow the Russian type of planned economy. During the 1960-62 debacle, Peking not only failed to formulate a long-term plan, but also failed to execute an annual plan. A third 5-year plan was to have begun in 1963. Secondly, since collective production occupies 95 per cent of the arable land, agricultural output can scarcely increase substantially without peasant cooperation. With a population of 700 million in 1965 and the prospect of 1 billion by 1980, a pronounced uplift in agriculture is an unquestioned necessity. Finally, if any plan aims at the same level of investment the second one aspired to, some \$7 billion would have to be allocated for capital investment annually. Conditions in 1965 appeared to make this impossible.

Yet, despite all these marks of acute underdevelopment, crisis, and at times famine con-

ditions, Peking wrote into its impericologist plans the subjection of the population to the heavy costs of nuclear development, as highlighted by the nuclear explosion of October 1964, and makes it suffer the equally burdensome costs of a 2.6 million army and a huge militia of men and women. Like Moscow, Peking pours resources into the support of both peaceful and violent penetration of the underdeveloped countries. Briefly, at these incalculable costs and by the same totalitarian policy, Red China is the impericologist competitor of the U.S.S.R.

THE CAPTIVE ECONOMIES OF CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN EUROPE

Behind the impericologist giants stand the dependent totalitarian regimes of central and southern Europe. The economies ruled by these regimes are captive systems like those found within the U.S.S.R., in several Asian countries, Yugoslavia, and Cuba. The nations in this area, consisting of the Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, Polish, Rumanian, and East German peoples, constitute a third of the contemporary family of captive nations. Their total population, approximately 100 million, is less than that of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. As indicated earlier, the aggregate GNP of the area is just slightly higher than Red China's.

Totalitarian economic planning was soon instituted in these areas. Allowing for differences among the various countries, programs were launched at the start of the 1950s for the "construction of socialism" as a prelude to Communism. The most developed of the group, the binational state of Czechoslovakia, rapidly embarked upon full agricultural collectivization, industrial socialization, and the abolition of private commercial and professional enterprises. The less developed countries of Albania and Bulgaria followed closely in this radical development, with Rumania, Hungary, East Germany, and Poland struggling behind. Spurred on by Moscow, the area intensified its industrial investment, raised production targets, accelerated various growths at the expense of higher living standards, and became increasingly dependent on U.S.S.R. raw material supplies. In the span of 10 years more rapid progress was realized, especially in the industrial realm. East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary, which form the industrial tier of the area and account for nearly seven-eighths of the total industrial output, achieved most of this progress, while Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania participated but continued largely in agricultural pursuits.

Construction of "Socialism." However, the first half of the 1960s was highlighted by an extensive controversy over planning industrial slowdowns, severe agricultural difficulties, demands for improved living standards, and apparent friction with Moscow on long-range area development. As for the general course of constructing "socialism," the achievements were far from being synchronous and symmetrical. Poland, for instance, had collectivized only 13 per cent of its farms, while East Germany allowed some degree of private trade and industry. The 1953 East German uprising, numerous Slovak resistance forays, the 1956 Poznan riot, and the Hungarian revolution graced the decade with overt opposition to the politicoeconomic tyrannies of the totalitarian Red network and also contributed positively both to impeding "socialist construction" and to the empire's troubles of the 1960s. By 1963-64 even advanced Czechoslovakia found itself in the throes of replanning its economy along so-called Titoist lines, involving decentralization, greater plant autonomy, production geared to consumer demand, and incomes partially determined by profitability. East Germany, Poland, and Bulgaria moved somewhat in the same direction. The points on politicoeconomic perspective considered ear-

lier in the section on the U.S.S.R. apply here, too.

Industrial and Agricultural Reverses. These essentially pragmatic experiments with new techniques of economic planning were precipitated chiefly by both industrial and agricultural reverses. During the 1950s the area enjoyed increases in production as high as 61 per cent, especially in coal, crude oil, steel, and electric power, and the rate of industrial output for the advanced countries ranged annually between 9 and 11 per cent. By the end of the decade Czechoslovakia was a major world exporter of machine tools and industrial equipment, and East Germany attained to the status of Europe's fifth largest industrial economy. Plans for the 1960s called for still more impressive strides in heavy industry, chemical production, and machine equipment. Yet, as in the U.S.S.R. and Red China, a stringent capital shortage overshadowed these plans, while blunders in planning and high costs of production blighted their industrial phase of realization. Czechoslovakia, for example, had been in an economic crisis since 1961 and industrially produced less in 1963 than in 1962. East Germany was plagued with insufficiency of skilled labor and, like most of the others, with scarce foreign currency to import needed industrial and agricultural goods. Despite its riches in raw material, Rumania was steeped in a visa blackmail racket to acquire dollars, and Poland found itself overinvested in far too many unfinished factories. In 1963 much of the area was afflicted by a deceleration in industrial output. Significantly, in the following 2 years, and like the U.S.S.R. and Red China, all these economies looked to Western trade for their further industrial buildup.

When we turn to the area's agriculture, the pattern of totalitarian economic crisis assumes even more exact contours and proportions. In order to offset population increases of roughly 1 million a year and the contraction of arable land area because of industrial projects, highway construction, and urbanization, intensive agricultural investments were made during the 1950s for raising low acre yields and expanding total food production. Tractor production more than doubled, reaching about 300,000 in 1960, the fertilizer supply also doubled, and, with qualitative seed improvements, yields per acre increased. Nevertheless, total output of the principal produce for the area lagged behind prewar levels: grains and potatoes, for example, fell by about 6 per cent. Although the area is capable of producing over one-third more foodstuffs and had achieved a new high in pigs, sugar beets, and other production, it turned into a food-importing region. Renewed pressures for extended collectivization in 1958 scarcely helped the situation; indeed, the curtailment of peasant initiative and "planned mismanagement" from above darkened the agricultural picture. By 1963, with the exception of Rumania, which fell below expectations but enjoyed favorable harvests and lent 400,000 tons of grain to the U.S.S.R., country after country in the area sought free world relief in this fiasco. A self-sufficient grain producer before World War II, Czechoslovakia entered into a 3-year contract with Canada for 1.2 million tons of grain; despite its undercollectivization, Poland did likewise and in addition purchased 2.3 million tons from the U.S. and France; Bulgaria also contracted with Canada for 3 years, while Hungary turned to the United States and France, and Albania to Red China, which in turn tapped Australia and Canada.

Unable to feed their populaces with a modicum of constant adequacy, these captive economic systems have been harried not only by food shortages but also by other depletions in the standard of living. As in the other capital-intensive totalitarian systems, they have employed the concession technique

when acute strains were felt in basic popular consumption. Following the Korean War and the East German uprising and again after the Hungarian revolution, temporary concessions were affected in prices, availability of consumer goods, and a reduced tempo of heavy industrialization. Housing construction, on a per family basis worse than even in the U.S.S.R., has continued to be a perennial problem. At times, as at the close of the 1950s, the area's consumption of shoes, television sets, sewing machines, and many other items lagged behind the low per capita consumption of the U.S.S.R. Despite some improvements in the area, the workers' condition by 1963-64 appeared to have become graver. Food costs absorbed as much as 64 per cent of a skilled worker's average monthly income of \$63 in Rumania, as high as 75 per cent in Bulgaria and 50 per cent in Poland. It took a Hungarian skilled worker at least 2 weeks of labor time to earn the purchase cost of a cotton dress. As everywhere else in the empire, female labor was utilized to a maximum as families strove to elevate incomes to a living standard. Czechoslovakia, which in the previous 40 years had had the highest standard of living and the closest contacts with the West, had to proclaim meatless days.

The Evolving Pattern. On the basis of all these major developments, the pattern that has evolved in the central and southern European area is featured by capital-strained industrialization, unbalanced agriculture, concession-quilted consumption, a progressively limited raw material base, and an increasing dependence on trade with the U.S.S.R. and China, and, when acute emergencies arise, with free world suppliers. One of the principal features of the Eurasian complex has been the steady integration and interdependence of these captive economies in the economic plans of the two imperio-colonialist giants. Except for periods of shortage, both the U.S.S.R. and Red China are unlimited markets for machinery and also sources of raw materials. Most of the area's more than \$15 billion trade has been intra-empire, as high as 73 per cent for Czechoslovakia and 63 per cent for Poland. Operating bilaterally through the Council of Economic Mutual Assistance (CEMA) and its policy of country-by-country specialization, the captive systems have actually been trading on a smaller scale than comparable capitalist nations. In 1963 the Bank of Economic Collaboration was established to encourage multilateral trading. Although colonialist Moscow's exploitation of these economies is not so crude as in the past, it has been conservatively estimated that almost \$2 billion has been exacted through price discrimination. CEMA has always been an arena of intraempire problems, as for example, the supposed deviation of Rumania (1964-65), but it can hardly be denied that it carries out Moscow's mechanism for external colonialist exploitation, basically serving both the U.S.S.R. economy and the common goal of penetrating the underdeveloped free world countries.

THE SATELLITE ECONOMY OF YUGOSLAVIA

The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is an integral part of the Red empire, though it enjoys a different status because of geographic, historical, and other circumstances. It is not under any direct domination of Moscow nor does it possess either a potential or actual power base (as does Red China) to qualify as a junior imperio-colonialist partner, but its totalitarian character and essential actions in both internal and global affairs plainly show that its future and very survival are inextricably tied to the advances of what is called world Communism.

This small state of some 19 million people is essentially an underdeveloped, agricultural area. It is a forced federation of six republics consisting of five distinct national entities,

the largest being the Serbian, followed by the Croatian, Slovenian, Macedonian, and the Montenegrin. These nations are as completely captive as those in other parts of the Communist empire.

Moves Toward Socialization. When the topics of "Titoist techniques of economic planning" and "Yugoslav economic pluralism" are discussed, it is well to review the haphazard, makeshift course of the satellite's development since 1945. The earliest phase was punctuated by blunders and failures, and if it had not been for timely Western and particularly U.S. grants, the new totalitarian state probably would not have endured. In the period between 1945 and 1950, Belgrade was determined to move more rapidly toward complete socialization and collectivization than all other parts of the extended Communist empire. In industry and commerce, most enterprises were seized in 1945 on grounds of "collaboration" with the enemy, a confiscatory action formalized the subsequent year by the Law of Private Economic Enterprises. Modeled on the U.S.S.R. plans, the first 5-year plan (1946-51) typically overemphasized centralized planning and heavy industrial projects, and ended in a fiasco as capital, labor, and other factors were grossly overestimated. By 1950 the Fundamental Law on Management of State Economic Enterprises was passed by the Federal Peoples' Assembly to infuse some economic rationality into the system with a more expeditious plan of decentralization under the theme of "factories for the workers." A whole series of regulatory changes ensued throughout the entire decade. The Economic Reorganization Law of 1956 and the Federal Social Plan for that year reduced heavy industry investment by 17 per cent and increased the agricultural by 19 per cent, but real economic recovery was not achieved until 1957. Industrial production by the end of the 1950s had increased by 88 per cent, but the levels, when compared in absolute terms with those of the central and southern European area, make one view such percentage changes with caution. Electric power production, for example, reached over 7 billion kilowatt hours against 103 billion in the captive area, steel nearly 2 million tons against 19 million, cement 2 million tons compared with 20 million. Though still at a comparatively low level, industry continued to expand, production in 1963 approximating 11 per cent over the 1962 level.

Foreign trade, too, showed prominent percentage increases, well over 100 per cent during the 1950s, from a half billion dollars to \$1.2 billion. By 1964 more than 70 per cent of this trade was with the free world, notably Western Europe.

Agricultural Development. Yugoslavia has experienced an erratic farm development. With the Law on Agrarian Reform and Colonization in 1945 it plunged into a wholesale confiscation of farm lands, peasant distribution, and rapid collectivization. About 39 per cent of the land was collectivized by 1951, but characteristic farm failures necessitated a major retreat in 1952, not unlike that of the U.S.S.R. earlier and Red China later. Decollectivization was decreed, and by 1956 only 22 per cent of the land was in the socialized sector. Further agricultural reorganizations failed to reduce the satellite's increasing dependence on imported foodstuffs during the 1950s. As late as 1958, average grain production in Yugoslavia was below that of the prewar period, 7.8 million tons to 8.1 million. Bumper harvests in 1957 and 1958 helped to raise the average for the decade. With its goal set for an increase of 70 per cent in overall production in the 5-year plan for 1961 to 1965, Yugoslavia did not experience the scope and depth of reverses felt in other parts of the empire during the early 1960s.

Totalitarian Character. In evaluating Yugoslavia's institutional changes it is impor-

tant to recall that Hitler's Germany maintained all the forms and several functions of a private enterprise economy and yet, under the guise of national socialism and its institutional mixture, was thoroughly totalitarian. This should be borne in mind when notions about Yugoslavia achieving a "rap-prochement between capitalism and socialism" and tending toward "a socialist democracy" are entertained. At the foundation of the entire structure is the ruling, totalitarian party, working gradually but assiduously through "voluntary association," "education," and "persuasion" toward internal "socialist" goals and through diplomatic brokerage, chiefly with the uncommitted and underdeveloped countries, toward "world Communism" externally.

In Agriculture. The methods of "voluntary association" and "education" are well illustrated in both agriculture and industry. After the hectic collectivization debacle, Yugoslavia decollectivized, but the law of 1953 on the Agricultural General People's Land Fund reduced the maximum size of private farm holdings to 10 hectares, although the 1945 law allowed the maximum of 30, and excess land was banked into a general people's land fund for use by the instituted "agricultural working cooperatives," near-collectives which underwent further reorganization in 1958 along with the industrial management model. In 1953, Marshal Tito candidly explained the change in these words: "We are not going back to the old system. We are only changing the methods of our socialism, and we are reorganizing. But we are still heading toward the same goal. . . . We are not renouncing the idea of creating big farms, but they will be created entirely on a voluntary basis and gradually." On numerous occasions Edward Kardelj and other leaders enunciated the "educational" aspects of these measures to inculcate "Communist consciousness" into the peasants. The technological difficulties of employing machinery on small land units, the costliness of farm machinery, the tax benefits and subventions meted out to the "voluntary" cooperatives, and discriminations in prices and quality of inputs are some of these aspects that have led to an exodus of countless peasants to the urban centers and to the enlargement of the land fund.

In Industry. In industry the same adroitness of control and passion for efficiency can be observed. Again, after the industrial chaos of the earliest period, Belgrade relinquished direct planning of the Soviet type, but necessarily retained general control and regulatory functions through the Social Plan, which broadly defines the scope and direction of investments and the obligations of economic enterprises toward the community. In decentralized conditions of "social management," the enterprises are run by plant-elected Worker's Councils, management committees, and directors, and goods are competitively produced at council-determined specifications for markets where prices are not rigidly fixed and are frequently at variance in the same market. A number of prices, considered as "key prices," for salt, bread, steel, and so forth are predetermined in the hope of stabilizing other prices. From their total revenue the enterprises pay a number of different taxes, contribute to the amortization fund, and pay rent to "society" for the use of the means of production.

Within limits set by the government, successful enterprises can divide their profits for increased wages, plowed-in investments, or bonuses in the form of constructing for workers houses, recreation halls, and the like. However, all this is subject to the final approval of the local government that provides plants and facilities for the enterprise in the last analysis according to plan. If enterprises fail to meet the wage bill, the government guarantees 80 per cent of the worker's wage.

Where profits are distributed for wages, a heavy tax is imposed when inflationary considerations arise.

This economic organization is further complicated by the syndicalism that has emerged with industrial chambers, professional associations, and economic committees replacing on a voluntary basis the former administrative associations of economic enterprises. Also, in 1958, rationalized as a step toward "the withering away of the state," communes were established as basic territorial and administrative units. They enjoy autonomy in local government, workers' affairs, and social management.

Despite all these innovations, Yugoslav industry and agriculture require further rationalization as do the other economies in the Communist empire. But in terms of the decisive cold war and the basic directions of this satellite economy, one cannot but wonder about the "investment" of some \$3.5 billion made by way of Western grants and credits to sustain and reinforce this economy. Its seemingly devious course should not cause one to lose perspective of its short development and its instrumental role in the world Communist movement.

Bibliography: R. L. ALLEN, *Soviet Economic Warfare* (Washington 1960). R. W. CAMPBELL, *Soviet Economic Power*, ed. C. KAYSAN (Boston 1960). J. G. CHAPMAN, *Real Wages in Soviet Russia since 1928* (Cambridge, Mass. 1963). L. E. DOBRIANSKY, *Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the U.S.S.R.* (Washington 1964). N. JASNY, *Essays on the Soviet Economy* (New York 1962). V. KATKOFF, *Soviet Economy, 1940-1965* (Baltimore 1961). A. NOVE, *The Soviet Economy* (New York 1961). G. W. NUTTER, *Growth of Industrial Production in the Soviet Union* (Princeton 1962). H. SCHWARTZ, *Russia's Soviet Economy* (2d ed. New York 1954). H. G. SHAFFER, ed., *The Soviet Economy* (New York 1963). N. SPULBER, *The Soviet Economy* (New York 1962). U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, *Comparisons of the United States and Soviet Economies* (Washington 1960). U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, *Dimensions of Soviet Economic Power: Hearings, together with Compilation of Studies* (Washington 1963). U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, *The Soviet Economic Offensive in Western Europe* (Washington 1963). U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *The Many Crises of the Soviet Economy* (Washington 1964). K. C. CHAO, *Agrarian Policy of the Communist Party 1921-1959* (New York 1960). C. Y. CHENG, *Communist China's Economy, 1949-1962* (South Orange, N.J. 1963). A. ECKSTEIN, *The National Income of Communist China* (Glencoe, Ill. 1962). M. C. HSUEH et al., *The Socialist Transformation of the National Economy in China* (Peking 1960). T. J. HUGHES and D. E. LUARD, *The Economic Development of Communist China, 1949-1958* (New York 1959). H. J. LETHBRIDGE, *China's Urban Communes* (Hong Kong 1961). H. and Y. C. YIN, *Economic Statistics of Mainland China, 1949-1956* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960). S. D. KERTESZ, ed., *East Central Europe and the World* (Notre Dame, Ind. 1962). N. SPULBER, *The Economics of Communist Eastern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass. 1957). S. H. WELLS, *The Economics of the Soviet Bloc* (New York 1964). United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Economic Commission for Europe, *Economic Survey of Europe* (Geneva 1947-). U.S. Congress, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Recent Developments in the Soviet Bloc* (Washington 1964). F. W. NEAL, *Titoism in Action: The Reforms of Yugoslavia after 1948* (Berkeley, Calif. 1958). J. TOMASEVICH, *Peasants, Politics, and Economic Change in Yugoslavia* (Stanford, Calif. 1955). C. ZALAR, *Yugoslav Communism* (Washington 1961). U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, *The Soviet Empire* (Washington 1965).

[L. E. DOBRIANSKY.]

SPEECH OF HIS MAJESTY KING PETER OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been directed to an address by His Royal Majesty King Peter, of Yugoslavia, to the annual convention of the U.S. Reserve Officers' Association, in New York on May 6, 1967.

King Peter, who has seen the people of his nation suffer for 20 years under a Communist dictatorship, draws from his own personal experience and observations to comment on the situation in Vietnam. I believe his remarks are most timely, and insert them in the RECORD at this point as a continuation of my remarks:

SPEECH OF HIS MAJESTY KING PETER OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. President of the Association; Admiral Walker; Admirals, Generals and Members of the Association; Ladies and Gentlemen: It is indeed, a great pleasure to be at the Convention of your Association. For, undoubtedly, your Association is most important among the leadership of the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

However, our pleasure is more particular, since it offered to us a very rare opportunity to meet a brilliant leader of the United States Navy, who has come from a battlefield, where, in our opinion, the faith of the free world, as well as its fate, is at stake.

And no less so, because of the fact that many among you, gentlemen, are our dear comrades-in-arms of the last World War.

I was deeply impressed with the statements of Admiral Walker, as I was some time ago with the statements made in New York and before the Congress of the United States by General Westmoreland, whom I met several days ago in California after our visit with General Eisenhower.

It is only natural that I abstain from making any comment with regard to the political implications of the war, the conduct of military operations, as well as the statements made by Admiral Walker and General Westmoreland. For, I firmly believe that President Johnson is doing his utmost to protect freedom, democracy and the very existence of the Republic of South Vietnam from Communist aggression. And, by reason of this, he is actually defending one of the first lines of defense of this nation.

We also believe that Admiral Walker and General Westmoreland, two gallant commanders, are the most qualified individuals to explain to you and to your country what is at stake; of your way of life and heritage, in that far land called the Republic of South Viet-Nam.

But, since our country—Yugoslavia—was a victim of a practised Communist subversion and conspiracy, I should like to restrict my remarks to this aspect of the Communist war strategy. Fundamentally, the subversion and conspiracy in South Viet-Nam is the same as it was forty years ago in Russia, and twenty-five years ago in Yugoslavia.

Initially, I should like to quote here General Westmoreland, who stated that the support which the Viet Cong received from the people in South Viet-Nam:

" . . . is largely the result of terror, intimidation and murder of those individuals who oppose it . . ."

And, since two examples General Westmoreland mentioned in his speeches are characteristic of the forms of Communist terror, subversion and conspiracy, I prefer to quote them here also:

His first example, is the following:

"... During the early morning hours of April 16, the Viet Cong attacked a hamlet 20 miles north of Saigon, among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. Three of them were women. Their hands were tied behind their backs and they were all shot through the head..."

The second example was worded as follows:

"... A typical day in Viet-Nam was last Sunday. Terrorists, near Saigon, assassinated a 39-year old village chief. The same day in the Delta they kidnapped 26 civilians assisting in arranging for local elections. The next day the Viet Cong attacked a group of revolutionary development workers, killing one and wounding twelve with grenades and machine gun fire in one area, and in another they opened fire on a small civilian bus and killed three and wounded four of its passengers..."

According to General Westmoreland the Viet Cong's terror and killings are:

"... with emphasis on Mayors, Councilmen, Policemen, Teachers, Government Officials and even Journalists who would not submit to blackmail..."

In all probability, this kind of Communist terror and subversion are unknown and new to those who for the first time in their lives are facing Communists in the battlefield. However, to us and our guerrilla units who so bravely and courageously fought against Communism in Yugoslavia in World War II these are well known strategies and tactics.

This leads to the logical conclusion of an unbroken series of subversive attempts to undermine free nations, from which follows recognition of a continuing Communist international conspiracy.

We believe that you remember, ladies and gentlemen, that Yugoslavia was dismembered through the Axis occupation and the satellite regime in Croatia. Until the Third Reich attacked the Soviet Union on June 22nd, 1941, the Communist Party of Yugoslavia fully collaborated with the powers of occupation. And, as the beginning of their struggle against the occupiers they celebrate the day of July 7th, when actually two members of the Party, who fought in the Spanish Civil War, killed two policemen who were assigned to watch a peasants' gathering in a churchyard.

You probably also will remember that our Minister of War in the Yugoslav Government in Exile, General Mihailovich, tried to combine his struggle against Nazi occupation together with the Communist partisans. Striving only to take over control of the country after the completion of the war, the Communists were decimating the civilian population, as well as individual officers or couriers passing through their territories.

When they, for example, entered a small town as Trstenik in Western Serbia in October, 1941, they put to fire first the County records and all official documents proving land ownership and other legal rights of the District's population. All those who distinguished themselves as Communist opponents were removed from the Town proper and shot through the back of the head, just as is presently being done in South Viet-Nam.

After the conflict, between the Royal Yugoslav Army and the Communist forces, started in November, 1941, the Communists shifted to another tactic: They wore uniforms of General Mihailovich's units, when attacking a village populated by Roman Catholics or Moslems; they then employed uniforms of the Croatian Ustashe when entering a village populated by orthodox Serbs or Moslems. Such examples are manifold. While in their propaganda they strove for fraternity among Yugoslavia's nationalities,

they actually were the main protagonists of fratricide in our country. Losses resulting from this strife amounted to approximately 15% of the total population at that time.

While in South Viet-Nam, according to General Westmoreland's statement, Communists:

"... for propaganda purposes, will turn losses and defeats into absurd claims of victory..."

Their comrades in Yugoslavia during World War II were stilling the victories of the Royal Yugoslav Army units. To illustrate such Communist undertakings, we will mention here only the case of the very well known "Visegrad Bridge". This was witnessed by Brigadier Armstrong of the British Forces and Colonel Seitz of the United States Military Mission attached to the headquarters of General Mihailovich. David Martin, author of the book "Ally Betrayed", in part, describes the episode in the following manner:

"... The Chetnik forces, which were under the command of Colonel Ostoyich, blew three small railway bridges down river from Visegrad; then they stormed the Town of Visegrad, overcoming a garrison of more than 800 Axis troops; then they destroyed the garrison of 300 enemy troops at the bridge itself; and on the following day October 8, they set their charges and blew the bridge. Colonel Seitz himself pushed the plunger that sent the bridge toppling down into the gorge..."

"... some ten days later—continues Martin—... B.B.C. announced: The Partisans have destroyed the four bridges of the railway Uzice—Visegrad..."

As you see, ladies and gentlemen, the closeness between Communist subversion, terror and propaganda in Yugoslavia during the Second World War and the same, at the present time, in the Republic of South Viet-Nam is striking. Although, our country and our peoples became the victims of such subversion and terror, due to a want of political awareness among war-time leaders of the western world, we will look to the future with more hope, if you, military leaders of your country, will keep closely in line behind your President and Commanders like General Westmoreland and Admiral Walker.

We pray to Almighty God that not one of the leaders of the Republic of South Viet-Nam will be obliged to sadly echo the words of our Minister of War, General Mihailovich, who said:

"... The Allies have made a mistake. But some day they will come back to us..."

We pray to Him most sincerely that each of you here and your colleagues and men on the battlefields of South Viet-Nam will be inspired with the ideals of Private Hiram D. Strickland. Then, we can expect that freedom will come back to the shores of our own country.

Thank you, and God Bless America!

MINNESOTA FARMER SPEAKS FOR MANY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Art Ellertson of Route 3, Madelia, Minn., one of my many farm constituents, has recently written me to express his concern over USDA crop estimate inaccuracies which have contributed to depressed farm prices. Mr. Ellertson suggests that these reports be abolished.

He speaks for the overwhelming ma-

majority of Second District farmers in expressing total opposition to the many blows leveled by the Federal Government on rural America in order to depress prices. As Mr. Ellertson properly points out—

No single segment of the economy can safely be used as the sacrificial lamb for the other segments without ultimately destroying the total economy.

For the benefit of my colleagues and the policymakers in the Department of Agriculture, I am including Mr. Ellertson's letter in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I hope it will be read and considered:

MADIELIA, MINN.,

August 13, 1967.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heard a radio report stating that you were suggesting more accurate agricultural crop reporting. May I strongly suggest that you do everything in your power to abolish the publication of these reports! In the last three months, corn has dropped 20¢ a bushel, each new crop report adding impetus to this roller coaster. Any slight advantage from these reports to agriculture is far overshadowed by the damage created in the market place.

As a matter of fact, I think the very attitude of the Department of Agriculture could stand a hard reappraisal! Is the Department of Agriculture faithfully representing agriculture, or is it a tool for attempting to control inflation in the rest of the economy? Admittedly, inflation needs control, but my point is this: no single segment of the economy can safely be used as the sacrificial lamb for the other segments without ultimately destroying the total economy.

Last summer's government grain dumping, plus last winter's dumping, plus the Department's decision to limit the A.S.C. diversion to only 20%, plus the overly optimistic crop reports have brought us to the point where, if favorable weather and crop reports materialize, harvest time prices could fall disastrously low. This chain of events leads one to wonder: might this be a calculated action now out of control, or a very incompetent appraisal of the agricultural situation over the past months?

While the agricultural vote may have lost its national prestige, the business of agriculture is a vital segment of the total economy, and this sick patient is in no shape to withstand any weakening relapses!

Yours respectfully,

ART ELLERTSON.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S STANCE ENCOURAGES MASS STUDENT RESISTANCE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, if we are concerned with recent unhealthy attitudes assumed by large groups of our younger people, perhaps we had better reflect on the example which is being set by their elders.

News stories carried in the press today report a move by the National Student Association to "organize and support

resistance to the draft" on campuses throughout the country. It is not too difficult to understand why college students are encouraged to take such a position in the face of the decision reached by the Attorney General and the Justice Department that mass defiance of the law is not illegal. Last week I pointed out the statement from the Department of Justice that "counseling evasion of a required duty means attempting to persuade a specific person or persons to evade such duty." It is the position of the Justice Department that Stokely Carmichael has not violated the Universal Military Training and Service Act because Carmichael has only tried to influence large groups to evade the draft instead of talking to them one by one. The action by the National Student Association is a natural followup for those who are against being drafted to serve in the military forces of the United States.

There is certainly room for changes in the draft law. Serious consideration should be given to redesigning our Armed Forces to make a voluntary career in the military more attractive. But we cannot condone mass movements to teach how to break the law.

Today's news stories of other action taken by NSA reveals the students are demanding complete control by them of college dormitories including visiting hours and regulations. From the reports we are receiving daily of the extent to which the revolt of students is being carried on on many campuses of this country, it does not seem that students have demonstrated sufficient responsibility to have such authority. But before we condemn them, let us take a look at the example being set for them by our generation, including national leaders who seem to have abandoned all morality in the conduct of our national affairs. National responsibility should be the concern of all. We cannot indulge in a loose standard of morality for adults and expect younger people to have a greater attachment to responsible moral standards and conduct.

The news story on the NSA meeting at the University of Maryland as it appeared in today's Washington Post follows:

NSA VOTES TO ORGANIZE RESISTANCE TO THE DRAFT

(By Richard Blumenthal)

The National Student Association voted late last night to "organize and support resistance to the draft" on campuses throughout the country.

Representatives from 334 student governments, meeting at NSA's 20th Student Congress, overwhelmingly approved a resolution that called for an end to the Selective Service System and the creation of a volunteer army.

Earlier in the evening, the students passed a resolution calling on the Nation's universities to give students total power over rules on housing, dormitory hours, student activities and other matters of "solely student concern."

In the antidraft resolution, the students supported these measures:

The creation of a steering committee to start a "nationwide campaign" against compulsory service.

Fund-raising involving fasts on member and nonmember campuses.

An information program, including "anti-draft kits" with pamphlets on conscientious objection, as well as traveling antidraft speakers and counselors.

A legal-aid program combining the efforts of students and faculties at law schools and legal-aid organizations.

In the long and often-heated debate preceding the vote, supporters of the antidraft resolution touched on the failure of past criticism of the war and the draft, the moral dilemma of men who oppose them and the effectiveness of resistance as a means of cutting off manpower from the military.

The NSA passed a resolution opposing the draft last year, but delegates complained last night that the organization had made no effort to implement it.

The resolution on the students' role in setting university rules urged faculties and administrations to recognize the students' "full rights as citizens" to "democratically control" all nonacademic affairs.

Meeting in the University of Maryland's sweltering armory, all but a handful of the students raised their yellow delegate cards in support of the resolution.

The resolution also calls for "joint control" by students with faculty and administrators over course requirements, grading systems, hiring and dismissal of faculty, buildings and grounds planning, and policies on admissions and financial aid.

To assume such power within the universities, it outlines an ambitious program of campus action, including a "legal desk" to inform students of their rights, a fund for legal defense of students who challenge the universities, a national "student power" conference, a newsletter and creation of regional coordinators.

The approval of the resolution followed several hours of heated debate over the proper limits of such power, the competence of students to exercise it, and the tactics to be used against the administrations or faculties.

During the debate, supporters of the resolution agreed with NSA Vice President Ed Schwartz that "students have demonstrated (through political and civil rights work) that they can take over their own affairs."

Greater control, he argued, was actually in the interests of the universities because such control would contribute "to the process of development" among students and "make education relevant to what we are and what we want to be."

In previous resolutions at other congresses, the NSA had called for an "equal role" for students in the formation of academic policy, but it never before had demanded sole authority for students over matters of "solely student concern."

The delegates are expected to take stands on black power, the Middle East and Vietnam.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY RESULTS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to sample the opinions of my constituents of the 19th District of Michigan, I recently sent out a questionnaire asking their opinion on a number of important issues facing the 90th Congress. I would now like to enter the results of my survey into the RECORD:

1. What should we do about Vietnam?	Percent
Escalate land war to invade North Vietnam	7
Escalate air and naval war to bomb strategic centers and blockade harbors	53
Continue our present course	17
Cease fire and try to begin negotiations with:	
North Vietnamese	2
North Vietnamese and Vietcong	10
Withdraw immediately	11
2. If Congress were to change the present Selective Service system which of the following proposed changes would you regard as the most desirable?	Percent
Abolish the draft and rely on volunteers for the military forces	7
End deferment of students except those studying medicine and dentistry	16
Select men for the service by means of a lottery	12
Establish universal service for young men, giving them a choice between the military and some form of social service	46
Leave the present system the way it is	19
3. Do you think that the Federal Government should return a portion of the taxes it collects to state and local governments to use as they see fit?	Percent
Yes	69
No	31
4. Do you favor the Dirksen amendment which would permit prayer in the schools?	Percent
Yes	83
No	17
5. Do you favor an increase in the Social Security tax rate to provide for additional benefits?	Percent
Yes	37
No	63
6. The Administration's proposed budget forecasts a deficit—\$12 billion if Congress enacts a 6% tax on corporate and individual incomes, \$15 billion if Congress does not enact the tax. Which course should Congress follow?	Percent
Approve the budget without a tax	8
Approve the budget with the tax	6
Approve the tax but reduce the budget to avoid a deficit	27
Withhold funds from the following domestic programs to avoid both a deficit and a tax increase: (choose one or more)	59
The poverty program	27
The Model Cities bill	33
Farm price supports	22
The space program	18
KNX RADIO SUPPORTS SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA NATIONAL CEMETERY	
Mr. PETTIS. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?	
There was no objection.	
Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert P. Sutton, vice president of CBS radio, and general manager of station KNX in Los Angeles has produced an ex-	

cellent radio editorial supporting a concept which is incorporated in legislation which I introduced into the House in January of this year.

Mr. Sutton's editorial of July 24 supports formation of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County. My legislation, H.R. 3159, calls for the establishing of a national cemetery on land already owned by the Federal Government.

Here follows the radio editorial:

A FINAL PLACE

Most Americans support our involvement in Vietnam. A few do not. However, on at least one point we should all be able to agree: Those American soldiers who have died for their country deserve a final resting place of honor.

The families of many of our fallen servicemen prefer that they be interred in a private cemetery. Many other families prefer a U.S. Military cemetery as a final resting place for their son or husband. If these families are Californians, they are just out of luck.

There is practically no space left to bury anyone in a military cemetery anywhere in this state. The last burial plot in the Rosecrans Cemetery was taken just a few days ago. At Sawtelle, there are about 1500 spaces left. These are being held for veterans who die in government hospitals.

In other states such as Arizona or Nevada, there is no shortage of military cemetery space. This is little comfort to the families of deceased California soldiers. They want the grave of their loved one where it can be visited conveniently. This is both understandable and justified.

Our federal government is spending billions on the war, on foreign aid, on many questionable domestic programs. California—as a state—has lost more men in Vietnam than any other in the Union. It seems to KNX that the Congress should be able to provide a final burial plot for the men who have served their state and their country so well.

KNX believes another military cemetery is urgently needed somewhere in Southern California. If you agree, write your Congressman and urge him to see that we get it.

THE PROBLEM OF WATER POLLUTION AND ITS CONTROL

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the problems of water pollution and its control is a major concern of all levels of government. I would like to discuss this subject and call to your attention some of the promising research that is underway and the results already attained.

On the one hand, this Nation has an abundance of polluted streams, rivers, lakes, and even sea coasts.

On the other hand, we have a multitude of tools to work with, primarily the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Clean Water Restoration Act, and the Model Cities Act. These tools have created new Federal agencies, authorized the expenditure of much money, and generated a kaleidoscope of movement. Depending on your definitions, there are now a total of between 30 and 40 Federal agencies that have an interest in the complex sub-

ject of water. Total Federal expenditures this year will probably be in the neighborhood of \$8 or \$9 billion.

We also have a large rooting section which occasionally gets down on the field with us to fight the good fight. We can count on the support of hundreds of citizen action organizations, conservation clubs, and sportsmen's groups. Their pleas and admonitions are echoed back and forth in the newspapers and the trade and business publications. Pollution control is a ready subject of conversation. It has become so popular, in fact, that it is about to achieve the same status as motherhood and apple pie.

But what about results? Can anybody say that our waters are any cleaner today than they were at any time in the past? I cannot. I doubt that anyone else can.

There are, I am sure, any number of specific instances where this industry or that town cleaned up its waste, but on close inspection you will find that these actions have been in the planning stages for several years. And I doubt that the total of all the good things in any way offsets the increased pollution due to plain old growth, municipal, and industrial.

In short, I am saying that there are practical steps we could take now to bring an immediate halt to water pollution. The money that is being spent, that \$8 or \$9 billion a year, will have an effect in the future, in 1975 or 1980, perhaps, and beyond, but not tomorrow.

About half of the Federal money, \$4 billion or so, goes into research. Topics include weather modification, the nature of water, the water cycle, the relationship between weather, topography, and water supply, and the collection of water use data. The list goes on and on. Also in this chunk is development money. The practical testing and improvement in desalinization, tertiary waste treatment, and new materials for water purification are examples. Again, the list is extensive.

But even the best, and most of the developments, work is at least 5 years away from practical application, and there is the rub. Because in the meantime we are wallowing in our own filth.

Another slice goes into studies. How, for example, should this river be managed? Should a dam go here or further upstream? What is the cost/benefit ratio of a dam as opposed to a series of wells? And what are the projected water requirements for 1975 and on.

Administrative expenses eat heavily into the funds, as you can well imagine.

That leaves something over \$600 million for water pollution control, and less than half of it is meant for clean water. The biggest part goes for sewers and collection devices.

Believe me, \$300 million is not enough to do the job. If we want clean water, we are going to have to pay for it. We have been looking for several years—and still are to judge from the money being spent on research—for some kind of snake oil to pour on the polluted waters. There is not any.

Clean water costs money. Since April 1966, HUD has given water and sewer facility grants totaling \$160 million to 326

localities. In its first year, HUD budgeted \$100 million and had applications for \$2.5 billion—almost the total capital expenditures for water and waste treatment facilities in 1964. The FWPCA has been out of money for some time. Many construction projects were begun after June 30, 1966, with the idea that financial assistance from the FWPCA would be on its way.

Where is all the additional money for clean water going to come from?

Industry will have to clean up its own waste. Pollution control is part of the cost of doing business. The more responsible members of the industrial community have already responded to public demands for cleanliness. Federal and State Governments are working now to provide an appropriate combination of carrots and sticks.

Municipal sewage is a different matter. It is difficult to convince a community to clean up its sewage so that the next town along the river would not have to spend so much to purify its drinking water. I realize there are other arguments for clean water, but this is the one we eventually get down to. And this argument will continue until all water intakes are located downstream from discharge points and communities start reusing a portion of their own waste.

This is an appropriate time to diverge a little and do what I can to destroy another popular myth—that we are heading toward reuse of water. We are already reusing water. By the time the water in the Mississippi River gets to New Orleans, it has been used a dozen times. It has been used to transfer energy, cool, dissolve, process, and rinse. It has been swum in, washed with, cooked with, drunk, and flushed. Most of its goes back to the river. Not much of it is cleaned. Reuse is only a matter of degree.

The Federal Government is already committed to helping communities finance waste treatment, and, like water reuse, it is only a matter of degree. We are not spending enough to do the job. Clean water is going to cost money, and as far as I am concerned, we have reached a put-up-or-shut-up situation.

Let us get back to the main topic—results. Granted that not enough money is being spent to do the job, what are you getting for what is spent? You are not getting clean water.

What we are getting is concrete and steel in the form of secondary treatment plants. That is how our legislative tools funnel the money. If you were the guy in your community who was responsible for cleaning up the sewage, you would find that it would be years before Federal help would result in a clean discharge and a clean river.

The cry now is for bigger and better secondary plants, and these are needed. The funds that the legislative tools have made available are being disbursed as well as is possible. But there are not enough funds, and, even if there were, secondary plants alone cannot get the job done. As early as 1965, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was cited as saying that, even if all sewered communities were provided with secondary treatment plants by 1980,

we would have the same amount of municipal pollution then as we do now simply because there would be so many more people.

The laws should account for treatment processes that can be combined with concrete and steel so we can start now to clean up our waters and to keep them clean in the future. I am thinking here of chemical treatment.

The proposed State standards for water quality on interstate waters were due in Washington last June 30. It will take some time to check those standards and either approve or disapprove them. But the trend is clear, and it would not take much thought for a community to predict the most likely standard that it must meet. Let us do it. Let us meet it. The job can be done now.

The ability of chemicals to clean waste water has been demonstrated. And the best, most dramatic results were obtained in overloaded secondary plants, those structures which are now being hailed as the answer to water pollution.

The waste from Washington, D.C., was being inadequately treated in a secondary plant. The city's Blue Plains treatment plant first went into operation in 1938. Since then, it has been expanded four times and presently has a replacement value of over \$50 million.

That plant used to discharge 100 tons of solids and 25,000 pounds of organic waste every day to the Potomac River in addition to the residual waste remaining in the effluent. The result was a polluted river and a huge black stain of just plain garbage.

Two months ago, the Blue Plains plant began chemical treatment trials using demonstration money from the FWPCA. That black stain is no longer there. I know. I have been out to the Blue Plains plant, and I have seen what used to be pumped into the river.

The cost of keeping the solids out of the river is less than \$2,000 a day. That sounds expensive, but is it really? The company that is conducting the demonstration estimates that it would take \$12 million of concrete and steel to do the same job that the chemicals are doing now; plus 4 years to get the new facilities into operation. You can spend \$2,000 per day for about 16½ years before you use up \$12 million. Then you can start figuring the interest on \$12 million. Looking at it another way, \$2,000 per day is only 10 percent more than it costs to operate the Blue Plans plant now.

Grand Rapids, Mich., is another city treating its sewage in a secondary plant. It is well run, efficient, and doing a good job of controlling pollution. But it was operating at capacity with no room for population growth or industrial development. Chemical treatment extended the capacity of that plant as soon as it was begun. New residential areas have been tied into the sewage treatment system, and a paper mill that had been discharging its waste into the river for years now plans to send its waste to the municipal plant for adequate treatment. The pollution load to the river was reduced. It was done immediately and with no capital construction to be designed, financed, and built.

The cost to Grand Rapids was minimal. The city did not have to buy back the mistakes and oversights of the past, and the increased efficiency of the plant saves just about as much as the chemicals cost.

Let us assume then that we have somehow made the necessary money available and that we have made it available for water pollution control, not just for secondary plants. Will this provide us with clean water? Not necessarily. Not until some changes of attitude occur.

Take the consulting engineer. He is the guy that does the design work on a treatment plant, figures up the cost, and supervises the construction.

The consulting engineer is in a curious position. He is biased in favor of concrete and steel because, like an architect, his fee is a percentage of the total cost. He is also spending city money, which the city probably found very difficult to obtain, so the pressure is there to produce what the city wants and not necessarily what the city needs. He is also putting his name on a structure that should last upwards of 30 years, so he wants to use only proven technology and equipment. He is naturally conservative.

But it does not take 15 or 20 years to prove out a new treatment technology. Good analytical and statistical procedures make this Nation completely obsolete. New technologies, new equipment, and new operating procedures are here now. They are proven. They ought to be used.

Treatment plants must have instrumentations; in effect, they should be automated. Waste varies from hour to hour, day to day, season to season, the waste entering a plant will be different. And yet, you can count on your fingers the number of treatment plants that have instruments that will alert the operators to anything beyond a change in the volume of flow. In almost every treatment plant in the county the operator does not know what kind of waste he is trying to treat at any given time.

This lack of instrumentation carries all the way through a plant. The most commonly used measurement of organic waste is BOD—biochemical oxygen demand. A conventional BOD test takes 5 days to perform. That is about 4 days and 23 hours too late. There are instruments that will do the same thing in 1 minute.

Most chemical processing plants—and that is really what we are talking about here—have backup equipment and emergency procedures. If a critical part goes bad, reserve equipment goes into operation immediately or else the plant is shut down until repairs can be made.

The flow of waste from a city cannot be shut off. And yet backup equipment is absent from most sewage treatment plants. If a pump breaks, a filter clogs, or a bacteria culture is killed, untreated sewage spills into the river until a new part can be ordered from the catalog. This often takes weeks.

The people who are responsible for operating sewage treatment plants are going to have to change their outlook also. These people are scored on the efficiency of the plant. Since operating data is either unreliable or nonexistent—remember, there is an almost universal

lack of instruments to provide data—the measure of efficiency is cost. The man who runs his plant the cheapest gets the best score.

This penny-wise, pound-foolish approach is standing in the way of clean water. Plant efficiency means pollution control, not cost reduction. New scoring procedures are clearly indicated. Efficiency must be the ability to keep grease, chemicals, solids, phosphates, BOD, or whatever out of the river.

Pollution control is the name of the game. It is going to cost money, and it ought to be done now. There is no reason to wait 5, 10, 15, or 20 years—if we revise our thinking and start working for results.

HOW TO FORTIFY AGAINST ANARCHY AND LAWLESSNESS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, at what point shall we expect the approach of danger? By what means shall we fortify against it? Shall we expect some transatlantic military giant, to step the ocean, and crush us at a blow? Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth—our own excepted—in their military chest; with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years.

At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time, or die by suicide.

I hope I am overwary; but if I am not, there is, even now, something of ill omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law which pervades the country; the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions, in lieu of the sober judgment of courts; and the worse than savage mobs, for the executive ministers of justice. This disposition is awfully fearful in any community; and that it now exists in ours, though grating to our feelings to admit, it would be a violation of truth, and an insult to our intelligence, to deny.

I know the American people are much attached to their Government—I know they would suffer much for its sake; I know they would endure evils long and patience, before they would ever think of exchanging it for another. Yet, notwithstanding all this, if the laws be continually despised and disregarded, if their rights to be secure in their persons and property, are held by no better tenure than the caprice of a mob, alienation of their affections from the Government is the natural consequence; and to that sooner or later, it must come.

Here then, is one point at which danger may be expected.

The question recurs "How shall we fortify against it?" The answer is simple. Let every American, every lover of liberty, every well wisher to his posterity, swear by the blood of the Revolution, never to violate in the least particular, the laws of the country; and never to tolerate their violation by other. As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor; let every man remember that to violate the law, is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the character—charter?—of his own, and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws, be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe that rattles on her lap—let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars.

There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob law. In any case that arises, one of two positions is necessarily true; that is, the thing is right within itself, and therefore deserves the protection of all law and all good citizens; or, it is wrong, and therefore proper to be prohibited by legal enactments; and in neither case, is the interposition of mob law, either necessary, justifiable, or excusable.

Mr. Speaker, all of these words are those of President Abraham Lincoln. Then as now, his words were prophetic. For those who countenance lawlessness or civil disobedience—such as Martin Luther King—I can only point out that they are not made of the kind of stuff that Abe Lincoln had. They live in an entirely different world no matter how badly they try to make their efforts respectable. These words of our 16th President should be remembered today to fortify against the lawless anarchy which is being promoted throughout our land.

PROSPERITY WITHOUT END

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, Licking County, Ohio, resident James Warthen has done a masterful job of taking a statement—doubtless from the soaring mind of an administration rationalizer—and giving it the practical application which all can understand. Certainly there is a little tongue in cheek, but I think less than one might at first suspect. The point is well made. With some of the wild schemes now afoot in the adminis-

tration, and some that hopefully have seen too much public reaction to be implemented, one wonders if it might be better not to circulate Mr. Warthen's statement lest it be latched onto.

It is, apparently, this type of thinking, as seen in the short quotation, that makes a \$9 billion budget deficit equal a \$29 billion deficit; and that makes the USDA the agency only of the farmer who makes more than \$10,000 per year; and the type of thinking that proposed that a man should be taxed an amount equal to the rental value on his home, even if he owns it.

At this point I would like to submit the letter which I received from Mr. Warthen:

JOHNSTOWN, OHIO,

August 14, 1967.

DEAR SIR: In the Aug. 14, 1967 issue of a reputable national weekly I find the following:

"Some other predictions of the business analysts: Over the long run, riots are likely, in a way, to be stimulating to business. How? By causing an increase in government spending, federal, state, and local. For what? For relief, antipoverty programs, rebuilding of cities."

The above reasoning is straight from the gospel of the New Economics, and hence is scarcely open to question. I have, therefore, a proposal to make, which is very easy to implement, and which should bring our country prosperity without end.

We begin by putting Columbus to the torch. From the University complex to Veterans Memorial, from Broad and High to the outer limits of the city, we leave not a structure standing: not a home nor business place, not a factory nor office building. Then, to share with our countrymen the good times so sure to follow, we expand our work beyond Franklin County and beyond the state. From Maine to California and from Florida to Washington we press our campaign, until not a single work of man is left intact above the smoking rubble.

Now, we are undismayed by the fact that Washington, D.C. no longer exists. We locate Pres. Johnson in his bunker in the Catoctin Mts., and urge upon him the grandest schemes for urban renewal, relief, and the elimination of poverty. He is bilstered, dazed, and shaken by his recent experiences, but on hearing such phrases as "urban renewal" and "antipoverty", he recovers quickly and forthwith endorses our program in full. (We do not have to remind him that a dollar spent as taxes is a more potent creator of jobs than the same dollar spent by a wage earner. The President knows this has been true ever since the days of his idol, FDR.)

Soon the wheels of industry are humming again. We do not know where the wheels have come from, but that does not matter. We are guided by the genius of men like John Kenneth Galbraith and Walter Heller, and we have no worries. Our prosperity knows no bounds.

Then, after our cities have been rebuilt, we ensure that our good times continue without interruption by repeating our little parties the length and breadth of the land, again . . . again . . . and again . . .

Sincerely,

JAMES WARTHEN.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM: ACTION NOW

Mr. PETTIS. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the bill passed by the Senate on March 7 by a vote of 75 to 9, to bring about some sorely needed improvements in the operation of the Congress has languished in the House Rules Committee for more than 5 months now.

The bill, S. 355, contains more than 70 sections and runs to 134 pages. I am not going to suggest that it is a simple piece of legislation, because it is not. And at no time have any of the members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress attempted to claim that S. 355 is more than a modest reform bill, for all its length.

However, we do feel that S. 355 is a significant step forward in the modernization of the first branch of Government. The recommendations made by the joint committee, which this bill is designed to put into effect, have been on file with the Congress for more than a year. The bill was thoroughly discussed on the floor of the Senate during 18 days of debate earlier this year.

Each of us naturally has his own ideas about what ought to be done to improve the operations of Congress. I would just like to remind my colleagues that the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, comprising six Members of the Senate, an equal number from each party, and six Members of the House, an equal number from each party, listened to enough testimony and read enough statements on the subject of congressional reorganization to compile a hearing record in excess of 2,300 pages.

At the same time, staff studies were conducted not only by the joint committee but by such groups as our House Republican task force on congressional reform and minority staffing. I again call the attention of my colleagues—those who have not yet had time to read it—to the book written by our task force, entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress," published last fall by the McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans have refrained from speaking out on S. 355 for 5 very weary months. We have done this from a recognition that a bill of this length deserves careful study, and out of deference to the assumed good motives of the members of the Rules Committee to report the bill eventually. In view of the time which has expired and the deep feeling we have about the urgency of modernizing Congress, I think our restraint has been commendable.

But there comes a time we must ask not only when, but indeed whether, the committee plans to report this bill to the floor. I want to know by what rationale this legislation can be permitted to reside in the dark recesses of the House Rules Committee after so much work has been done, by so many people, over such a long period of study, to shape a meaningful, modest, and needed bill.

There is a loud, clear call for congressional reform. My mail and visits in my district tell me this, and I am sure many of my colleagues have been hearing the same refrain.

I call on the leadership of the House to act now on S. 355.

A STATESMAN IN HIS OWN TIME

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, no man ever becomes indispensable, but an elite few approach that hallowed status. Such a man is Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. In his recent column entitled "Dirksen Reelection Called Vital," which appeared in today's Washington Post, William S. White called attention to DIRKSEN's importance to the U.S. Senate and why he should be reelected.

DIRKSEN's reelection is vital for many reasons—for the welfare of the State of Illinois, and for the unparalleled leadership which he brings to the Senate, and for the guidance and counsel he has given American Presidents in time of national crisis. His leadership has been important to Illinois and to the entire Nation. He is a national leader in whom people from all 50 States take pride, and we of Illinois especially. He has become a spokesman for all Americans, of every race, color, and creed.

Our three most recent American Presidents have attested to assistance given by Senator DIRKSEN when our Nation's security has been endangered. He has always been willing to forsake the prejudice of partisanship while in pursuit of the national interest.

I and other members of the Illinois Republican congressional delegation join in wholeheartedly seeking the reelection of Senator DIRKSEN. William S. White, whose article follows, well says what so many Americans think about our senior Senator from Illinois:

ABOVE POLITICS: DIRKSEN REELECTION CALLED VITAL

(By William S. White)

What is likely to happen when the need for human loyalty among members of a political party to its duly chosen champion meets, flatout, the absolute demands of high national interests clearly standing above any partisan consideration?

This is no mere iffy thing; for almost certainly precisely this hard and delicate question is going to confront Democratic voters of Illinois next year. The position is this: The veteran Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen will be up for reelection at a time when the Democratic organization of the State appears from afar to be both essentially strong, in the wake of the tremendous reelection triumph of a few months ago of Chicago Mayor Richard Daley, and prospectively able to offer a vital challenge to Dirksen's continued political life.

This is far more than a contest for a Senate seat in a big and politically important State in a presidential, as well as a senatorial, election year. For Dirksen is not only the Republican leader of the Senate but is also a man all but irreplaceable there both to his Party and to the country itself.

In point of fact, he is by any fair measure the least expendable senator in either party, quite apart from the circumstance that his defeat would offer immense problems to the

G.O.P. to find an acceptable replacement in the leadership.

For this man, so often seen so superficially as only a kind of northern Senator Claghorn with an overrich vocabulary is in simple truth the balance wheel of the Senate itself and by far the greatest force there for an enlightened, and even a statesmanlike, approach to the truly vital affairs of the Nation. On all that really counts—on the great issues of foreign policy on which national honor and national safety alike depend and even on such harsh domestic questions as the right and effective way to solve the racial crisis—he has for years stood miles above small politics.

He was a strong and nationally-minded supporter of the Democratic President John F. Kennedy in all the foreign crises that had to be faced in those years. And when last Dirksen stood for reelection in Illinois, in 1962, John F. Kennedy limited his assistance to the Dirksen challenger, Rep. Sid. Yates.

And what Dirksen did, over and over, for Kennedy in the grand foreign showdowns he has done, over and over, for President Johnson as well.

What makes the whole business even more poignant is the fact that, again as in 1962, the Democrats are likely to offer a thoroughly able and honorable alternative, possibly in some such man as Adlai Stevenson III. That a Stevenson, given time and luck, might well himself become a notable Senator and a valuable public servant is clearly more than possible.

But again, all this Dirksen has long been; and in the bargain he has, simply and unarguable, earned the gratitude of the responsible people not only of Illinois but of all the United States.

There is, for example, not the slightest doubt that if the entire United States Senate could vote in the Illinois election next year on some impossible secret ballot, at least 80 of its members, including no less than three-fourths of the Democrats themselves, would mark their ballots for Everett McKinley Dirksen.

In the first World War, old Premier Clemenceau of France observed that war—by which he meant the utter and ultimate necessities of war—was too important to be left to the generals.

The plain fact of the matter is that Dirksen is too important to be destroyed by ordinary political considerations.

And this is going to be the undeniable, final reality next year when the irresistible force of partisan loyalty meets the immovable object of potent national interest.

CARMICHAEL IN HAVANA

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mrs. REID] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, I presented my remarks before the House in which I pointed out that—

It will take more than money to restore law and order in our land—

And that—

It will require the strict enforcement of all laws—Federal, State, and local.

At that same time, I quoted a letter which I had written to the Attorney General of the United States urging that he use his full authority to enforce Federal laws and calling to his attention the inflammatory statements made by Stokely

Carmichael while attending the Communist-sponsored Latin American Solidarity Conference in Cuba—including a call for guerrilla war in the cities of our Nation, hand-to-hand combat, the destruction of our regime and our system, and threats to the lives of our President and members of the Cabinet. In that same letter to the Attorney General of the United States, I expressed my strong hope that—

If, as appears evident on the basis of available information, Stokely Carmichael has violated the Smith Act or any other Federal law, he should be immediately taken into custody and prosecuted if and when he returns to the United States.

I also urged "that all others who may be violating Federal law through inciting rebellion or insurrection be brought to justice."

I have finally received a response from J. Walter Yeagley, Assistant Attorney General, Internal Security Division, Department of Justice. I doubt if you and the law-abiding, loyal citizens throughout our Nation, who share my concern will find this Justice Department report any more encouraging or satisfactory than I did when I read it—but I did think you would be interested in knowing the thinking of the Justice Department on matters of law enforcement and dealing with those who incite to riot, so am quoting the entire letter written to me under date of August 16 by Assistant Attorney General J. Walter Yeagley:

I have your letter of August 8, 1967 and attached copy of your remarks made in the House of Representatives regarding Stokely Carmichael.

We are looking into Carmichael's activities, including his travel to Cuba, to ascertain whether he has acted in violation of any Federal statute within our jurisdiction. In the event sufficient evidence is developed to establish a violation of Federal law, appropriate action will be undertaken.

With respect to the shocking statements attributed to Carmichael in Havana, as reported in the press, it should be noted that it is necessary to have competent witnesses to such statements and quite difficult to obtain such witnesses, particularly in an unfriendly country. Nonetheless, in the event any of his activities in Cuba reflect a violation of our laws and witnesses can be obtained to testify to his activities, you may be assured that prosecution would be undertaken.

In addition, it is our understanding that the Department of State contemplates revoking Carmichael's passport facilities upon his return to the United States.

With respect to some of the domestic utterances of Stokely Carmichael and others, it may be well to note that incitement to riot is ordinarily a local offense governed by the law of the state or city where such conduct occurs and is not usually a violation of Federal law.

The Attorney General appreciates having the benefit of your views.

In reference to the third paragraph of the above quoted letter, I can only assume that the Justice Department does not consider members of the press as competent witnesses as I am sure that various news reporters who heard Stokely Carmichael's remarks firsthand and those who monitored Havana Radio broadcasts of his statements would be more than happy to present any verification requested by the Justice Department. I also wonder just how much effort will be exerted by the Justice Depart-

ment to obtain what they consider "competent witnesses."

You will note that Mr. Yeagley, presumably speaking for the Attorney General and the Justice Department as a whole, also takes refuge in the fact that incitement to riot is a local offense governed by the law of the State or city where such conduct occurs and is not usually a violation of Federal law when it comes to action against domestic utterances of Stokely Carmichael and others. I cannot help but wonder what other excuse to avoid taking action will be used by the Justice Department should the Federal Antiriot Act—which has already been overwhelmingly approved by a vote of 347 yeas to 70 nays in the House of Representatives—become law. Those of us who sponsored and voted for this legislation believe strongly in retaining local law enforcement rights—but I, for one, certainly feel that this House-approved Federal Antiriot Act is both constitutional and vitally needed to help local and State law enforcement officials cope with individuals like Stokely Carmichael, H. Rap Brown, and so forth, who use interstate facilities with the intent to incite a riot.

You will recall, of course, that when this Federal antiriot legislation was under consideration by the House of Representatives on July 19, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, pointed out that Attorney General Ramsey Clark expressed his absolute opposition to this legislation to him personally as well as on "Meet the Press." On the other hand, it is interesting to note that the Attorney General of the United States enthusiastically supported those provisions of H.R. 5037, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, which would have given the Attorney General unlimited power over State and local police and which would have enabled him to establish racial and other guidelines with which the local governments would have to comply if they were to receive funds. Fortunately, such Federal controls as desired by the Attorney General in that instance were taken away through Republican-sponsored amendments which were adopted on the House floor with my full support.

WISCONSIN MINK FARMERS' WEEK

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, this week being Wisconsin Mink Farmers' Week—August 20 through 26—I would like to take this opportunity to again pay tribute to the more than 1,000 mink ranchers in my State of Wisconsin, which is the leading mink-producing State in the country.

Mr. John R. Hacklander, president of the Wisconsin Board of Fur Farm Cooperative Associations, has provided me with a copy of Wisconsin Gov. Warren

P. Knowles' recent proclamation, which points a proud and approving finger at the industrious group of mink farmers in my State.

The proclamation signed by Governor Knowles on August 9, 1967, follows:

A PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN

Whereas, mink farming in the State of Wisconsin is recognized as a major agricultural industry, annually returning to our economy over \$45 million from the world pelt market; and

Whereas, thirteen regional mink farmers' organizations of the State of Wisconsin will be hosting the Directors of the National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Inc., for their Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting at Oshkosh; and

Whereas, the College of Agriculture of the University of Wisconsin will be hosting the industry in a special Fur Farmers' Summer School in Madison, reporting research in keeping with the high standards of service rendered to all forms of agriculture by the State of Wisconsin to its citizens; and

Whereas, the State of Wisconsin, being the nation's largest producer of mink pelts, and finding that the nation's mink ranchers are facing economic disaster from the excessive flow of duty-free imports, flooding American markets with low-quality pelts without restriction;

Now, therefore, I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim the week of August 20 through August 26, 1967, as Wisconsin Mink Farmers' Week, and urge that the importance of the mink ranching industry in the State of Wisconsin be given full recognition by our citizens and public officials.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Wisconsin to be affixed. Done at the Capitol in the City of Madison this ninth day of August in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

EXTENSION OF RURAL MAIL SERVICE

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was welcome news to hear that the Post Office Department is extending its rural delivery service.

I have actively sought more liberal rules on rural mail deliveries through personal and written communications with postal officials over the past number of years, and I welcome this new development.

Under the old regulations, service was provided only to areas having at least two families a mile. Under the new rules, service will be provided to areas with an average population density of 1½ families per mile. With farms becoming larger and farther apart, it has been obvious for some time that the old formula did not adequately serve our rural areas. This liberalizing of the rules is certainly welcomed by those of us who have been close to the changing rural scene.

Congress should note that rural mail carriers serve 10 million American fami-

lies, or more than 35 million individuals. These people, located in the sparsely populated areas of the Nation, have too often seen needed transportation and communication services denied them in recent years as emphasis shifted to the urban centers. So it is good to note that the Postmaster General is taking this important step in the other direction. Rural America will benefit greatly by expanded mail service.

AUTOMOBILE SAFETY

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much in recent months about auto safety. This is most beneficial in my judgment and the importance of the recent public discussion of this issue should not be minimized.

However, as is most often the case a story is made sensational and thereby brought to public attention at the expense of perspective. I am inserting in the RECORD today an article from the August 8 edition of the St. Louis Globe Democrat entitled "Auto Industry's Drive for Safety." This article describes the efforts of the auto industry in this area that go back many years.

In developing auto safety standards it is most important to bear in mind the actual contribution of the industry. In the long run nothing will be gained by creating shibboleths and tilting windmills.

The article referred to follows:

AUTO INDUSTRY'S DRIVE FOR SAFETY (By Ted Schafers)

The 1967 model cars are the safest ever built and in 1968 they'll be safer. They also will have devices which will substantially decrease the air pollution emitted from exhaust gases.

Some people will give Ralph Nader, America's car critic, and the government's new safety standards, credit for the improvements. However, a tour through any of the automobile proving grounds operated by General Motors, Ford or Chrysler corporations, quickly dispels that belief.

The 4011-acre GM proving grounds at Milford, Mich., has been responsible for safer cars nearly 40 years. Similar facilities of Ford and Chrysler also have been around a long time. Crash testing of cars goes back at least 30 years.

Seat belts, lap belts, smog control equipment and pop-out windshields have received a lot of public attention, but safety glass that crumbles instead of shattering, blow-out proof tires, gasoline tanks that withstand terrific impacts and particularly the new "energy absorbing" steering columns are far more significant safety items.

These improvements did not come about because someone waved a magic wand. They are the result of years of continuous research by leading automobile, carburetor, glass, tire and metal producers.

New safety products must be designed, built and tested extensively before they can be put into mass production.

Few people were concerned about smog and other pollutants from gasoline engine combustion in 1940 when there were 30 million

cars on U.S. streets and highways. But as America's auto population climbed to 70 million, the amount of pollutants coming out of a car or truck tailpipe has become a critical problem.

Research work done by the "Big 3" and others on cars operating in California is resulting in the first pollution-control breakthrough that will bring less pollution of the air by 1980 than now, although the car population will soar to 110 million in the next 13 years.

The new steering column installed in 1967 automobiles and developed by General Motors is the result of seven years of active research and testing. GM has already collected case histories on 225 actual accidents.

One 1967 Oldsmobile slammed into a tree at 45 miles an hour and the driver walked away with minor injuries although the steering column was crushed $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches!

A 1967 Pontiac hit the rear end of another car at 60 mph. The driver received no injuries. A passenger in this car, who did not use the seat belt provided, smashed head-first into the new-type shield and escaped with minor face cuts.

Ford led the march to padded dashboards. But in 1956, when the padded dash and other safety deep-dish steering wheel and safety doorlocks were promoted by Ford, the public turned a deaf ear and sales dropped. The belief then was that the public was more interested in style than safety.

Chrysler long has promoted engineering and safety but until the company changed car styling and improved its merchandising, it did not have the impact on car buyers it enjoys today. Buyers expect safe cars, but they still buy on eye appeal, one observer remarked.

VETERANS' PENSION AND READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. HECKLER] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the motion to adopt the conference report on S. 16 unanimously passed the House of Representatives. It is my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I can, therefore, attest to the diligence with which the committee applied itself to the drafting of this legislation to strengthen and liberalize the veterans' benefit program. The House of Representatives had already endorsed the bill reported by the committee by a unanimous vote on March 20 of this year. Most of the provisions of the House-passed bill have survived the conference and are set forth in the conference report. The Senate provisions which have been agreed to by the conferees have served to strengthen and balance the bill.

I am, of course, disappointed that the bill as agreed to by conferees contains no provisions to forestall the possible adverse effect of the pending social security increase upon veterans' pensions. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has given assurances, however, to the Members of the House and the Nation's veterans that our committee will take timely action to

prevent any veteran or widow on the pension rolls from being adversely affected by the social security increase. The chairman of the legislative committee in the other body having jurisdiction over this important subject has, I understand, given similar assurances.

The bill as agreed to, Mr. Speaker, contains a well deserved increase in the monthly pension rates payable to approximately 2 million veterans, widows, and orphans. A substantially greater increase for widows with children having little if any outside income is also provided.

Widows of veterans of all wars will be eligible to receive a monthly allowance of \$50, in addition to pension otherwise payable, if they are confined to a nursing home or are in need of the regular aid and attendance of another person. Veterans who are receiving pension under the so-called old law may now qualify for a pension of \$100 a month if they are housebound because of the severity of their disability.

Young men and women who are serving during this period of conflict in Vietnam will now be eligible for all of the benefits that were available to veterans of wartime service.

Many of these wartime benefits had already been granted. This bill, however, authorizes disability compensation rates and dependency allowances for service-connected disabilities payable at the full wartime rate. Non-service-connected pension benefits for veterans, their widows, and children is extended on the same basis as is presently available to veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. A burial allowance of \$250 is also authorized.

Increases in monthly educational allowances, in recognition of the high cost of tuition, for veterans of service since January 31, 1955, is authorized under the bill. The educational program of the GI bill is expanded to include on-the-job training, farm cooperative training, and flight training.

Additionally, the date on which the World War II home loan guarantee program was scheduled to expire, July 25, 1967, has been extended to July 25, 1970.

These are but the highlights, Mr. Speaker, of the veterans' benefits bill that will be passed with the adoption by the other body of the conference report that was before the House. I was proud to support this bill in committee and to cast an affirmative vote also on March 20 when it was before the House. I supported the bill because it tells the Nation's veterans, their widows, and orphans, and the young servicemen fighting under the American flag on battlefields in the Far East that a grateful government recognizes their sacrifices.

IT'S TIME THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN WAS LOOKED AT

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, the hate-happy few—the Stokely Carmichaels and Rap Browns—have made their point. They want to destroy this Nation. But they represent only a small minority.

It is time the other side of the coin was looked at. Last week, I inserted in the Record an excellent interview with Negro Col. Daniel James, Jr., stationed in Da Nang, Vietnam. For Members who may have failed to read this interview, it appeared on pages 22700–22701, August 15.

I also introduced a House concurrent resolution aimed at recalling Colonel James to tour the country and offset the damage done to our young people by the hate-mongers.

To date the response to this idea, from people in Florida, and from Members of both political parties here in Congress, has all been favorable.

I include the following letters in today's Record:

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
August 17, 1967.

Rep. EDWARD J. GURNEY,
Washington, D.C.

Sir: Upon reading about Col. James in Sunday's Miami Herald I had the same thought you raised in the enclosed clipping published in the Morning Herald, but unlike you, I did nothing about it.

If there is anything I can do now, such as write to other Representatives and Senators and asking my friends to do so, I would be happy to know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. WARREN C. CAVINS.

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
August 18, 1967.

Rep. EDWARD J. GURNEY.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I have been talking about the very thing you have started: bringing Col. Daniel James, Jr. back to help solve the Negro ghetto problem.

Thanks and Congratulations.

W. C. CAVINS.

TAMPA, FLA., August 16, 1967.

HON. EDWARD GURNEY.

DEAR SIR: This is in regards to your statement in the Tampa Tribune on August 16 in proposing to bring the Negro Air Force Colonel home . . .

I am a white middle age lady—the fifth generation of a fine family that lived in Jones Mills N.J. (now in the Fort Dix area) and I am so heart sick to see the actions this country is taking toward hoodlums. The wrong people are being punished . . .

I certainly hope you have good success in your efforts in regards to try and keep hoodlums out of this country and let us sometime soon be proud of our country.

We have been Tampa residents at the above address for 15 years—my husband is a Tribune retired linotype operator.

Good luck and success.

Yours truly,

Mrs. M. HOWARD WILLIAMS.

TRUE ENTERPRISES,

Lake Placid, Fla., August 17, 1967.

HON. EDWARD GURNEY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposition to bring home Negro Air Force personnel to counteract the treasonous acts of the hate advocates is excellent. I hope it receives the support necessary. Should it not be appropriate to bring other combat personnel (white) also for the hate is not 100% from our Colored Citizens?

Can you point out to the administration that the city riots are costing this Nation

millions of dollars in the tourist trade. Visitors will go elsewhere. Will not this drain our revenue hurt the balance of payments we hear so much about?

Sincerely,

W. H. TRUE.

MIAMI, FLA.,
August 19, 1967.

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GURNEY: I am very favorably impressed with the idea of bringing Col. James to the U.S.A. for appearances in key cities.

Am writing friends in Pennsylvania and New York concerning this idea.

Will keep in touch with Mr. Courtney as to progress in this project.

Yours for God and U.S.A.

Mrs. MILTON MUNSON.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.,
August 16, 1967.

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: Your suggestion, Fight Black Power With Negro Air ace, is a novel idea, and, although, I do not know how widely the idea will be accepted throughout the country it certainly looks as if it is worth a trial.

There are two or three things that are to be acted on by the congress or the senate of the United States on which I wish to express my views:

Very truly yours,

JOHN S. FISH.

In addition, another responsible Negro leader has spoken out against the preachings of hate. This article, by former boxing champion Archie Moore, was sent to me by a Floridian, and under unanimous consent I include it in the RECORD.

Unless we focus more attention on the responsible statements of men such as Colonel James and Mr. Moore, we will not be able to counter the poison spread by the likes of Carmichael and Brown. The article follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Aug. 13, 1967]

ARCHIE MOORE SPEAKS OUT ON RACE RIOTS
SAN DIEGO.—Archie Moore, retired light heavyweight boxing champion of the world, told friends last week that he believes that "everybody must take a stand in this time of internal crisis."

"A man who stands neutral stands for nothing," said Moore, who then wrote a statement and submitted it to the Copley News Service.

In his statement Moore condemns rioting and violence, saying:

"We made it because we had a goal, and we were willing to work for it. Don't talk to me of your 'guaranteed national income.' Any fool knows that this is insanity. Do we bring those who worked to get ahead down to the level of those who never gave a damn? The world owes nobody—black or white—a living. God helps the man who helps himself!

"Now then, don't get the idea that I didn't grow up hating the injustices of this world. I am a staunch advocate of the Negro revolution for the good of mankind. I've seen almost unbelievable progress made in the last handful of years. Do we want to become wild beasts bent only on revenge, looting and killing and laying America bare? Hate is bait, bait for the simple-minded.

"Sure, I despised the whites who cheated me, but I used that feeling to make me push on. If you listen to the professional

rabble-rousers, adhere to this idea of giving up everything you've gained in order to revenge yourself for the wrongs that were done to you in the past—then you'd better watch your neighbor, because he'll be looting your house next. Law and order is the only edge we have. No man is an island.

"Granted, the Negro still has a long way to go to gain a fair shake with the white man in this country. But believe this: If we resort to lawlessness, the only thing we can hope for is civil war, untold bloodshed, and the end of our dreams.

"We have to have a meeting of qualified men of both races. Mind you I said qualified men, not some punk kid, ranting the catch phrases put in his mouth by some paid hate-monger. There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine.

"And while we're on the subject, do you doubt for a minute that communism, world communism, isn't waiting with bated breath for the black and white Americans to turn on each other full force? Do you want a chance for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the land of your birth, or do you want no chance at all under the Red heel?"

"There are members of the black community who call for a separate nation within America. Well, I do not intend to give up one square inch of America. I'm not going to be told I must live in a restricted area. Isn't that what we've all been fighting to overcome? And then there is the element that calls for a return to Africa.

"For my part, Africa is a great place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. If the Irishmen want to go back to the Emerald Isle, let them. If the Slavs want to return to the Iron Curtain area, okay by me. But I'm not going to go to any part of Africa to live.

"I'm proud of my ancestry, and of the country that spawned my forefathers, but I'm not giving up my country. I fought all my life to give my children what I'm able to give them today! A chance for development as citizens in the greatest country in the world.

"I do not for a moment think that any truly responsible Negro wants anarchy. I don't think you'll find intelligent no, let me rephrase that—mature Negroes running wild in the streets or sniping at total strangers. God made the white man as well as the black. True, we haven't acted as brothers in the past, but we are brothers. If we're to be so many Cains and Abels, that's our choice. We can't blame God for it.

"Something must be done to reach the Negroes and the whites in the ghettos of this country, and I propose to do something.

"As a matter of plain fact, I have been doing something for the past several years. I have been running a program which I call the ABC—Any Boy Can. By teaching our youth, black, white, yellow and red, what dignity is, what self respect is, what honor is, I have been able to obliterate juvenile delinquency in several areas.

"I would now expand my program, change its scope. If any boy can, surely any man can. I want to take teams of qualified people, top men in their fields to the troubled areas of our cities. I know that the people who participated in the recent riots, who are participating and who will participate are misguided rather than mad.

"If some bigot can misguide, then I can guide. I've spent too much of my life building what I've got to put it to torch just to satisfy some ancient hatred of a man who beat my grandfather. Those men are long dead. De we have to choke what could be a beautiful garden with weeds of hate? I say No!—and I stand ready to start "Operation Gardener." I invite the respected Negro leaders of our country to join me.

"Yours for a United America.

"Archie Moore"

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN GIRLS

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, Miss Nicolee Fode of Jud, N. Dak., recently won the State public speaking events for girls at the North Dakota 4-H Institute. Her talk was entitled "A Challenge to American Girls."

Because I believe Miss Fode represents the fine young people in North Dakota of which we are so proud, and because I believe her speech might serve as an inspiration to other young women, I insert it in the RECORD at this time:

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN GIRLS

In a temple on the Yangtze, lives an old woman whose parents dedicated her to the service of this temple when she was a small child, and since that time she has dedicated herself to righteous living, that she may be reborn a man. As a woman she has no hope or desire for any important part in her country's welfare, but when she is reborn a man, she will be of value to China!

But in America—to be a woman is to be honored. Because she lacks physical strength, the American woman is not hitched to a plow! She is a potential mother, so her welfare is of supreme importance. She is spared the harsh, the ugly, and the cruel. The American man protects his women and children; he gives his life for them in times of strife.

On the other hand, the woman has many privileges. She can spend her husband's money. The obey clause in the marriage ceremony is generally omitted, for the days are past when American women were servants to their husbands. Today they obey only their impulses and the principles of decency which have been taught them.

American women are the most honored, the most privileged, the most pampered in the world. But do we deserve these honors? And having accepted them, do we recognize the responsibilities that go with them? When we look about us and see American women standing idle, watching opportunity pass by them; when we see American women in political and industrial worlds, taking underhand advantage of the fact that they are women, then the answer is definitely, "No!"

I question the high school students. We are in that difficult position when we are trying to decide what we shall make of ourselves. Are we girls going to meet the challenge of our privileged lives?

Meeting a challenge does not necessarily mean leading armies as Joan or Arc did, or discovering a new chemical substance, as Madame Curie did. The challenge which we must meet, is the challenge of everyday life.

Are American women too softhearted, too hesitant? We are given the right to vote when we are 21 years old. But do we vote the Republican ticket, or the Democratic ticket because our fathers before us voted that way, or because our husbands today vote a certain ticket, or do we recognize the advantage in making our own decisions?

American women have served on city councils and in state legislatures; they have governed cities and states; they have gone to Congress; and they have been ministers to foreign countries. Have they, while engaged in these services, preserved their own individuality, or have they merely reflected man's own ideas? If we meet the challenge of today, we shall give to these offices the

woman's own viewpoint and therefore, the woman's own service.

Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria governed empires, and England has never known a more glorious, more progressive period than those of the Elizabethan and Victorian ages. American women today, with all the privileges of their modern life, are fortunate in inheriting from them and other great women what has been called, "a legacy of so much effort, so much bloodshed, and so much pain." Are we going to be bystanders, watching that heritage decay? We must glorify it and pass it on to our girls.

Not all of us will take a direct part in government. What then is the challenge to us? There is the challenge of citizenship, yes, but there is also the challenge that comes in raising intelligent citizens.

Women constitute one-half of the human race, and they are responsible for the other half. To women, God gave supreme happiness in the ability to build the body and the soul. It is said of American women that too many are interested in the political and industrial worlds, and not enough in the home and children. While we need not pay our mothers to bear children, as Hitler did, America needs boys and girls, not to mold and train for war, but to mold into good citizens.

Michelangelo's mother did not paint great pictures. Shakespeare's mother did not write great drama. Webster's mother did not deliver great orations. But these mothers gave life to the men who did these things.

If a woman today feels that her career lies in the home, she must choose her husband for love, for kindness, and for intelligence. She must choose her husband for a lifetime, for marriage is not a week-end affair! She must choose her husband because he is morally and physically fit. And then, as a parent, she must contribute her time, her patience, and her love to building a home and rearing her children so that with God's help, they may be able to help solve the problems of the world.

Victor Hugo once said:

"A house is built of bricks and stones,
Of sills and posts and pliers
But a home is built of loving deeds,
That stand a thousand years."

American girls, the mothers of tomorrow, are the real makers of history. Their children through wise guidance, a faith in God and in the triumph of right over wrong will be the hope of the future, a hope that cannot fail.

In war, American soldiers give their blood and their lives to a cruel, hungry desire which is still unsatisfied. But American women today can and must give their lives to a glorious desire which must never be satisfied.

I am an American girl. I'm proud of it. I stand, with other American girls, on the threshold of a new day—a day filled with promise. We see a new world—a world in which women must recognize, as never before, their responsibilities as well as their honors. There is a challenge in this new day. May we meet that challenge.

YUGOSLAVIA EXPANDS "FREE ZONE" FOR JOINT ECONOMIC VENTURES

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, all of us in Congress continue to be alert for ac-

tions by foreign nations aimed against the interests of the United States. We raise our voices and record our concern over such acts as their aiding our enemies in Vietnam; reverting to Stalinist methods and the like. While on the one hand I strongly believe we should condemn such inimical policies, I also believe we should be ready to recognize policies which help promote more natural relations between so-called Socialist states—such as Yugoslavia—and the West.

As some of my colleagues know, Yugoslavia is a state that has occupied my concern in the past, and one in which I am still quite interested. In the 89th Congress I sponsored an amendment that cut off Public Law 480 shipments to that country because it was aiding North Vietnam.

The most recent example of expanding Yugoslav commitment to a less centralized governmental systems and its own economic and political well being appeared in the August 7 issue of the International Commerce. This article, based on a State Department dispatch, describes further expansion of Yugoslav free zone for economic cooperation with Western nations. I might add that this is the only Socialist country which has permitted foreign investments on its soil. The latest is the fourth area allocated for such purpose. The free zone in Split on the Adriatic Sea covers an area of 35 acres, with some 7½ acres of enclosed space. A modest development. Here join Yugoslav-foreign company effort is aimed at construction, machining, processing, repackaging, finishing and repairing for profit-sharing operations.

Judging by a reportedly less dogmatic involvement of the Communist Party in Yugoslav domestic affairs, a recent novisa required by Western tourists, and other liberalizing tendencies one can say to its people, "Keep up the trend toward freer relations between your country and the West."

I should like to include the article which appeared in the International Commerce weekly:

YUGOSLAVIA ALLOWS FOREIGN AND LOCAL FIRMS TO COOPERATE IN FREE TRADE ZONE ACTIVITY

New regulations for Yugoslav Free Zones now permit cooperation between Yugoslav business enterprises and foreign firms on the basis of a contract spelling out the area of joint activity. Effective May 18, the new rules allow cooperation in the finishing, processing, machining, or repairing foreign goods; and storing, sorting, re-packing and other commercial manipulation of goods, as well as the construction of facilities for such activities.

Transfer of income is permitted under the pertinent foreign exchange regulations; foreign equipment enjoys customs-free status as long as it is used within the customs-free zone for the above purposes. Subject to the approval of the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Trade, foreign firms may establish an office within the zone in connection with a joint business arrangement and may employ both foreign and Yugoslav citizens.

The application of the Yugoslav seaport of Split for a customs-free zone has recently been approved. The free zone is in the northern part of the harbor, and covers about 140,000 square meters of open space and 29,000 square meters of enclosed space. Other free zones already in existence are in Belgrade, Koper, and Rijeka. The ports of Bar and Ploce also have applied for custom-free facilities.

Holders of OBR 65-49, "Foreign Trade Regulations of Yugoslavia," may wish to note the above as supplementing the section of Free Zones.

CCC "BUDGETARY GIMMICKERY"

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I was interested to read the testimony of Budget Director Schultze before the House Ways and Means Committee concerning the administration's tax proposal. In his testimony, Mr. Schultze referred to "relatively uncontrollable" increases in expenditures for fiscal 1968 over last January's estimates. Included in this category was \$400 million of increased Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures for price-support payments. This is a \$400 million increase over the estimated expenditures for this purpose presented to us in January.

After studying CCC's expenditure pattern over recent years, I had some questions about the January estimate for fiscal 1968. Since that estimate appeared to be considerably below actual experience in 1966 and 1967, I wondered if the Secretary of Agriculture had plans to call for changes in current farm programs or if this was what has become known as "budget gimmickery." I need not wonder any longer. It was the latter.

My colleagues may well recall that when the USDA appropriations bill for fiscal 1968 was up for consideration earlier this year that I raised the question and offered an amendment to hold expenditures of CCC to the level presented in the budget. My purpose for making this amendment was to make CCC spending controllable. If the amount placed in the budget was not sufficient to carry out price-support programs, then I wanted the administration to say so at the time or come back at a later date and get a supplemental appropriation to fill those needs.

It is most unfortunate that my motion to put these precise controls on the expenditures of the Department of Agriculture did not come to a vote before this House. However, I do not believe that we should let this matter die. I urge my colleagues to join me in the future to press for expenditure control measures such as this. With administration leaders admitting they cannot control expenditures, then it is time for the Congress to prove that it can and will control them through the very proper channels of regulated appropriations for every expenditure made.

BLACKSTONE GANG WINS HIGH PRAISE OF LUTHERAN NEWS-PAPER

Mr. O'HARA 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. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that the Chicago Blackstone Gang, of the South Side of Chicago has established status for itself and to extend my remarks to include the laudatory comment in a leading newspaper of the Lutheran Church.

First, the members of the Blackstone Gang put on a musical which packed all performances and won the praise of professional critics.

August 12 was Bud Billiken Day which is celebrated by the Negro community with a big parade. The Blackstone Rangers decided to celebrate Bud Billiken Day by visiting Valparaiso University. Here is the article from the Lutheran Witness Reporter of August 20, 1967, describing the "Peaceful Invasion of the Valparaiso Campus" by the Blackstone Rangers.

CHICAGO BLACKSTONE GANG CAPTIVATED WITH VALPO UNIVERSITY IN PEACEFUL INVASION

VALPARAISO, IND.—Some 800 Blackstone Rangers invaded Valparaiso University here on Saturday, Aug. 12, and, by their own admission, they received a royal welcome.

The South Chicago gang decided it would be better for the peace of the community if they left town on the day of the big parade. "The big parade" is held annually in honor of Bud Billiken, a Negro who has played Santa in the area for the past 10 or 12 years.

Fearing that violence might erupt if a clash developed, the Rangers looked for a place to go. On Aug. 12—just 2 days before the parade—Rev. George T. Hrbek, director of the Chicago project of the Lutheran Human Relations Association of America, suggested Valparaiso. The VU administration reacted favorably to the request—and the deal was on.

In a telephone conversation with the Reporter on the following Monday, Pastor Hrbek reported that he was gratified with the results.

"Several of the Ranger leaders met with Dr. O. P. Kretzmann, president of the university, to express their sincere appreciation 'for all the trouble you went to provide us with a place,'" Pastor Hrbek told the Reporter. The gang, not one of them a Lutheran, expressed surprise that "the Lutherans are so gracious."

PURPOSE OF GANG

In its Aug. 11 issue *Time* magazine credits the Blackstone Rangers and two other gangs in part with keeping racial peace in Chicago this summer.

The Rangers, a part of the 15,000-member Blackstone "nation," is composed of Negro youngsters between the ages of 13 and 19. Their purpose, as expressed by Pastor Hrbek, is "to help the Negro youth recognize their own potential so that they can be responsible and appreciate the fact that black is beautiful."

The 800 teen-agers left Chicago at 10 a.m. in 17 chartered buses and several private cars. They arrived on the VU campus shortly after noon and immediately began to serve the food they brought with them—barbecued ribs, hams, chickens, pop, ice cream.

After the lunch, which took about an hour and a half to serve, the Rangers enjoyed the Valpo pool in groups of 75, played volleyball on five courts, used the 10 areas Valpo provided for softball and touch football, and staged a bongo drum concert and dance on the tennis courts. About 10 percent of the people who made the trip were girls.

DISCIPLINE AMAZING

The Rangers left for their Chicago haunts about 6:30 p.m. "The discipline their leaders

exert is amazing," Pastor Hrbek, a 1958 graduate of the St. Louis seminary, noted. "They were so well organized that they policed the areas they used in 10 minutes—and the job of picking up was so thorough that you couldn't tell they were there."

Pastor Hrbek emphasized that "the whole project was their project." Some 20 adults and Prince of Peace Volunteers, most of them white, went along, but the "happening" belonged to the Rangers.

Transportation was financed by the community in which the Rangers live. The food was brought by them or purchased with funds from their treasury.

"The Blackstone Rangers are attempting to change their image," the Chicago project director told the Reporter. "They are selecting leaders with intelligence, and they are endeavoring to do constructive things. No white man can assume a position of leadership; you must earn their trust even to be a counselor."

Meanwhile, back in Chicago the television stations were photographing the hot parade with its emphasis on militant black power. But the Blackstone Rangers were in Valparaiso—enjoying a cool summer day, thanks to "the good deed of Valpo."

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON H.R. 6497, A BILL TO MAKE STATUTORY THE TAX DEDUCTION ALLOWED TEACHERS FOR EXPENSES INCURRED IN THEIR CONTINUING EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 of this year, I introduced H.R. 6497, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act so as to allow teachers to deduct from the gross income the expenses which they have incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit at institutions of higher education, including expenses for certain travel related thereto. At last count, 67 Members of the House had introduced bills which, although not identical, seek to remedy the problem of continuing education deductions for teachers. These bills can be categorized into eight basic types and I will include a table comparing the different bills as a part of the RECORD along with my remarks.

When I introduced H.R. 6497, I informed the teachers in my district of the bill's content and asked that they write me letters evaluating this proposed legislation. Mr. Speaker, the response was overwhelming. Cards and letters from a few of the nearly 300 Coloradans who responded are with me and I have asked the unanimous consent of the House that they be inserted into the RECORD immediately following these remarks, along with a list of all the Coloradans who have placed on paper their support of H.R. 6497. Also, Mr. Speaker, I intend to present this mail to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who chairs our Committee on Ways and

Means. It is my hope that the volume and unanimity of this mail will encourage the chairman to hold hearings on the bill, and to do all he can to have it favorably reported to the House for its early consideration.

Mr. Speaker, a compelling reason for immediate House action on H.R. 6497 is the broad-based bipartisan support the bill enjoys. Of the 67 related bills I earlier mentioned, 35 have been introduced by Members on our side of the aisle, and 32 have been introduced by our colleagues from the other side.

All Members of Congress are aware of the tremendous job that is being done by the teachers of our Nation. Furthermore, they are doing a better job every year, as can be shown by the success the United States has had in meeting the educational challenges and demands of our times. But, to be able to meet these challenges, teachers must continually return to colleges and universities to make themselves aware of new developments in both their fields of academic endeavor and in educational devices and methodology. Continuing teacher education is an absolute prerequisite for those who wish to become principals, superintendents, or other administrators. But beyond this, teachers are, in increasing numbers, having to continue their educations to merely retain their present status.

One teacher informs me that in the State of Colorado, "our State department—of education—may very well, in the near future, require at least 30 semester hours or a master's degree to teach in secondary schools." Yet, Mr. Speaker, under current law these teachers must rely on Internal Revenue Service whims on the matter of whether or not these expenses are deductible.

Additionally, these conscientious teachers feel that their commitment to the education of our Nation's youth necessitates keeping up to date with developments in their fields. They want to give their students the best possible education and know that this can only be achieved by continuing their own studies. Unfortunately, the fulfillment of these teachers' desires are costly, but fortunately, the many members of the teaching profession are willing to bear such expenses to the limit of their resources. A teaching couple in Brighton, Colo., informs me that the only way they "can continue teaching and raise—their—family of five children is to moonlight." Mr. Speaker, I submit that moonlighting is not an activity that we in the Congress should want to encourage among our teachers through the tax policies we write for the country. Another teacher, this one from Arvada, Colo., assures me that the knowledge she has obtained in summer sessions has become incorporated into her lessons and has thus been directly beneficial to her students. She points out the real financial question involved:

The ability to deduct expenses for additional education has been a financial encouragement not because it is a monetary gain, but because the financial loss is lessened.

She further states that additional education does not always imply an immediate raise in salary. In this connec-

tion, I should add that a substantial number of teachers have reported to me that the cost of continuing education often is never fully recouped, even when salary increases do follow.

The importance of education to the U.S. growth and development cannot be understated. Indeed, economists have, in recent years, come to the conclusion that a minimum of one-sixth of our annual increase in gross national product can be attributed to investment in the human factor. Some of this is directly traceable to the efforts of our schools. But, all of it is generated by the schools in a way analogous to the way in which the economic infrastructure generates capitalization and production. If the schools are going to continue their contributions to America's growth and prosperity, it goes almost without saying that teachers must continually update and upgrade their skills. Mr. Speaker, facilitation of those ends is embodied in the legislation I have proposed.

H.R. 6497 has become necessary because of the changeable attitudes evidenced by the Internal Revenue Service in recent years. A teacher in my district told me, "The change in regulations from year to year by the Internal Revenue Service has been very distressing to everyone in education." If a teacher does not, in advance, know with certainty that his continuing education costs will be deductible, a great deal of incentive to return to college classes will be removed. Teachers, who generally must follow strict budgets in any event, are in no position to take advantage of the legal recourses available to those who have been wronged by unfavorable administrative decisions. And, I remind the House that while Internal Revenue Service rulings and regulations are subject to change on very short notice, teachers must plan for their return to colleges and universities many months in advance. A sudden switch in Internal Revenue Service policy could have disastrous effects on

a teacher who has given up his summer employment for the betterment of his teaching skills, only to later find out that he can, in fact, not afford a summer of study, and that he also no longer has his best source of summer income available to him.

I have suggested several reasons for not leaving these matters within the discretion of the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service. There are other reasons worthy of mention. I feel that it is our responsibility, as Members of Congress, to write the country's tax policies. When the Congress holds hearings on a piece of legislation, a record of legislative intent is built. The hearings and committee reports will be of considerable assistance in reaching a uniform interpretation of the law. That such a record of congressional intent is necessary can be shown by a brief history of teacher education deductions.

The most charitable term I can use to describe the recent legal history of teacher deductions is "unsettled." It has been an "on-again, off-again" proposition. In 1958, Treasury Decision 6291 was issued for the purpose of recognizing, as legitimate business expenses, the costs of continuing teacher education. But, teachers found great difficulty in claiming the deductions which all thought to be allowed by Treasury Decision 6291. In fact, extensive, and I should add, expensive, litigation has been required down through the years. In 1960, a clarification ruling was issued, but it did not cover such things as the deductibility of expenses incurred as a result of educational travel, and the teachers' difficulties continued. I have a brief from the NEA which outlines numerous court decisions handed down between April 1958, and July 1966. For example, there have been Tax Court decisions in 1960 and 1961, a U.S. Court of Appeals decision in 1961, a U.S. District Court decision in 1961, four Tax Court decisions in

1962, three U.S. Court of Appeals decisions and a Tax Court decision in 1964.

In June of 1964, the Internal Revenue Service decided to limit deductions for educational travel to that occurring while on sabbatical leave. Attempts to remedy the situation by legislation were again made, but without success. Then, on July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service published a proposed regulation which would make most teachers' educational expenses nondeductible. That regulation never became effective, and on May 2, 1967, Treasury Decision 6918 was issued to generally liberalize the deductions that might be claimed by teachers. Whether the new regulation will be restrictively construed by local IRS agents remains to be seen. I believe the possibility of such an occurrence should be removed.

Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons I urge our Committee on Ways and Means to proceed with consideration of H.R. 6497 at once. I propose that tax deductions for teachers continuing their educations be codified into our statute books. I propose this method of assisting the Nation's teachers because it is the most efficient form of assistance and also because it is the method which is least inhibitive of freedom of choice and academic freedom, both of which are essential ingredients in the American concept of education. The passage of such a law would not be a huge drain on our Treasury. It would encourage, not discourage, initiative and improvement on the part of our teachers; it would permit our teachers to plan their futures; it would make our laws uniform in this respect in all of the 50 States.

In short, I believe it would definitely be in the Nation's interest.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include the table referred to, several letters from Colorado teachers expressing their support of H.R. 6497, and a list of Coloradans who have taken the time to write in support of this bill:

Bill	H.R. 6497 (Mr. Brozman); H.R. 646 (Mrs. Griffiths)	H.R. 138 (Mr. Talcott)	H.R. 193 (Mr. Anderson of Tennessee)	H.R. 310 (Mr. Broomfield)	H.R. 899 (Mr. Morton)	H.R. 5242 (Mr. Berry)	H.R. 8030 (Mr. Rarick)
PROVISIONS							
Law -----	1. Inserts a new subsection (f) in 26 U.S.C. 162. 2. Redefines "gross income" to reflect this new deduction.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. No redefinition of gross income.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. Same as H.R. 6497, but broadened to include other self-employed individuals.	1. Same as H.R. 6497. 2. No redefinition of gross income.
Eligibility -----	1. Teacher during taxable year; or 2. Teacher during the last 4 years and attended an institution of higher education during taxable year.	1. 1 supplying a written statement from school officials saying the teacher: (a) Taught for 6 months during year, undertook and completed advanced training. (b) Education necessary to develop skills or maintain job. 2. May use other methods of proof available to taxpayers.	1. Same as H.R. 138 except that education need not be advanced. 2. Same as H.R. 138.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Self-employed for 5 preceding years; or 2. Employer grants a specific leave of absence; or 3. Currently, or most recently employed as a teacher. 4. Once qualified, a person may deduct for more than 1 year if course of study lasts more than 1 year.	1. Elementary and secondary school teachers.
Scope of deduction ---	1. Tuition and fees required for attendance and for credit courses or degrees. 2. Books, supplies, and materials required for credit courses or degrees. 3. Traveling expenses (but not lavish) while away from home and in attendance.	1. Ordinary and necessary tuition, fees, and expenses (including related expenses in 26 USC 162(a)(2)).	1. Same as H.R. 138.	1. Eligible education expenses, which are expenses for— (a) Tuition and fees. (b) Travel away from home. (c) Books and materials required for credit courses or a degree. (d) Related books and materials up to	1. Same as H.R. 6497 for deductions 1 to 3, but no provision is made for deduction of educational travel costs (deduction No. 4 in column dealing with H.R. 6497).	1. Same as H.R. 310, except that— (a) No deduction for related books is mentioned. (b) Expenses need only be required for a course of study.	1. Same as H.R. 310 except that expenses for items (a), (b), and (c) cannot exceed \$500 per year.

Footnotes at end of table.

Bill	H.R. 6497 (Mr. Brozman); H.R. 646 (Mrs. Griffiths)	H.R. 138 (Mr. Talcott)	H.R. 193 (Mr. Anderson of Tennessee)	H.R. 310 (Mr. Broomfield)	H.R. 899 (Mr. Morton)	H.R. 5242 (Mr. Berry)	H.R. 8030 (Mr. Rarick)
PROVISIONS—Cont.							
Scope of deduction	4. Educational travel costs if academic credit given for travel or if travel is accepted by employer in satisfaction of some requirements.			\$100 and which expenses are required for a course or for a degree (courses must be for credit).			
Definitions	1. Teacher—Classroom teacher, supervisor, administrator, adviser, or consultant (including but not limited to guidance counselors and librarians.) 2. Educational institution—Same as 26 U.S.C. 151(e)(4). 3. Institution of higher education—One authorized to confer baccalaureate or higher degrees.	1. Teacher—Same as H.R. 6497. 2. School—Same as 26 U.S.C. 503(b)(2). 3. Advanced education—Any course, travel (not to exceed \$350), or activity which is employer required or in an area in which teacher performs or is related to improving skills or is for an advanced degree.	1. Teacher—Same as H.R. 6497. 2. School—Same as H.R. 138. 3. Education—basically the same as advanced education in H.R. 138, except that there is no \$350 travel limitation.	1. Teacher—Basically the same as H.R. 6497, but does not mention advisers or consultants generally. 2. Institutions of higher education—Same as sec. 103(b) of NDEA of 1958. 3. Elementary school—Same as sec. 103(g) of NDEA of 1958. 4. Secondary school—Same as sec. 103(h) of NDEA of 1958.	1. Teacher—Same as H.R. 6497. 2. Educational institution—Same as H.R. 6497. 3. Institution of higher education—Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Teacher—The Secretary shall make appropriate regulations for defining who qualifies as a teacher. 2. Institution of higher education—Same as sec. 103(b) of NDEA of 1958.	1. Teacher—Full-time elementary and secondary school teachers. 2. Institution of higher education—Not defined. 3. Elementary school—Same as H.R. 310. 4. Secondary school—Same as H.R. 310.
Exceptions	1. Does not apply prior to time of 1st service as a teacher. 2. Does not apply to education not related to a person's teaching career.	1. Advanced education—does not include the above mentioned expenses when they are for personal benefit or changing employment. 1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as for advanced education in H.R. 138. 1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. None. 1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. For teachers, the course of study must be directly related to their teaching profession, or calculated to improving skills or status. 1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Librarians, guidance counselors, supervisors, and administrators are not included as teachers. 1. Same as H.R. 6497.
Effective date	1. Next taxable year after enactment.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.	1. Same as H.R. 6497.

¹ H.R. 5043 by Mr. Cramer is an 8th type of related bill, but is not mentioned because it is identical to H.R. 6497 insofar as teachers are concerned. The distinguishing characteristic of H.R. 5043 is that the provisions for teachers appear as title IV to the Private Enterprise and Individual Initiative Act of 1967.

SAMPLE LETTERS FROM THE NEARLY 800 COLORADANS WHO HAVE EXPRESSED THEIR SUPPORT FOR H.R. 6497, INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN DONALD G. BROTZMAN

BRIGHTON, COLO.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROTZMAN: The bill which you introduced into Congress, H.R. 6497, regarding tax deductions for teachers certainly deserves the support of the teaching profession.

Unfortunately, like other Americans, if the situation is not immediate, teachers tend to ignore it. The recent rulings announced by the Internal Revenue Service have mollified the teachers, and now they can see no reason for pressing the matter further. As you pointed out in your remarks in the House, the rulings of the Internal Revenue Service are not law, and therefore can be changed at will. In view of this latter fact, please accept my encouragement in furtherance of the bill you have sponsored.

Yours truly,

GERALD O. KELVER.

LONGMONT, COLO.

DEAR SIR: I should like to express myself in favor of Bill H.R. 6497 which is designated to support income tax deduction for teachers who incur costs for improving their education.

I have completed my own college education and have helped my husband send four children to college. I know that on a single salary this would have been impossible. How much it would have helped to be able to deduct the cost of my own advanced training!

I see young men in the profession who have young children and are struggling to make ends meet on a single teaching salary. Many need to work during the summer to keep the family going and cannot get their advanced work or must borrow to do it. It is becoming increasingly necessary in the teaching profession to get a Master's Degree or beyond. A tax break would help!

Yours truly,

Mrs. LOUISE E. BILLINGS.

EVERGREEN, COLO.

DEAR SIR: I most certainly feel that an income tax deduction for teachers' educational expenses is long overdue. For years a me-

chanic has deducted for tools, a waitress for uniforms, and business men for advertising. As I see it this deduction for education is not too much different as education is the uniform of the profession, the tool of the teacher and the advertisement of the business of education.

I most certainly hope this long overdue equality is forthcoming by the very early passage of your bill.

Each year for the past several years the firm of tax experts that has done my income tax has been in a dilemma about the deduction of educational expenses, some years allowing them and some years not allowing them. I find it absolutely necessary to go to school if I am to keep up with the fast moving field of education as it is today.

Never before in the history of the U.S. has the education of our young been so important and if our country is to avoid the fate of China and the other over populated countries as it becomes more congested we must have well educated masses in order for our heritage of freedom and democracy to survive.

The necessity for additional periodic education for this nation's teachers can hardly be denied and is just as necessary as tools for a mechanic, machinery for a farmer, transportation for a salesman, or office deductions for a business man.

It is time Congress recognized this and gave the teachers of this nation their assurance that advanced educational upkeep was recognized by the leaders of this nation as a necessity of the teaching profession.

Sincerely,

RILEY D. SCOTT.

ARVADA, COLO.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROTZMAN: I strongly support your bill which would allow teachers and educational administrators to deduct certain education expenses in computing their income taxes. We thank you for your interest and loyalty in behalf of educators.

My husband is an elementary school principal in Jefferson County and is presently working toward a doctorate degree at Greeley (Colorado State College). I am an elementary school teacher myself, who remains at home with young children. Ever since our marriage nine years ago, we have been struggling to

obtain post-graduate education and it has been a slow, painful, and expensive process. Year after year we have borrowed money for my husband to continue his educational goals. Until this past year, it has been necessary for both of us to have part-time employment to sustain ourselves in the field of education.

Several years ago when my husband completed his Master's degree we attempted to deduct our cost for tuition, books, thesis typing, etc. on our income tax form. We had spent over \$1,000.00 that year for educational expenses. My husband needed the degree to advance in administration. He was an assistant principal and wanted a principalship position, which required further education. The Internal Revenue Service investigated our return and told us that unless we had signed statements from my husband's principal and the Superintendent of Schools stating that he absolutely had to have this degree to maintain his position, that it was necessary to meet the requirements of his employment, we were not eligible for any educational deduction. It was explained to us that education for one's personal advancement, improvement, or step from teaching into administration could not be counted. Unless our employer stated that my husband would lose his job if he didn't further his education, we were not eligible. We discussed this with both the principal and the superintendent at the time and were forced to admit that this was not the case. My husband was not in danger of being fired from his position. He could choose to remain an assistant principal the rest of his life. Only his own desire to advance within his chosen field and become a superintendent of schools someday prompted his educational pursuit. It goes without saying that a doctorate degree in the field of education is required for the positions he seeks. We were unable to deduct any educational expenses and had to borrow money to pay the Internal Revenue Service at that time. Since that time we have made no effort to deduct any of our further education expenses. We never once tried to collect anything for travelling and living expenses incurred while attending an educational institution. My husband commutes some 160 miles daily to Greeley to continue his education.

Many of our personal friends have left the field of education for greener financial pastures. As an administrator, my husband is often chagrined by the quality of people who we can attract to the classroom. What could be added to the creative output of our nation if we could tap and utilize our greatest resource—people. We must encourage and not penalize our educators.

As a debt-ridden, discouraged, but dedicated teacher, I thank you for your assistance. You have the full support of my husband and I.

Sincerely,

SUSANNE MASON.

AURORA, COLO.

DEAR SIR: The income tax deduction for teachers improving their education is needed for people like ourselves.

My husband and I both teach. We have no children, so our monthly taxation is tremendously high. Next year my husband has decided to go back to school for his Masters Degree. He will be going to New Mexico on a grant. There are no openings in my field in the schools there, so I will not be working. Recently we checked with the movers and the move will cost us over \$500. We will have other school expenses: food, rent, clothing, and of course, taxes for the remainder of the year.

We need all the help we can get in the way of deductions. Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. DON R. ROBINSON.

LAFAYETTE, COLO.

DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: Educators have too long been at the mercy of the Internal Revenue Service.

H.R. 6497 may at last give educators the opportunity to improve their teaching or administrative skills and know the financial burden will not take food from the family table.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. BELLOMO.

AURORA, COLO.

DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: I appreciate your efforts to secure tax deductions for educational expenses. The rapid developments in the field of education cannot be utilized by the schools unless teachers are made aware of them and trained to put them into practice. I believe that money spent to educate either yourself or your children should be considered a tax deductible expense. It is the most direct and inexpensive method of assisting those persons who wish to make this effort. I thank you for your introduction of this type of legislation.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. MERLE DAVIS.

ARVADA, COLO.

MY DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: I am writing this letter in support of H.R. 6497. I feel that it is high time that I.R.S. should be guided by congressional legislation in establishing income tax deductions for teachers who incur educational expenses. Tuition, books, travel, lodging and other related fees are very expensive. Colorado requires its public school teachers and administrators to improve themselves through additional college courses. In fact, most states require this.

It has become quite evident that our nation holds education—quality education—necessary for purposes of national defense and progress. To impart such a program of quality education it seems logical that teachers and school administrators should improve their knowledge in both scope and validity. College courses are one fine means for doing this.

It is already difficult to attract talented people to the education profession because of its relatively low wages. The added deficit

of paying for required college courses makes education monetarily less attractive.

Should H.R. 6497 become law, it would help in a measure to make education more attractive to qualified teachers and administrators.

Indeed, it would be a step toward a better America through better education.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM C. BARLOW.

ENGLEWOOD, COLO.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BROTZMAN: Support for H.R. 6497 dealing with educational expenses for teachers is fully supported by teachers. I am sick and tired of being harassed by the Internal Revenue Service every year about educational expenses.

Every year I get a different auditor who has a different viewpoint on the same poorly written I.R.S. Code. And, of course, the tax refund is delayed until August. This year I even offered to come down in advance of the April 17th filing date to be audited, but to no avail. Once again the refund will be unnecessarily delayed.

Please push this bill through. Thank you.

Sincerely,

E. THOMAS GARMAN.

DEAR MR. BROTZMAN: I want to go on record supporting H.R. 6497, allowing teachers and educational administrators to deduct certain expenses incurring in improving their qualifications for the teaching profession.

Innovations and curriculum changes are constantly being introduced, therefore, in order for the teacher to be effective in the classroom, it is necessary for him to attend summer workshops, clinics, and graduate school courses. In industry the cost of further schooling and training is absorbed by the company, whereas in education, the cost is left entirely up to the teacher. The teaching profession needs the full support of the Congress to allow deductions in the computation of income taxes.

I trust your bill will receive favorable support from your colleagues—our representatives in the Congress.

Sincerely,

CLAUDE STIEHA.

LIST OF COLORADANS SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD G. BROTZMAN TO HAVE H.R. 6497 ENACTED THIS SESSION OF CONGRESS

E. Thomas Garman, Englewood.
 Claude Stieha, Englewood.
 William C. Barlow, Westminster.
 Mrs. Merle Davis, Aurora.
 John A. Bellomo, Lafayette.
 Mrs. Don R. Robinson, Aurora.
 Margaret Ann James, Arvada.
 Susanne Mason, Arvada.
 Riley D. Scott, Evergreen.
 Mrs. Louise E. Billings, Longmont.
 Gerald O. Kelver, Brighton.
 Robert DeBrey, Commerce City.
 Mrs. Robert DeBrey, Commerce City.
 Mrs. Joan Lind, Longmont.
 Wilburt Zulauf, Longmont.
 Paul E. Kasza, Jr., Brighton.
 Marguerite Wisecup, Longmont.
 Nelle L. Sandoval, Aurora.
 Rosemary Scheuring, Arvada.
 Joann Hanson, Longmont.
 Edward C. Pino, Englewood.
 George S. Jurata, Arvada.
 Marian Watkins, Denver.
 Herbert E. Bowman, Littleton.
 C. L. Stiverson, Denver.
 Judith E. Sullivan, Denver.
 Bess V. Neep, Denver.
 Robert F. Pyle, Denver.
 Joseph L. Mapes, Boulder.
 Marilyn Jo Mapes, Boulder.
 Lorene Lundstrim, Denver.
 Ida Magnusson, Arvada.
 H. Grant Vest, Denver.
 Geraldine T. Frank, Denver.
 Vern Knock, Arvada.
 Jerrold R. Duerksen, Arvada.
 Carolee Forrer, Denver.
 Beatrice Powell, Steamboat Springs.
 Mrs. Jessie E. Ball, Steamboat Springs.
 Judith Ryan, Steamboat Springs.
 Carol Jean Doner, Lafayette.
 Edna M. DeVoll, Lafayette.
 Roberta G. Simmons, Lafayette.
 Ann Bramball, Lafayette.
 Mary L. Williams, Lafayette.
 Bertha A. Sleppy, Lafayette.
 Jean Stermlon, Lafayette.
 Lynn Peterson, Lafayette.
 Jo Ann Mazzeri, Lafayette.
 Nancy Bailey, Lafayette.
 W. W. Housar, Lafayette.
 Bridget Olguin, Lafayette.
 Anna Marie Bittner, Lafayette.
 Robert Caklin, Lafayette.
 Susan Flint Smith, Lafayette.
 Martha Lou Heltzel, Lafayette.
 Elizabeth Nason, Lafayette.
 Neva E. Kelly, Lafayette.
 Donald D. Hagan, Lafayette.
 Robert C. Reyes, Lafayette.
 Myrtle Graham, Steamboat Springs.
 Mary Powell, Steamboat Springs.
 Judith S. Yamaguchi, Steamboat Springs.
 Zella Mae Williams, Steamboat Springs.
 Frances T. Saylor, Fort Morgan.
 Susan Sperry, Boulder.
 Opal Sauer, Steamboat Springs.
 Don G. Curtis, Arvada.
 Minnie R. Hertzog, Steamboat Springs.
 Mrs. B. J. McClaffin, Englewood.
 James Buller, Brighton.
 Charles M. Mallek, Boulder.
 Barbara L. Mallek, Boulder.
 Jack O. Pope, Longmont.
 John F. Stephens, Longmont.
 George D. Hockman, Littleton.
 J. R. McCartney, Pueblo.
 Mrs. J. R. McCartney, Pueblo.
 Louise M. Parks, Longmont.
 Helen Burnett, Denver.
 Linda L. Wurtz, Boulder.
 Bonnie L. Manion, Longmont.
 William Manion, Longmont.
 Larry E. Longtreth, Longmont.
 Phyllis E. Hamilton, Longmont.
 Alma J. Baldwin, Steamboat Springs.
 Billee Harris, Steamboat Springs.
 Laird King, Longmont.
 Mrs. Laird King, Longmont.
 Carolyn White, Westminster.
 Beverly Winter, Littleton.
 Carol Kramer, Aurora.
 Louise M. Workman, Denver.
 Phyllis Fitzsimmons, Boulder.
 Olive Fassett, Denver.
 Carol Buxton, Westminster.
 Jean W. Foss, Nederland.
 Mable L. Kirby, Englewood.
 Lana Kirby, Englewood.
 Lowell R. Kirby, Englewood.
 John Nelson, Lakewood.
 Wayne C. Phillips, Arvada.
 Edwin J. Wilcox, Arvada.
 Mel Schwartz, Denver.
 Mrs. Mel Schwartz, Denver.
 Dale F. Reed, Lakewood.
 Melinda H. Reed, Lakewood.
 Susanne S. Smith, Evergreen.
 C. W. Witherspoon Jr., Morrison.
 Mrs. C. W. Witherspoon Jr., Morrison.
 Uhla Lautenklas, Arvada.
 Joan A. Steinhour, Commerce City.
 Jo Ann Baird, Boulder.
 Shirley J. Tronsgard, Lakewood.
 Bertha Kidder, Golden.
 Lucille E. Brown, Johnstown.
 Richard Yamaguchi, Arvada.
 Ely Karasik, Denver.
 Sue Wheat, Denver.
 Nancy Winograd, Lakewood.
 Mary Jane Riley, Lakewood.
 Mrs. Wallace K. Sherertz, Lakewood.
 DeForest R. Chase, Denver.
 Pauline Stieha, Denver.
 Helen H. Crisman, Aurora.

John M. Dale, Aurora.
 Tony B. Cantu, Littleton.
 Rosalie Alldredge, Boulder.
 L. A. Hoelscher, Englewood.
 Mrs. L. A. Hoelscher, Englewood.
 Sandra Godden, Boulder.
 Mrs. John E. Kulakowski, Littleton.
 Carol L. Jensen, Boulder.
 Mary A. Leonard, Broomfield.
 Evelyn B. Mullen, Broomfield.
 Darlene Gustafson, Broomfield.
 Grace Skinner, Denver.
 Thomas M. Geler, Boulder.
 C. Richard Anderson, Boulder.
 Janice S. Vickrey, Boulder.
 Cynthia L. Robertson, Broomfield.
 Edna Ruth Fields, Broomfield.
 Lynne Gale, Boulder.
 Mary Louise Carson, Boulder.
 Ruby Rosenberger, Denver.
 Karen L. Grant, Broomfield.
 Orlando Manchego, Lafayette.
 Walter Shilton, Broomfield.
 Pamela Ward, Boulder.
 Bernard Duran, Denver.
 Mrs. Hattie C. Dieringer, Broomfield.
 Mrs. Monna Williams, Boulder.
 Mrs. Inez Flint, Broomfield.
 Mrs. Frances Mann, Broomfield.
 Mrs. Estelle P. Johnson, Golden.
 Mrs. Bette Jeppson, Broomfield.
 Mrs. Nancy Moor, Boulder.
 Mrs. Marilyn Dally, Broomfield.
 Jean Gray, Boulder.
 John R. Ortner, Broomfield.
 Glenn A. Hearne, Denver.
 Leon H. Terrell, Boulder.
 Betty S. Terrell, Boulder.
 Gary H. Weber, Denver.
 Verna Drain Baird, Denver.
 Cara Thompson, Littleton.
 Virginia R. Smrcka, Littleton.
 Doris Southworth, Westminster.
 Thomas A. Youngberg, Boulder.
 Mrs. J. D. Demaree, Boulder.
 Albert E. Zarlengo, Jr., Denver.
 Lois Robinson, Steamboat Springs.
 Marilyn S. Vaughn, Denver.
 Gerald H. Smith, Broomfield.
 Helen V. Smith, Broomfield.
 Louise Cummins, Littleton.
 Marcia J. Berndt, Denver.
 Doug. D. Williams, Longmont.
 Judith E. Williams, Longmont.
 Harriett M. Grass, Aurora.
 Nancy Smith, Denver.
 Florence E. Manahan, Aurora.
 Faye Lurvey, Westminster.
 Reginald S. Holmes, Jr., Littleton.
 Max D. Smith, Littleton.
 Floy Louise Tugman, Littleton.
 James A. Sible, Littleton.
 Mrs. James A. Sible, Littleton.
 Irma C. Wilson, Boulder.
 Lorna L. Rinck, Aurora.
 Joe A. Rinck, Aurora.
 E. Theodore Archuleta, Longmont.
 Alice Ballinger, Holdrege, Nebraska.
 Mary Flowers, Englewood.
 Mrs. Adolf Huettner, Aurora.
 Jan Muyskens, Aurora.
 Janet W. Smith, Littleton.
 Evaeth Overholser, Boulder.
 Lucille D. Firth, Englewood.
 John Delburn, Aurora.
 Janet Champlin, Aurora.
 Robert R. Seno, Denver.
 Kay P. Millar, Denver.
 Joyce Cumsning, Denver.
 Veronica A. Murphy, Denver.
 Reba Pitcher, Denver.
 Donna J. Flibbe, Denver.
 Pamela G. Bianchi, Denver.
 Nancy King, Denver.
 Elizabeth Gudger, Denver.
 Karen R. Nygren, Denver.
 Donald E. Merrill, Aurora.
 Sally M. Merrill, Aurora.
 Linda Bradt, Littleton.
 Karen Babbitt, Jefferson County.
 Robert F. Brown, Brighton.

Jack L. Padgett, Littleton.
 Lloyd B. Curtis, Boulder.
 Florence E. Curtis, Boulder.
 Richard O. Schafer, Aurora.
 Mrs. Sadie Walden, Denver.
 Thomas J. Casey, Boulder.
 A. K. Mitchell, Denver.
 Lloyd Eastlund, Littleton.
 Glenela W. Fine, Thornton.
 Harvey L. Guest, Denver.
 Galen R. Crowder, Littleton.
 Ann Van Marter, Lakewood.
 George E. Bailey, Thornton.
 Mrs. George E. Bailey, Thornton.
 William E. Gavito, Westminster.
 Constance L. Morrow, Aurora.
 Munro A. McPhetres, Boulder.
 Dorothy M. Clark, Denver.
 Alice Spengler, Westminster.
 Harry J. Mrachek, Boulder.
 Mary Patania, Greeley.
 Dale H. Hoag, Denver.
 Dan Farrell, Boulder.
 Julianne Ruetz, Littleton.
 Lucy Fraker, Boulder.
 Lena A. Steele, Denver.
 David Hugins, Littleton.
 Eleanor M. Bridge, Denver.
 Betty Jane Hosler, Broomfield.
 Arly W. Burch, Aurora.
 T. Kulaga, Littleton.
 Carol M. Nydegger, Denver.
 William B. Satterwhite, Commerce City.
 Jack R. Reeves, Denver.
 Donald M. Duell, Englewood.
 Emma Lou Wilson, Englewood.
 William B. Landon, Englewood.
 Elizabeth Dennen, Englewood.
 Ruth Ann Steele, Littleton.
 John J. Dore, Littleton.
 Julius G. Uhrlaub, Jr., Littleton.
 Nancy Attkisson, Denver.
 Curn A. Gilchrist, Denver.
 Pauline Gilchrist, Denver.
 Richard L. Stalzie, Denver.
 Donald D. Bruno, Denver.
 J. E. Ripple, Boulder.
 C. M. Bennett, Boulder.
 Carl S. Wilkerson, Pueblo.
 Vicki L. Hall, Denver.
 Joseph Hart, Wheat Ridge.
 Shirley Harper, Lakewood.
 Hazel Petrocco, Denver.
 Harlan Heinz, Steamboat Springs.
 Margaret L. Maguire, Steamboat Springs.
 Marily M. Masten, Steamboat Springs.
 Mrs. Donald G. Gilman, Steamboat Springs.
 Jon L. Olsen, Steamboat Springs.
 Mrs. Brower, Steamboat Springs.
 M. J. Brower, Steamboat Springs.
 Analee Gardner, Steamboat Springs.
 Rina Bavaresco, Denver.
 Karen J. Hickey, Aurora.
 Helen C. Kort, Denver.
 Richard A. Sharkey, Aurora.
 L. R. Hickman, Longmont.
 Clara Mae Place, Steamboat Springs.
 James D. Mercer, Steamboat Springs.
 Gertrude Campbell, Steamboat Springs.
 Lucille Butler, Steamboat Springs.
 Patricia M. Reed, Steamboat Springs.
 A. M. Root, Steamboat Springs.
 Pearl Stehley, Steamboat Springs.
 Richard Russell, Steamboat Springs.
 Bertrand M. Ball, Steamboat Springs.

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. I yield to my colleague from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me by my distinguished colleague from Colorado to speak in support of realistic tax deductions for teachers.

Certainly there is no more vital business expense for the teacher than the furtherance of his own education. Often his tenure and his advancements hinge upon the attainment of a myriad of educational requirements imposed upon him

by his employer, the school system or institution of higher learning.

As we all recognize the great return to society that proficiency in teaching affords, so also must we recognize the real financial hardship some members of the teaching profession must endure in order to attain that proficiency. For many years, other professions have benefited from tax deductions involving a variety of business expenses.

CONTINUING CONCERN FOR TEACHERS

On May 6, 1965, after months of study and review with interested parties—the Kansas State Teachers Association, the National Education Association, and the Internal Revenue Service, I introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of a variety of educational expenses incurred by teachers in the course of their professional advancement. In introducing this bill in the 89th Congress, I stated:

The IRS must follow the letter of the Internal Revenue Code and has tried to provide fair interpretations within these limits. However, there remains extensive confusion and controversy. Such confusion could be eliminated by amending the law to provide deductions for educational expenses of teachers be based on explicit provisions in the Internal Revenue Code. Furthermore, legislation should be enacted to allow more extensive tax deductions for teachers who are willing to make the necessary effort and investment to become better qualified teachers.

Subsequent to introduction of the bill, I kept in constant communication with the National Education Association, the Kansas State Teachers Association, and the Internal Revenue Service, with respect to the issue of teachers tax deductions. On October 1, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service caused to be published in the Federal Register certain proposed regulations which greatly liberalized the code and, on May 2, 1967, the Internal Revenue Service promulgated regulations which allowed teachers to deduct a variety of educational expenses; indeed, these regulations followed closely many of the provisions included in my bill of May 6, 1965.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NECESSARY

Nonetheless, and notwithstanding the Internal Revenue Service revised regulations, in order for the teacher to realize the full advantage of these deductions congressional action is necessary.

The legislation introduced by many Members of both parties provides that the teacher may deduct his educational expenses, including the tuition and fees, the travel incurred, the books, materials, and supplies, from his gross income prior to the standard deduction allowed a taxpayer under the option for filing the short form.

This legislation, if enacted into law, will assert the Congress concern for the well-being of the teachers of the United States. It will specifically remove the ambiguity that has surrounded the whole issue of the deduction of teachers' educational expenses for so many years. The legislation not only provides clearly that the teacher's educational expenses may be deducted from his gross income, but also delineates just what those educational expenses may include.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation is enacted, teachers will not have to depend upon Internal Revenue Service interpretations, nor contend with necessary delays often involved with Internal Revenue Service rulings to receive tax deductions for educational expenses. The law will be clear on the subject.

The qualified and experienced instructor must be encouraged to advance to more specialized teaching positions or to positions of more responsibility.

It is my conviction that our educational system can be strengthened substantially through measures which seek to encourage the individual teacher to improve his teaching and administrative capacities and to continue to contribute the benefits of his experience and education to the educational system.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas for his contribution to this vital subject.

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 8280, to provide income tax deductions for teachers who are pursuing their education at institutions of higher learning is one of over 60 introduced this session to achieve this purpose. These bills reflect both the widespread concern within this body for taking whatever steps we can to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and second to make certain that no teacher will be deprived of these tax benefits through arbitrary or unpredictable Internal Revenue Service rulings.

It is a striking fact, as a recent—July 1967—issue of the Journal of Taxation has noted:

There is no statutory authority to deduct any education expenses. The closest statutory references which are to be found are those for ordinary and necessary business expenses under Section 162 as contrasted with capital expenditures (Section 263) and personal expenses (Section 262). Since the Code is silent on this point, the regulations are especially important. (p. 29)

I believe it is important that the Internal Revenue Code no longer be silent on this point. We should not have to rely so exclusively upon Internal Revenue regulations in this important area.

My bill, H.R. 8280, is designed to eliminate this deficiency. It would amend section 162 which, as I noted, relates to trade or business expenses, by permitting certain educational expenses of teachers to be deducted from gross income for income tax purposes. It would be limited to a person who was a teacher during the taxable year or during any of the 4 preceding taxable years and who attended a college or university during the taxable year. This subsection would clearly permit the deduction of ordinary and necessary expenses for tuition and fees, for books, supplies, and materials required for courses for academic credit, and for traveling expenses, including amounts spent for meals and lodging while away from home attending such institutions.

It permits similar deductions for educational travel where academic credit is

given for such travel by an institution of higher learning or where such travel is accepted by the taxpayer's employer in satisfaction of educational requirements set by such employer or by the State where he is employed as a teacher.

Now it is true that revised Internal Revenue Service rulings, contrary to previously proposed regulations, essentially permit the same kinds of expenditures as my bill does. But this by no means obviates the importance of having this bill passed. Without this bill we can have no assurance that the Internal Revenue Service will not again change the rulings and knock out deductions which, under current interpretations, are allowed.

Up until these revised regulations were passed, money spent for education could be deducted only if the expenditures were made to maintain or improve skills required in the taxpayer's job, trade, or business, or if it were required by the employer as a condition for the taxpayer to retain his or her job, salary, or status. The deductions were not permitted to teachers who returned to college voluntarily without being required to do so as a condition for holding their job or those who went back to school merely to become better teachers or to improve their salary potential. Without this bill, we can have no assurance that the Internal Revenue Service will not revert back to the narrower interpretation.

The education of America's children is too important a business to allow narrow tax technicalities to stand in the way of encouraging our teachers to improve themselves and the quality of the instruction they will be able to give our children.

We cannot expect teachers to do their best, to work long hours at low pay, when they see the tax laws interpreted in a way discriminatory and unfair to them. They have only to see how liberally the Internal Revenue Service has interpreted the short, intensive, and very expensive courses given for accountants, lawyers, and other highly paid professionals. Is there any profession in which we should encourage additional training more than education? Is there any place where such education will pay greater dividends for the future of our country?

This is not a subject to be trifled with. We must treat our teachers fairly. We must encourage them to advance their education and improve their teaching skills for the sake of our children and the future of our country. Therefore, I urge prompt consideration and rapid adoption of my bill, H.R. 8280, a copy of which I here include:

H.R. 8280

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) CERTAIN EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the 4 preceding taxable years, and who attended an institution of higher education during the taxable year, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for—

"(A) tuition and fees required for his attendance at such institution, for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such institution, or for an academic degree;

"(B) books, supplies, and materials required for courses for academic credit pursued by him at such an institution or for an academic degree; and

"(C) traveling expenses (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances) while away from home attending such institution.

"(2) EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL.—In the case of a taxpayer who is a teacher during the taxable year or who was a teacher during any of the 4 preceding taxable years, the deduction allowed by subsection (a) shall include the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred by him during the taxable year for travel while away from home (including amounts expended for meals and lodging other than amounts which are lavish or extravagant under the circumstances), if—

"(A) academic credit is given for such travel by an institution of higher education, or

"(B) such travel is accepted by the taxpayer's employer in satisfaction of educational requirements set by such employer or by the State in which the taxpayer is employed as a teacher.

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

"(A) The term 'teacher' means an individual who is employed as a classroom teacher at an educational institution, or as a supervisor, administrator, adviser, or consultant in any capacity related to the instructional program of such an institution (including but not limited to guidance counselors and librarians).

"(B) The term 'educational institution' means an educational institution as defined in section 151(e)(4).

"(C) The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution which is authorized to confer baccalaureate or higher academic degrees.

"(4) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(A) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer prior to the time he first performs services as a teacher.

"(B) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to any expense paid or incurred by the taxpayer for the purpose of obtaining, or qualifying for, employment than as a teacher."

SEC. 2. DEDUCTION FROM GROSS INCOME.—Section 62(2) (relating to definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES OF TEACHERS.—The deduction allowed by section 162(f) for the educational expenses of teachers."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BROTZMAN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his excellent presentation and for participating in this special order.

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

Mr. BROTZMAN. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks

made by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and the other Members who have spoken on this very timely and crucial issue.

I should like also to say that I, along with many of our colleagues, have introduced legislation which would codify tax deductions allowed teachers for expenses incurred in pursuing studies for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education. It is my view that this legislation is necessary to clear up the confusion surrounding this whole matter of educational deductions because we know that in the past the Internal Revenue Service has failed to be consistent in this area.

It is of the utmost importance for deductions of this nature to be clearly prescribed by statute rather than by the issuance of regulations by an administrative agency of the Federal Government. The enactment of a law will spell out precisely what deductions will be allowed.

I need not emphasize the importance of extending such a concession to a group of people who are charged with the vital task of molding the minds of our Nation's youth—our most precious resource. Every possible step must be taken to encourage our teachers to not only continue in the profession but to increase their knowledge of their subject matter and to acquire new methods and techniques of teaching that subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, I hope favorable and prompt action can be taken on this most crucial issue.

Again I commend the very distinguished gentleman from Colorado for his presentation today and the manner in which he has brought this matter to the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for a very valuable contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to join the distinguished gentleman from Colorado and my many other colleagues in calling to the attention of this House the need for positive action to encourage members of the teaching profession to continue their education.

There is no category of our society which receives so little rightful recognition as the dedicated men and women who mold the minds of our young people. Education is one of the basic pillars upon which a progressive society rests. Teachers should be given an incentive to broaden the scope of their knowledge, to keep in touch with advances being made in the field of education, and to develop an increasing understanding of the many facets of society for which the students they teach are preparing themselves. This not only helps the teachers but their students, and, as a result, the entire community and Nation benefit.

Allowing them full deduction for their educational and related expenses will enable many teachers to take additional courses or degrees which, in turn, will be reflected in their greater effectiveness in the classroom and on the campus.

In the early days of this Congress, I introduced legislation, H.R. 4913, which would provide for the income tax deductibility of all educational expenses incurred by teachers. Such expenses would include tuition, fees, books, supplies, and materials, and travel expenses, including educational travel. I hope earnestly that our concerted efforts here today will result in early action on this bill or one of its companion bills. In this way our fine teachers would be encouraged to improve their skills and expand their knowledge. Our schools, our young people, and our country cannot help but profit from this measure.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under existing authority, the Internal Revenue Service has broad powers to interpret the various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. To a great extent, this is necessary since it would be impractical to spell out all the details by law. From time to time, however, it seems the proposed rulemakings are contrary to congressional intent.

It is also true that eligibility for deductions, in many cases, is not clearly defined. A case in point is the allowance of deductions for expenses incurred by teachers in pursuing their education. Because of the complexity of tax laws and regulations, the teacher many times must appear before the IRS to argue his case for the deduction.

The quality of our educational system in great part is a function of the ability of our teachers. In my own State of Maryland, as many as 25,000 of the 33,000 public school teachers are taking courses. An estimated 1,600 teachers hold "provisional certificates" and must earn a bachelor's degree to continue teaching in the Maryland school system. Another 24,000 teachers are being prodded by the State's standard laws to advance from a bachelor's degree to a master's degree within a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, with these facts in mind, I have cosponsored legislation which will set down in law the eligibility of teachers' education expenses for tax deductions. Such costs will be deductible regardless of whether the individual is sharpening his teaching skills or pursuing a higher academic degree.

The enactment of this legislation will set Congress on record in support of a national policy to treat teachers' education expenses as an investment in the future, deserving of the same tax treatment that is accorded new plants and machine tools.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY]

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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman for providing this time and I am grateful to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] for bringing this important issue to the attention of the House. I wish to associate myself with his efforts to provide tax deductions for teachers for expenses they incur in continuing their educational training.

As the gentleman from Colorado knows, I have also long been interested in giving our hard-pressed teachers some relief from an inequity now existing in the Internal Revenue Code. On January 11, I reintroduced H.R. 2004, similar to a bill I had offered last year. My bill, as well as that of some 70 others, would simply amend the code to permit teachers to deduct from gross income the amount of expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education, including certain travel.

For a number of years, the Congress has had a commendable objective of improving the quality of education—at every level—and many, many millions of dollars have been expended in pursuit of this noble purpose.

Yet, there is a simple and direct way to help education, without massive Federal expenditures. This way is open to us by the simple expedient of a relatively minor tax benefit proposed in the large number of bills now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Teachers, and particularly good teachers, are in short supply at elementary, secondary and higher education levels. Yet, those who do teach our children, for meager compensation mostly, are inspired by a dedication to a teaching career. And, in their self-dedication, they continuously strive to improve and update their knowledge, their capacity and ability. The increasing cost of higher education is discouraging to their efforts.

I believe that the Federal Government can further the teachers' commendable practice and desire for self-improvement. It can do this easily, by amending the law to enable them to deduct their continuing educational expenses from their gross income.

In many areas, including my own home State of North Carolina, a teacher—if he or she is to advance in the profession—must continue to receive educational training. It is not as much of an option as it is a necessity, a requirement. Thus, the teacher must pay these additional expenses out of pocket, out of his own meager resources. He must finance his individual program of improving his competency, without even the minor encouragement that the tax bill a number of us have introduced would give.

Through federally funded fellowships and scholarships, the Government has attempted to encourage the professional improvement of teachers. Why not make the improvement program broad and general, by allowing all teachers to improve themselves?

Again, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for initiating this debate on a timely and important subject and for allowing me to participate in it.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Colorado in this special order to discuss legislation on tax deductions for expenses incurred for continuing education. During the 89th Congress, and again on February 2, 1967, at this session of Congress I introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow income tax deductions to teachers, individuals employed or self-employed in the same profession for a minimum of 5 years, and persons granted a leave of absence by their employer for study at an institution of higher education. The deductible expenses would include tuition and fees, books and educational materials, and travel away from home necessitated by such educational pursuit.

This bill would provide fair and equitable treatment under our tax laws for individuals in a variety of fields who after having once begun careers return to college at considerable expense in order to meet their professional desires for new methodology and continual renewal of content. Though teaching is the vocation which most readily comes to mind because of the accelerating frontiers of knowledge with which educators must cope, this bill also covers all medical personnel, accountants, and other professional persons whose success depends upon their keeping abreast of new developments in their field.

I sponsored this same bill in the 89th Congress, and many of my colleagues joined me in this late-session endeavor to clarify the uncertainty surrounding the subject of educational deductions. Unfortunately, no hearings were held on this legislation, but I am hopeful that my colleagues will again see fit to sponsor similar bills so that we may have early action in this session of the 90th Congress.

There is a real need for such legislation because of the unpredictability of the Internal Revenue Service's position on this matter over the years. On July 7, 1966, Internal Revenue published a set of proposed regulations regarding deductions for educational expenses, which was strenuously opposed by most teachers' organizations, and then later rescinded. Despite this rescission of the proposed regulations, there remains considerable confusion concerning the whole matter of these deductions. I introduced this bill to make educational deductions a matter of statute rather than agency interpretation. Last session this bill was endorsed by the National Education Association, the Hawaii Medical Association, the Hawaii State Board of Education, the Maui County Board of Supervisors, the Hawaii Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, the

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, the Maui County School Advisory Council, and many other organizations and private citizens both in Hawaii and throughout the country.

It seems more than ever obvious, Mr. Speaker, that a busy professional person in meeting his demanding daily commitments must indeed have a difficult time keeping himself well-informed on newly developing knowledge and techniques in his field. It becomes incumbent for many such individuals to devote time to formal study and course work for this purpose, and I am convinced that we should offer them every incentive to take advantage of the continuing education opportunities available. This bill establishes what I believe to be already the national policy regarding support of continuing education. If we want to encourage this policy there is every reason to make clear that expenses incurred and money spent for further education are not included as taxable income.

Schoolteachers particularly are faced with professional requirements to accumulate a specified minimum of college credits on a periodic basis in order to maintain their certification. In many jurisdictions, the principle of refreshing and renewing learning is regarded as so desirable that incentive schedules provide salary increases for specified amounts of formal study by the teacher. The intensive course work required for the master's degree, becoming ever more essential for educators, also imposes a financial burden on the already overworked and typically low-salaried teacher.

The Congress has done much in recent years to confirm the importance of maximum education for everyone as a national goal. However, we have till now not done nearly enough to legislate in the interest of encouraging continuing education for those who have completed their basic curriculum of study and have already worked in their chosen career field.

My bill has safeguards which will exclude from its benefits anyone who desires to return to college to acquire education for a new career, in that it requires experience in the individual's particular field of study in addition to assurance that he will resume his employment in that vocation after completion of the particular studies for which he claims deduction.

There can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that education in our times does not end with the bachelor's degree and that 4 or 5 years of college does not guarantee continuing expertise in any specialized field. It is therefore in the greater interests of our country that we provide at the very least some recognition to those who seek to renew themselves by further education.

The power to establish a tax policy is the responsibility of the Congress and I feel it is indeed not only wisdom but prudence which dictates that we offer relief to those who expend their own funds to return to college to renew the quality of their professional capacity. What this bill in effect says is that what these persons do on their own initiative to further their educational background

they do for their entire profession and thus, that which they actually spend to seek that education ought not to be taxed as income.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to renew with my colleagues my belief that this Congress must give favorable consideration to this proposal, and enact into law a bill which will give comprehensive protection and recognition to those in our teaching professions and others who are incurring expenses for pursuits in education. This individual effort and incentive requires adequate recognition in the tax laws of this country and I urge all of our colleagues to join us in support of this bill.

Mr. BROTZMAN. 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on May 2 of this year, the Internal Revenue Service issued new regulations establishing more liberal guidelines for teachers to deduct expenses incurred in advancing their educations and teaching skills. This, I firmly believe, was a step in the right direction.

These guidelines will provide members of the teaching profession with the incentive to continue their education after they have been certified to teach. The recognized deductions include tuition and fees, books, and educational materials, as well as travel directly related to their continued education.

I certainly endorsed this action by the Internal Revenue Service. However, I believe that the issuance of an IRS guideline is something less than is necessary to provide teachers with firm evidence that these incentive deductions will not be withdrawn at some future date. It was, in fact, an IRS proposal of 1966 to remove certain educational expenses from the deductible category which prompted me to cosponsor legislation to firmly establish continuing education expenses as deductible expenditures for teachers. This policy should be more than just policy—it should be law.

Better education is the cornerstone of every program we conceive to help build a better society. Our educational program can only be made more sound by stimulating our teachers to broaden their knowledge and advance their teaching skills through continuing education. If our teachers are better equipped to teach, they can better inspire and encourage their students.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored this legislation in the 89th Congress and again in the 90th Congress. I am pleased to join with many of my colleagues today in expressing hope that this legislation will be enacted by this Congress.

We are discussing and debating many programs in this Congress to improve the quality of American education. And none is more important than the proposal we are discussing today.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New York [Mr. WOLFF] 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, fiscal responsibility means a carefully structured tax system with scheduled incentives and balanced deductions. It is simply good policy to tax selectively, allowing credit when it helps to create economic stimulus.

A tax deduction for teachers continuing their education has just these advantages, for better training of teachers is a sound investment in a more progressive future. Their continued education is for them quite simply a necessary business expense, and should be allowed the same deductive status as is given to other businesses. At the same time, it increases our national talent resources by actively encouraging continued training.

The tax loss in this case is a bargain price for the benefits to the Nation that will ensue and I strongly urge the Ways and Means Committee to proceed this session with hearings on my bill, H.R. 9054, and others to give teachers a tax break for education expenses.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KYROS] 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, legislation to provide for deductions of educational expenses for teachers is long overdue. We have witnessed in the last two decades an astounding expansion in the amount of knowledge available to man. Whole new fields of study, from nuclear physics to sociology to oceanography, have opened up in the years following World War II.

In order for American students to understand the developments that are remaking our world, their teachers must be familiar with this vastly expanded universe of fact and hypothesis. Only through frequent refresher courses, academic courses, and research can those teachers keep pace with progress in their respective fields. A teacher who graduated in 1964 and never returned to school could hardly attempt to explain sonar and telstar, or the Dead Sea scrolls and the United Nations.

This tax credit would give them an incentive to continue their own education.

It is appropriate that this proposed deduction should come under the section of the IRS Code relating to business expenses, because it is the business of teachers to be familiar with the latest developments in their field of expertise. It is appropriate that this measure receive consideration now, because as never before, the primacy of the United States depends upon the quality of the education its citizens receive.

I regard this legislation as urgent because of its great potential in benefitting the calibre of our teachers and our educational system. For this reason, I have

introduced H.R. 6840 to create this important deduction category.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the original proposal in the previous Congress to provide for an income tax deduction of certain educational expenses incurred by teachers continuing their education, I am happy to join my colleagues today in urging favorable and expeditious action on this legislation in this Congress. Early this session I incorporated my original proposal into a package tax credit bill, H.R. 5043, cited as the Private Enterprise and Individual Initiative Act of 1967.

The teacher tax credit provision of H.R. 5043 is one I consider to be of the utmost importance to the encouragement and growth of quality teaching of our young people, who are most assuredly this Nation's soundest investment for the continuance and preservation of a strong and free America. Our future strength and leadership among the free world nations rests squarely on the shoulders of today's youth. Thus, the quality of our educational system and the success of our teachers in imparting their knowledge and skills to our youth will be indelibly imprinted on this Nation's future.

We cannot afford to fail to encourage our teachers to advance their knowledge and their abilities through every means possible and certainly the tax credit incentive for the continuance of their education is both proper and necessary if our educational standards are to keep pace with the ever growing demand for advanced technology and highly developed expertise.

As an incentive toward economic growth, we extend to business and industry certain tax credits to encourage expansion and advancement. Certainly intellectual growth is of as great if not greater importance and a tax incentive to encourage and make possible continuing education and advancements in the knowledge and abilities of our teachers is surely the wisest of investments. As the leader and protector of the free nations, we must use every resource at our command to prepare today's youth to meet their responsibilities as tomorrow's leaders in this modern and highly competitive world.

The American dream can be preserved only through our mental, physical, and moral development, and to those to whom we entrust this precious duty—the dedicated teachers of our youth—we should certainly give every encouragement and opportunity for advancement. A tax credit for their continuing education is a small token to ask and it is unconscionable to me that we should even hesitate in granting them this incentive.

SUPPORT OUR SERVICEMEN DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, practically every civic, fraternal, business, and social organization of Madison County, Ind., worked to plan Support Our Servicemen Day at Anderson, the county seat, on Saturday, August 19, 1967. A major patriotic rally, a nonpartisan, public tribute to our country's men in uniform, it was to feature a parade with floats and units from all over Indiana.

Feeling it was only fitting and proper that the Armed Forces be represented, the sponsors invited a U.S. Marine band and color guard. The Marines accepted, then said they would have to withdraw.

The letter, dated August 11, 1967, from the officer in charge of the Marine Corps Recruiting Station in Indianapolis said:

Today I received a message from higher headquarters advising against active participation in affairs of this nature because of their "possible political implications."

A strong protest was made to the Department of Defense. At the last minute, a White House phone call authorized Marine participation. I was honored to be present at the ceremonies and am proud to say they were among the most moving and stirring I have ever seen.

The whole affair raises some questions that must be answered. The order banning participation was a Navy directive; to the best of my knowledge, nothing of this sort has gone to any of the other services. But who in the Department of the Navy felt the political implications were such that participation should be forbidden? We can be quite certain it was not a man in uniform.

The President has already taken the first correct step, when White House orders authorized Marine participation. The next steps are to seek out the man responsible and dismiss him at once.

The kindest thing that can be said about such a person is that he is stupid. Whoever did it displayed a monumental ignorance of his country, and his fellow citizens. Such stupidity will be repeated and makes such a person unsafe to make decisions affecting our Armed Forces.

We must see this does not occur again. Mr. President, the American people are waiting for your answer.

FOREIGN DIPLOMATS BEWARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned with the manipulations in connection with the administration's proposal to establish an International Center in the Nation's Capital, among other things because of the costs which have been estimated to run as high as \$500,000,000 or more. A substantial part of these costs will, under the administration plan, be placed upon the already bowed backs of the taxpayers of the entire country.

In a number of speeches dealing with the proposed International Center I have pointed out that it calls for subsidized sites for garages—underground and in solid rock, at least in part—hotels, shops, restaurants, and an international drink-

ing club. I have been quite critical of the proposal, which is set out in the \$8,000,000,000 comprehensive plan for 1985 for the Nation's Capital, and which is also incorporated in legislation developed in the Department of State and sent to the Congress by the White House. The President's message to the Congress was sent up on February 27 this year, and it spoke of his determination to recommend legislation which would be consistent with the legitimate interests of the citizens of the District of Columbia. Unfortunately, the legislation which the administration sent up to the Congress in March fell far short of that objective, and now the District Commissioners have castigated the National Capital Planning Commission's entire \$8,000,000,000 plan as not being responsive to the needs of the Nation's Capital. In a sharply worded letter under date of August 18 the District government attacked the plan, and called it a "disturbing" document which ignores the people of Washington.

Far from being consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens, the \$500,000,000 International Center plan, which is part of the \$8,000,000,000 overall plan, seems to be consistent only with the illegitimate interests of certain well-known lobbyists with an in to the White House and to the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. In their letter the District Commissioners indicted the international plan as "inappropriate and premature," which indeed it is.

I have received a number of letters dealing with the International Center, and the chancery issue, which I shall include, together with newspaper articles, as part of my remarks. The letters seem to be well documented, and are based in part on the newspaper articles. They point to the abuse of public interest and trust involved in the decisions of the National Capital Planning Commission, and they raise very serious questions which must be answered by the administration. The questions raised by the rejection of the rezoning application for the Wolman tract by the National Capital Planning Commission—a rezoning application supported by representatives of the Swedish Government, and representative citizens and citizens organizations—are grave. If this tract were rezoned to meet the requirements of the Chancery Act of October 13, 1964, the use of this 16-acre tract would solve the most pressing chancery needs of foreign governments, and it would not cost the Federal Government, or the taxpayers of the Nation, 1 red cent.

Saving money apparently does not interest this administration. The gaudier and more unrealistic a plan is and, especially, the costlier it is, the more appealing it seems to be to the White House.

One of the letters I have received points out the "hidden influence" at work in the rejection of the rezoning application by the National Capital Planning Commission, and this letter was delivered at the White House on August 8, but there has been no reply. Another letter points out that there is clearly a conflict of interest here, and Mrs. James H. Rowe, chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, is involved. The letter states:

Not only is the \$8,000,000,000 Comprehensive Plan for 1985 bad, but there is clearly a conflict of interest here, and Mrs. Rowe, as Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, should have had the good judgment to have abstained from voting and pushing for the rejection of the Wolman tract rezoning application in view of the fact that her husband's law firm stands to make such a financial killing, and reap such a financial bonanza, from its rejection.

The letter to President Johnson goes on to say:

The exercise of undue and hidden influence is a matter that cannot be condoned. As stated in our letter filed with the Zoning Commission, "In any other jurisdiction, this unrevealed information and connections of this type would be actionable." It is perfectly clear that the White House would not be used with your personal knowledge to advance selfish interests and influence peddling. Secret payoffs, whether in the form of unwarranted legal fees or other forms, are abhorrent to the American people.

The author of the letter to the President is John R. Immer, president of the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia, who concludes one of his letters this way:

The Zoning Commission may lack the courage and the moral fibre and stamina to buck the prestigious law firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe with its White House connections, and its domination and control of the National Capital Planning Commission. But the American people can be trusted to remember this scandal when election day rolls around next Fall.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters and newspaper articles in support of the remarks previously made:

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

August 18, 1967.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: We again wish to you our deep appreciation for your unending efforts to protect the public purse against raids on it to finance dubious schemes both at home and abroad.

Certainly your speech of May 22, entitled most appropriately we thought, "Foreign Diplomats Beware" was one which should have gotten a great deal more attention than it did, since it condemned a White House scheme in the Nation's Capital itself which would cost the American taxpayers, including the taxpayers of Iowa, an eventual \$500,000,000. In fact, it was suggested at the hearings held by the House Public Works Committee that it might cost a cool \$1,000,000,000, if one billion dollars can be considered to be cool. Some of the points you made in that speech might well be mentioned here. You said:

"It is high time this House took the time to unmask and uncover the behind-the-scenes forces which are hard at work in a bold maneuver to overturn the earlier House action. Apparently there are no limits to the willingness of this Administration to accommodate its friends and financial contributors. . . . The administration should tell us not only who is back of this effort to reverse the April 10 vote on the chancery issue and the administration plan to provide subsidized locations for international organizations, hotels, office buildings, restaurants, shops, and an international drinking club, but who the developers and operators of this complex will be. . . ."

"Recently a second site has won administration backing, according to a number of reports. A brochure prepared by the well-known Washington architect with White House connections, Chloethiel Woodard

Smith, calls for the use of the McLean Gardens housing project 'to provide suitable sites for chanceries and the headquarters of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Development Bank.'"

You pointed out in your speech that—"The questionable advantages of this site include the probability that Congress can be bypassed entirely and, in fact, ignored completely for, again according to the brochure 'The owner proposed to offer the tract to the U.S. Government in exchange for the note now being held by the Treasury for \$19,400,000 secured in part by McLean Gardens'. It is believed that this transaction could be executed without special authorizing legislation by the Congress.

"It now appears that a well-known and highly paid Washington lobbyist, with White House and Texas gas and oil connections of long standing, is a leading sponsor of the McLean Gardens site and has obtained the blessing and approval of the President for its use, which would help settle an estate.

"Needless to say, there may be some reason to doubt that the settlement would benefit the American taxpayers any more than does the oil depletion allowance. This particular lobbyist is not only interested in settling this estate to the maximum advantage of its heirs, but is also interested in blocking even the consideration of other sites with superior advantages by the Organization of American States and a number of foreign governments, despite the fact that the savings to American taxpayers of other sites may be very great and the advantages of other sites from the point of view of our Government may be many."

You may wish to bring to public notice the attached letters to the President, and the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia which protest the hidden forces at work in this matter. I might point out that the President has not replied to my letter, which referred to the highly paid Washington lobbyist, Thomas G. Corcoran, with important White House and Texas gas and oil connections of long standing, as a leading sponsor of the McLean Gardens site. The *Washington Post* reported on hearings held by the Zoning Commission on an application for rezoning the Wolman tract on August 2, 1967. The *Post* article pointed directly to the reasons back of the NCPD opposition to the Wolman tract rezoning when it referred to "those pushing the McLean Gardens plan. These interests, represented by former New Dealer Thomas G. Corcoran, contend that their 30-acre site could accommodate most or all of the countries that want new chanceries. The National Capital Planning Commission has also opposed the Wolman plan, challenging both its legality under the zoning laws and the appropriateness of chanceries on upper Massachusetts Avenue."

The *Evening Star* of July 29, reported that when the Wolman tract was taken up by the NCPD the opposition to its rezoning was led by Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., Chairman of the NCPD, whose husband, James H. Rowe, Jr., is a law partner of Thomas G. Corcoran in the law firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe. The *Evening Star* report declared that—

"The planning commission, at the urging of Walter Louchheim, and Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., two private citizens on the commission, passed the resolution advising against the embassy-chancery rezoning."

The *Evening Star* report also stated that Lt. Col. Louis W. Prentiss, Jr., assistant District Engineer Commissioner, who was representing the District on the NCPD, pointed out that existing zoning already permits high rise apartments and commercial use on the Wolman tract and said that "their stand was unreasonable. He said that to 'down-zone' the site from its present zoning for 800 to 900 apartment units to 20 to 60 single-family houses per acre would mean the District would have to compensate Wolman for the loss in value."

The August 1967 issue of the *Washington Magazine* has a most revealing article entitled "The Washington Legal Establishment" which deserves your very close scrutiny and that of other Members of Congress. One of the law firms cited in this article was among those which the government is the firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe. The article states that "Without a doubt, this is the most Baroque law firm in town . . . its litigation record is unimpressive. At the head of its cast of characters is Thomas Corcoran . . . James Rowe is a household word in the White House . . . In most firms offering this kind of informal, high-level consideration, fees amount to only about ten percent of their income. Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe do more of it, and naturally make more money out of it."

The documentation on Messrs. Corcoran and Rowe is long and impressive. *Fortune* magazine has written about Corcoran's connection with gas transmission lines which have been opposed by California; the Morgenthau Diaries refer to one or the other of them, as does Theodore M. White in his book "The Making of the President 1964" which reports on the connections of James H. Rowe, Jr. with both the President and the Vice President. There was also an interesting case of a Chinese General who made off with some of the funds raised for Free China, and the infamous Savannah Shipyards case, and the Sterling Products case, and the Elk Hill case which Corcoran had some open or behind-the-scene connections with.

The newspapers have now reported the sharp criticisms made by the District Commissioners of the Comprehensive Plan for 1985 developed by the National Capital Planning Commission. They were sharply critical of the International Chancery Center Plan, making many of the same charges you have made about it. They said, in addition, that it was "inappropriate and premature" for a comprehensive plan to deal with detailed site plans for an area such as the proposed International Center.

Not only is the \$8,000,000,000 Comprehensive Plan for 1985 bad, but there is clearly a conflict of interest here, and Mrs. Rowe, as Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, should have had the good judgment to have abstained from voting and pushing for the rejection of the Wolman tract rezoning application in view of the fact that her husband's law firm stand to make such a financial killing, and reap such a financial bonanza, from its rejection.

As I told President Johnson in a letter which is attached:

"The exercise of undue and hidden influence is a matter that cannot be condoned. As stated in our letter filed with the Zoning Commission, 'In any other jurisdiction, this unrevealed information and connections of this type would be actionable.' It is perfectly clear that the White House would not be used with your personal knowledge to advance selfish interests and influence peddling. Secret payoffs, whether in the form of unwarranted legal fees or other forms, are abhorrent to the American people. Only a prompt and full investigation and disclosure by the White House of the fees paid in the McLean Gardens Chancery matter, and of the services actually rendered by the various parties which have led to the NCPD opposition to the Wolman tract rezoning can keep the White House from the charge that it is being used improperly—in view of the fact that the McLean Gardens Chancery Plan has been presented at the White House and won full approval there."

The Zoning Commission itself may lack the courage and the moral fibre and stamina to buck the prestigious law firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe with its White House connections, and its domination and

control of the National Capital Planning Commission. But the American people can be trusted to remember this scandal when election day rolls around next Fall. Anything you can do to bring it to national attention will be commended by the American people.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. IMMER, *President.*

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

August 8, 1967.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Our Federation has long maintained that the District Government is free of graft and corruption, and is the cleanest government in the entire nation. Now, we are greatly disturbed to find that, on the eve of the House consideration of your Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967—and, clearly in eager and direct anticipation of its passage—that the new order of things under the Presidentially-appointed Mayor and City Council which it will usher in has already been revealed in the opposition of the National Capital Planning Commission, which is headed by one of your own personally chosen appointees, Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., to the Zoning Commission approval, or even consideration, of the application of August 2, 1967, for rezoning of the Wolman tract for chancery use.

Attached is a letter we have filed with the Zoning Commission charging that political influence has been, and is being exerted in this case by Thomas G. Corcoran, a law partner of James H. Rowe, Jr., husband of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, NCPD Chairman. The exercise of undue and hidden influence is a matter that cannot be condoned. As stated in our letter filed with the Zoning Commission, "In any other jurisdiction, this unrevealed information and connections of this type would be actionable." It is perfectly clear that the White House would not be used with your personal knowledge to advance selfish interests and influence peddling. Secret pay-offs whether in the form of unwarranted legal fees or other forms are abhorrent to the American people. Only a prompt and full investigation and disclosure by the White House of the fees paid in the McLean Gardens Chancery matter, and of the services actually rendered by the various parties which have led to the NCPD opposition to the Wolman tract rezoning can keep the White House from the charge that it is being used improperly—in view of the fact that the McLean Gardens Chancery plan has been presented at the White House and won full approval there.

Recently the *Wall Street Journal* disclosed that the husband of one of your Secretaries was quickly promoted to a \$26,000-a-year job for which he was completely unprepared. Later, the husband of another high White House secretary, Tyler Abeil, was given a prime location by the Redevelopment Land Agency for a restaurant in the SW urban renewal waterfront area only a block from where Vice President Humphrey lives. This is a government-by-crony. We remember how strongly the Democrats in Congress reacted to the vicuna coat which Sherman Adams gave a crony, and you were in the Congress at that time, and had a hand in removing Sherman Adams from the White House. We hope you will move just as resolutely in calling for a full disclosure of the hidden influence at work in the NCPD opposition to the rezoning of the Wolman tract. We look forward to prompt White House action, and we will support you in any house-cleaning which you undertake at the White House in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN R. IMMER,
President.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

August 11, 1967.

In re: File 67-19, August 2, 1967, letter to President Johnson, August 8, 1967.

Brig. Gen. ROBERT E. MATHE,
Chairman, Zoning Commission, District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MATHE: Attached herewith is a copy of a letter to President Johnson under date of August 8, 1967, in which I call his attention to the application for rezoning the Wolman tract, and the implications in the unrevealed connections of the NCPD and Eugene Ford, both of whom were adverse witnesses to the rezoning application, with the McLean Gardens Chancery plan and Thomas G. Corcoran.

Your attention is invited to the second paragraph in my letter to President Johnson in which I said: "Attached is a letter we have filed with the Zoning Commission charging that political influence has been, and is being exerted in this case by Thomas G. Corcoran, a law partner of James H. Rowe, Jr., husband of Mrs. Elizabeth Rowe, NCPD Chairman. The exercise of undue and hidden influence is a matter that cannot be condoned. As stated in our letter filed with the Zoning Commission, 'In any other jurisdiction, this unrevealed information and connections of this type would be actionable.'"

The Zoning Commission is required to give due consideration to all testimony and information filed with it. In view of the connections, which were not revealed, of the two adverse witnesses in the Wolman rezoning hearing, and which are set out in my letter to the President and my letter to the Zoning Commission of August 8 and August 4 respectively, it is clearly incumbent on the Zoning Commission to give these two letters the same weight and consideration given the NCPD and Mr. Eugene Ford.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. IMMER, *President.*

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

August 4, 1967.

In re: File 67-19, August 2, 1967.

Brig. Gen. ROBERT MATHE,
Chairman, Zoning Commission,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MATHE: We urge the Zoning Commission to approve the rezoning of the Wolman tract. At the same time, we request the Zoning Commission to reject the adverse recommendation of the National Capital Planning Commission which is advisory only. The Zoning Commission must take note of the newspaper articles on August 2, 1967 hearings on the Wolman tract rezoning request which contained very disturbing and significant information. The *Evening Star* (August 2, 1967) reported that: "The only witness opposing the plan was Eugene Ford, a real estate broker, who represents McLean Gardens, an apartment complex on Wisconsin Avenue NW, whose owners are interested in turning their land into a chancery center."

The *Washington Post* had a much longer report on Eugene Ford, and it reported that the interests back of the McLean Gardens chancery project are "represented by former New Dealer Thomas G. Corcoran". Mr. Corcoran is a law partner of James Rowe, Jr. in the law firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe. Mr. Rowe is the husband of Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. In the light of the expose of the influence of lawyers, including the firm of Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, on governmental matters in the July 1967 issues of *The Washington Magazine*, the relationship of Messrs. Ford, Rowe, and Corcoran, and their probable in-

fluence on Mrs. James H. Rowe, Jr., chairman of the NCPC, and Walter C. Louchheim, Jr., Commission member, cannot be ruled out by the Zoning Commission in its decision to accept or reject the views and advice of the NCPC on the Wolman tract.

We charge that the NCPC is opposing the rezoning of the Wolman tract for chancery use because of the lobbying pressures generated by Thomas G. Corcoran on behalf of the McLean Gardens interests through Mr. James H. Rowe, Jr. The McLean Gardens backers believe their project doesn't need to come before the Zoning Commission, or go to the Congress, and this was made clear in the *Washington Post*, and *Sunday Star* of May 14, 1967. The NCPC doesn't have clean hands in this entire matter, and the interests (special) backing the McLean Gardens project did, in fact, dictate the adverse recommendation of the NCPC on the Wolman tract. We further charge that the connections of Mr. Eugene Ford with Messrs. Corcoran and Rowe, and with Mrs. Rowe through Mr. Corcoran and Mr. Rowe were not fully revealed to the Zoning Commission by Mr. Eugene Ford when he testified before your Commission. In any other jurisdiction, this unrevealed information and connections of this type would be actionable.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. IMMER, *President.*

THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CITIZEN ASSOCIATIONS, BUSINESSMEN, AND PROPERTY OWNERS, FOR THE BEST LOCATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER,

Washington D.C., August 19, 1967.

Hon. H. R. GROSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GROSS: We call your attention to the attached correspondence with the White House which we believe to be of more than local interest, since it concerns the May 30 visit we had with Dr. William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the OAS, John P. Hoover, Program Officer, Pan American Union, and Mr. Donald Carr, Deputy Director of Administrative Affairs, Pan American Union, in the Pan American Union Building at 17th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.

(NOTE.—The OAS has now officially advised the State Department that the Sealtest Dairy industrial site is unacceptable, is entirely too small, that twice as much land space is needed as originally planned for.)

We testified in favor of rezoning the Wolman tract for chancery use at the hearings held by the Zoning Commission of D.C. in the Old District Building, Washington, D.C. This rezoning would, if granted, have met the requirements of the Chancery Act of October 13, 1964, and would not cost the taxpayers one dime. Yet it was strongly opposed by the National Capital Planning Commission, which knows, of course, that the only alternatives to rezoning of some of the major tracts of undeveloped land in the District, such as the Wolman tract, and the Shapiro and Henderson Castle tracts—which H.R. 6638, which the House adopted overwhelmingly on April 10 this year, would have rezoned in accordance with the requirements of the Chancery Act of October 13, 1964—are proposals for chancery development at Washington Circle and McLean Gardens which are enormously expensive, running upwards from \$500,000,000 and which must be paid for by the taxpayers of the nation.

We agree with you completely when you say that—

"Saving money apparently does not interest this Administration. The gaudier and more unrealistic a plan is and, especially, the

costlier it is, the more appealing it seems to be to the White House."

The *Washington Post*, in its report on the hearings on rezoning of the Wolman tract, said in its article of August 3 that—

"But Eugene Ford, a real estate broker working on a project to turn McLean Gardens—now a northwest apartment development—into a chancery enclave, said the Wolman plan would, in effect, skim off the cream of chancery hunting nations, leaving the poorer ones behind.

"Ford warned against creating a situation in which poorer countries found themselves segregated both from the rest of Washington and from the wealthier, older nations.

"This is a principal theme of those pushing the McLean Gardens plan. These interests, represented by former New Dealer, Thomas G. Corcoran, contend that their 30-acre site could accommodate most or all the countries that want new chanceries."

The McLean Gardens development has 1,200 single units, and over 700 family units and its conversion to chancery use would displace up to 3,000 people. The proponents of the plan to convert McLean Gardens also never mention the financial bonanza they would fall heir to if their proposal were adopted. Like some lawyers they present only their side of the case without pointing out the ultimate costs to society of the course of action they espouse. Actually, the solution to the chancery issue lies in a combination of H.R. 6638 and some liberalization of the Chancery Act of 1964 which would make it possible to utilize the large undeveloped tracts in the city, the Henderson Castle, Shapiro, and Wolman tracts, as well as to permit chanceries to locate in areas zoned for low-density apartment use. This would avoid entirely the pitfalls inherent in the proposals to locate chancery enclaves at Washington Circle and McLean Gardens. The enclave concept itself should be discarded for, as the Administration of President Kennedy, of which President Johnson was a part as Vice President, told the Congress in August, 1962:

"Diplomatic enclaves would tend to unnecessarily confine us all around the world. In the majority of cases we are not so confined in the enclave, and I think that it is better for us to be out among, and mix with, the people than to have a ghetto atmosphere for American personnel confined to a diplomatic area. That does not fulfill the objectives of our foreign policy, and I hope that we would not get into this situation by enforcing it here in the District of Columbia."

The present Administration plan for a diplomatic enclave at Washington Circle, as well as the McLean Gardens proposal for a diplomatic enclave, ignores the advice offered the Congress by the Kennedy Administration; both would establish a ghetto, and neither would "fulfill the objectives of our foreign policy". Furthermore, both would, if adopted, or if either one were adopted, would have unfortunate repercussions and could lead to the confinement of our own diplomatic personnel in similar ghettos overseas. We trust you will oppose this with all your strength.

Respectfully,

GEORGE FRAIN,

Coordinator.

PHILLIP J. BROWN,
Business Representative.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 6, 1967.

Mr. GEORGE FRAIN,

Coordinator, the Joint Committee, of Citizens Associations, Businessmen and Property Owners for the Best Location of the International Center, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRAIN: President Johnson has asked me to thank you for your letter of June 2, 1967, recounting your discussions

with representatives of the Organization of American States and urging reconsideration by the President of his recommendation that land immediately northwest of Washington Circle be made available for foreign chanceries and the offices of international organizations. I know the President appreciates the interest of those for whom you are acting as coordinator in the matter and is pleased to have the additional information which your letter conveys.

As I have advised in my letter of April 25, 1967, the Department of State and the National Capital Planning Commission as well as the Board of Commissioners of the District are the governmental bodies most directly concerned with the President's recommendations which are now pending before the Congress in legislation introduced by Senator Fulbright and Representative Kenneth Gray. Accordingly, I am transmitting your letter to each of these agencies for their consideration.

Thank you again for the statement of your views.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. POLLAK,
Adviser for National Capital Affairs.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CITIZEN ASSOCIATIONS, BUSINESSMEN AND PROPERTY OWNERS, FOR THE BEST LOCATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTER,

June 2, 1967.

In re: International Center.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We wrote you on April 19 reporting that we had heard from more than one Member of Congress that the OAS is unhappy with the so-called Sealtest Dairy site. We added, "Where you expect so much from a gift, it might be well to consider the objections of the OAS to this site, even if they haven't been presented to you in a formal way, or in the form of a State Paper." We received a letter in reply on April 25 from Stephen J. Pollak, your Adviser for National Capital Affairs, saying "This is a matter which the OAS would discuss with the Department of State and I am transmitting your letter to the Chief of Protocol, James W. Symington, for his consideration." We are enclosing copies of these letters for reference.

We met with the Honorable William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the OAS, John P. Hoover, Program Officer, Pan American Union, and Mr. Donald Carr, Deputy Director of Administrative Affairs, Pan American Union, in the Pan American Union Building on May 30 for two hours. The meeting had been arranged by Dr. Sanders at our request. We gave him copies of our correspondence with you. We discussed all aspects of this problem, we asked searching questions, and we got frank replies which we think will help you. We have also discussed this matter with Members of Congress including many Senators and Representatives, and we think the information we have gleaned will help you. We find:

1. The six-acre Sealtest Dairy site is only partly owned by the Sealtest Dairy, in fact only 1½-acres. The rest of the square is occupied by stores, and by homes owned by very fine people including Rabbi Philip Rabinowitz and Mrs. Rabinowitz, and Miss Christine E. Garner, a Negro school teacher. These homeowners do not want to sell. Further, this land is very likely to sell in the neighborhood of \$4,000,000 an acre.

2. The original plan of the OAS was to build a headquarters building for some 1,300 employees. The OAS officials we met with admitted frankly that their space needs had more than doubled, and that they would need some 15 acres to accommodate their

present needs, and provide for future expansion, because of phenomenal growth.

3. The State Department has suggested to the Congress that the site at Washington Circle occupied by the Sealtest Dairy could be obtained for \$6,000,000. This is to say, that the 1½-acre would cost \$6,000,000—for \$4,000,000 an acre. 6 acres would cost \$24,000,000. If 15 acres are needed, the total cost at Washington Circle would be \$60,000,000 for site acquisition, before a spadeful of earth were turned. We don't think the taxpayers are going to stand for this, nor do the many members of Congress think so.

4. The OAS officials were clearly disturbed that the OAS gift was tied in with an international center plan because:

(a) The severe criticism of the get-rich-quick land-development aspects of the plan by members of Congress, especially that part of the plan calling for 10-acres of underground parking, and international hotels, office buildings, shops, restaurants, and an international drinking club.

(b) The severe criticism of diplomatic enclaves here and abroad made by Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke in August 1962 in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in reply to a question by Senator Sparkman. The State Department is badly split over the wisdom of enclaves.

5. The National Capital Planning Commission is unwilling to give the OAS more than 6-acres at Washington Circle, and has suggested that if more land is needed that it could be acquired at some future date on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue. This would require bridging Pennsylvania Avenue. This is not planning, but reduces planning to a nullity. NCPC can't permit the OAS to expand in the International Center area north of Washington Circle, it is understood, because of (a) prior commitments to developers of the international hotels, office buildings, shops, clubs, restaurants, and (b) the excessive cost of the land (\$4,000,000 an acre) which, under the offer of the Secretary of State Dean Rusk, made and accepted by the Foreign Ministers in mid-February in Buenos Aires, is to be donated. The OAS has advised the State Department the Sealtest Dairy site is not acceptable.

6. The OAS would be quite willing to locate on an expanded Shapiro Tract of some 30-acres; which could be assembled without cost to the taxpayers by adding acreage adjacent to it now on the ownership of the Federal and District Governments. This would provide a site to balance the area a block to the West now occupied by the Shoreham, and Sheraton-Park Hotels, restaurants, shops, apartment houses, town houses and churches. These are already in existence and would not have to be subsidized and built. Such a location would maintain the present situation where 85 percent of the chanceries in Washington are located within a mile of the Henderson Castle and Shapiro Tracts provided by the House-passed H.R. 6638. Such a location would place the OAS near three of the city's finest hotels, the Washington Hilton, Shoreham, and Sheraton-Park, in a cosmopolitan part of the city; a site which would not be isolated from the life of the city; a site which would be near the French, Italian, Mexican, and Spanish Embassies and scores of chanceries, and near the city's finest residential areas: the Kalorama Area where Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz lives (at 2204 Wyoming Avenue), and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara lives (2412 Tracy Place), and many other members of your Administrations; Senators, including Senator Fulbright live, etc. (on Kalorama Circle).

7. We submit a letter from *The Evening Star* of April 29 quoting Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke's testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in August, 1962, in which he said that: "diplomatic enclaves

would tend to unnecessarily confine us all around the world. In the majority of cases we are not so confined in the enclave, and I think that it is better for us to be out among, and mix with, the people than to have a ghetto atmosphere for American personnel confined to a diplomatic area. That does not fulfill the objectives of our foreign policy, and I hope that we would not get into this situation by enforcing it here in the District of Columbia." We do not think the situation described by Ambassador Duke has changed one iota, and that what he said is just as true today as it was in 1962 when he spoke for the Kennedy Administration, of which you were the Vice President.

8. Wealthy nations are deeply disturbed by the "ghetto atmosphere" of the diplomatic enclave proposed at Washington Circle and have no intention to end up in it. Proof of this can be obtained from the local newspapers which in recent months have reported:

(Note: The OAS has now officially advised the State Department that the Sealtest Dairy industrial site is unacceptable, is entirely too small, that twice as much land space is needed as originally planned for.)

1. Australia is building a \$7.3 million chancery building at 16th Street (the historic Embassy Row) and Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., and the newspapers published pictures showing Dean Rusk turning the first shovelful of earth.

2. The U.S.S.R. in the advanced states of planning to locate on the Mt. Alto site.

3. Sweden, Mexico, and other nations are planning to locate on the Wolman Tract of 16 acres near American University.

4. In his opinion of March 20, 1967 Corporation Counsel, D.C., Charles T. Duncan said in his first paragraph: "The question is whether, in view of the provisions of an Act of Congress approved October 13, 1964 . . . certain foreign governments may construct diplomatic chanceries on properties in residential districts which they have owned for several years and which were acquired for such purpose. The countries involved are New Zealand, Greece, Turkey, France, India and Italy." The State Department and your Administration has not sought to get the Fulbright Act of October 13, 1964 amended so these nations could build on their own land.

5. Corporation Counsel Duncan's opinion says (page 5) that: "Prior to November 15, 1957, the terminal date for notification, 21 governments had, through the Department of State, formally advised the Director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections of their intention to use eventually for chancery purposes land either already acquired or in the process of being acquired. Such countries were listed in an order issued on February 17, 1958 (Order No. 37) by the Director of the Department of Licenses and Inspections as being exempt from the above-mentioned Commissioners' Order." We think the Federal Government should honor this commitment, and that a very important principle is involved, it is not a new one, and it is a principle we have always lived by, which is that our nation's word is as good as our bond.

We strongly oppose the Administration plan to locate the diplomatic enclave at Washington Circle, and H.R. 7415 and S. 1301 to enact this discredited idea into law because it would displace 300 low- and moderate-income families, 5000 jobs, 40 small businesses (at the very time Vice President Humphrey is calling on the private sector to provide 20,000 jobs to reduce and eliminate violence this summer in the Nation's Capital). It will eliminate \$5,000,000 in taxes to the District and Federal Governments at the very time you have asked Congress to increase the Federal payment and the House has passed such legislation. It will disastrously weaken the private sector, and

continue and enlarge the Administration's consistent and unremitting efforts to eliminate the private sector in the District of Columbia.

We think that your proposal (for an International Center at Washington Circle presented in S. 1301 and H.R. 7415) is totally unfair, in view of the fact that the Federal Government is the largest holder of land in the District of Columbia, and that land on the Bureau of Standards site, the Naval Observatory site, and other Federal holdings could be provided for the purposes of the OAS and the chanceries of Foreign governments; but the Federal government seems unwilling to donate its own land which wouldn't cost the taxpayers a dime.

To sum up, then, we urge you to reexamine your proposal for a diplomatic chancery enclave at Washington Circle in the light of this paper (setting forth the real needs of the OAS), and your pledge to the American people that the legislation you would recommend on this matter would be "consistent with the legitimate interests of District citizens".

Further, because of the importance of good relations with the South American nations at this time, we think it behooves your Administration to give them at least as fine a site as that being provided (by the United States) the U.S.S.R. at Mt. Alto, and we think this test is met (outstanding) by the expanded Shapiro Tract.

OAS officials advised us they had been approached by the owners of several large tracts of land in the District and they had expressed an interest in all of them. It is widely known in real estate circles that OAS wants to go anywhere but the Sealtest Dairy site, we have learned from leading members of Congress.

In view of the facts set out in this letter, and the letter from Stephen J. Pollak from the White House on April 25, cited above, we find it alarming that Chief of Protocol James Symington, the District Commissioners, and the National Capital Planning Commission have been completely unwilling to consider the manifest needs of the OAS which could easily be accommodated at the expanded 30-acre Shapiro Tract. The alarm of the OAS in being made a part of a development which includes international hotels, office buildings, shops, restaurants, and clubs (subsidized by the taxpayers of the entire country) against their will would indicate that there are factors at work which do not appear to the general public and the taxpayers in this situation.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN, *Coordinator.*

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 3, 1967]

UPPER MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE CHANCERY PLAN IS DEBATED

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Neighboring citizens groups gave strong support yesterday to a plan to put five chanceries in a 16-acre tract on upper Massachusetts Avenue n.w. But a man who feared "ghettoization" of foreign embassies in Washington opposed the plan at a Zoning Commission hearing.

Jerry Wolman, sportsman and real estate developer, hopes to turn the tract between New Mexico avenue and Massachusetts above McComb street into a home for the missions of Sweden, Mexico, France and two other countries. He needs special permission from the Zoning Commission to do so.

Nearby citizens—who have opposed proposals to build high-rise apartments on the site in the past—testified yesterday that Wolman's land would be an ideal site for the chanceries so many countries want to build here.

But Eugene Ford, a real estate broker working on a project to turn McLean Gardens—now a northwest apartment development—into a chancery enclave, said the Wol-

man plan would, in effect, skim off the cream of chancery-hunting nations, leaving the poorer ones behind.

Ford warned against creating a situation in which poorer countries found themselves segregated both from the rest of Washington and from the wealthier, older nations.

This is a principal theme of those pushing the McLean Gardens plan. These interests, represented by former New Dealer Thomas G. Corcoran, contend that their 30-acre site could accommodate most or all the countries that want new chanceries.

The National Capital Planning Commission has also opposed the Wolman plan, challenging both its legality under the zoning laws and the appropriateness of chanceries on upper Massachusetts avenue.

One witness at yesterday's hearing was J. J. de Dardel, Minister of the Swedish embassy here. Sweden already has plans for a chancery that it would like to put on one of the five plots Wolman wants to divide his tract into.

France and Mexico are also reported to be very interested. France would apparently like to build a large new chancery in a 5-acre piece of Wolman's land that faces Massachusetts avenue.

State Department officials have expressed satisfaction with Wolman's plan. The Zoning Commission can approve it, despite the Planning Commission's opposition, if it wants to.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 29, 1967]

PUBLIC ZONING HEARING SET ON WOLMAN EMBASSIES PLAN
(By Lee Flor)

The District Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing Wednesday on a controversial proposal to grant special zoning to permit five embassies or chanceries to be located at 4200 Massachusetts Avenue NW.

The request for special zoning, made by developer Jerry Wolman, is being supported by key civic groups, including the Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Association, which feels the chancery complex is the lesser of two evils. The association feels the 16-acre site would be developed anyway and that present zoning permits apartment towers that would be 90 feet high and would be incompatible with surrounding residential areas.

But the National Capital Planning Commission, which has no veto power over zoning, reviewed the proposal yesterday under regulations which require its advice on zoning proposals.

The planning commission rejected the idea. Wolman tried last year to get existing high-rise zoning on the 16-acre site increased, so he could build a \$30 million apartment complex there. The zoning commission turned him down.

Now Wolman has told the zoning commission that at least three governments have indicated an interest in placing chanceries on the site. They are Sweden, France and Mexico.

The 16 acres should be used for residential use, and the proposed use for embassies and chanceries is a violation of the proposed comprehensive plan for the District, the commission argued.

Lt. Col. Louis W. Prentiss Jr., assistant District engineer commissioner who was representing the District on the commission, pointed out that existing zoning already permits high rise apartments and commercial use.

The planning commission, at the urging of Walter Louchheim, and Mrs. James H. Rowe Jr., two private citizens on the commission, passed the resolution advising against the embassy-chancery rezoning.

Prentiss pointed out that their stand was unreasonable. He said that to "down-zone" the site from its present zoning for 800 to

900 apartment units to 20 to 60 single-family houses would mean the District would have to compensate Wolman for the loss in value.

STATES CITIZEN POSITION

Prentiss also said that citizen groups were in favor of the embassy-chancery site proposal, feeling that it would be better than having high rise apartments in their midst.

John W. Gill, chairman of the zoning committee of the Spring Valley-Wesley Heights Citizens Association, said today his organization felt the Wolman embassy-chancery proposal was better than having high rise apartments. Gill was a leader in the fight to oppose the Wolman proposal last year for higher density.

"We think this is a reasonable plan," Gill said. The embassies-chanceries site "would be an asset as far as the District is concerned," he added.

The zoning commission has a great deal of power over the type of development, the specific style of building and how buffer zones and plantings could be used to blend the new chanceries and embassies into the neighborhood, Gill said. The zoning commission would be expected to use these powers to protect the neighborhood, he added.

The hearing Wednesday will start at 10 a.m. in room 500 of the District Building.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 14, 1967]

NEW SITE OFFERED FOR CHANCERIES

A proposal to use the McLean Gardens tract in northwest Washington for the controversial proposed Chancery enclave has been presented to the State Department, a Department spokesman said yesterday.

Proposal brochures have been prepared setting a \$19,400,000 price for 30.23 acres of the apartment house-dormitory complex bounded by Wisconsin Avenue, 38th Street, Newark Street and Glover Archbold Park.

These figures appear in the brochure prepared by architect Chloethal Woodard Smith & Associates, calling the site the "best solution for international center." Eugene Ford, consultant for the owners, the Fairmac Corp., said a proposal had been made to the State Department based on studies by Mrs. Smith.

The brochure said "the owner proposed to offer the tract to the U.S. Government in exchange for the note now being held by the Treasury for \$19,400,000 secured in part by McLean Gardens."

"We just couldn't consider selling it for less than the mortgage the Government holds," Ford said, while stating that no formal offer had been made.

Ford said the Smith study was forwarded to the State Department as an alternative in the event that bills for the use of the Washington Circle area as an enclave site were defeated.

The brochure says McLean Gardens meets all criteria for an international center "better than any other site suggested to date."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 18, 1967]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HEADS HIT 1985 PLAN AS NOT MEETING NEEDS: NCPD PROPOSAL VIEWED AS NEGLECTING CITY'S ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

(By Roberta Hornig)

The District Commissioners today castigated the National Capital Planning Commission's proposed 1985 Plan for Washington as not being responsive to the needs of the city or area.

In a sharply worded letter, the commissioners charged that the master plan—which is still to be put into final form—pays little attention to solving the city's economic and

social problems, relegating these issues "to a secondary position by its preoccupation with the details of urban design and the physical appearance of the city."

"The Board of Commissioners, after reviewing 'The Proposed Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital,' is disturbed that it does not meet our urgent community needs and particularly that it gives so little attention toward resolution of the District's general economic health and the revenue desperately needed to carry out city programs," the board said in a letter signed by Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner to Mrs. James H. Rowe Jr., chairman of the NCPD.

SEE VIEWS AS SHARED

The commissioners said that their views are shared by "numerous individuals and groups," including members of Congress, the Washington Metropolitan Board of Trade, the Federal City Council, the Urban League and the Washington Planning and Housing Association.

"Therefore, the Board of Commissioners strongly urges the Commission to revise the present document in response to these concerns which have been voiced so widely in the community," they wrote.

The commissioners agreed with the NCPD view that Washington is a city of "unparalleled magnificence" in its monumental buildings, its parklands and its physical setting.

"But, as we all know, it is also a city where more than one-third of the population needs assistance in order to be adequately housed, where poverty reduces life to a subsistence level, where the crime rate prompts national headlines and where educational needs go unmet year after year," they pointed out.

These problems, the commissioners said, have been a primary concern to them and will require continued attention by the new city government.

"Their severity and urgency demand that they also constitute a central concern of the proposed comprehensive plan for the national capital," they continued.

The commissioners then went on to suggest some of the things the planning commission should consider in a revision. It should, they said, include the following considerations:

1. Establishment of a land-use policy that will foster economic development for the city and its people.

The District government and the Zoning Commission should be able to turn to the plan for guidance in making decisions that would stimulate investment in property, improved employment opportunities, and increased purchasing power, the commissioners said.

2. An analysis of the economic prospects for alternative employment opportunities, especially in blue-collar employment.

PROJECTION CALLED UNREALISTIC

The commissioners made this a specific request charging that the present master plan's "simple projection of growth in federal and private employment, with its arbitrary allocation of new jobs in the District and in the metropolitan region, appears unrealistic to the city government."

The commissioners charged that the other plan severely limits the land available in the District for the kind of commercial and residential development that would create employment.

They also accused the plan of containing "a Utopian emphasis on project planning and urban design, implying reliance on public intervention and programs to accomplish physical development objectives. "It seems obvious that the city government cannot and should not rely mainly on time-consuming public government in response to today's critical needs," they wrote.

The commissioners also said it is "inap-

propriate and premature" for a comprehensive plan to deal with detailed site plans for such areas as the International Center, the National Training and the Anacostia Uptown Center.

REVENUE LOSS FEARED

Another major criticism, they said, is that its failure to promote maximum investment in property will curtail the growth of District tax revenues.

"The plan's format should be revised to strengthen it as a policy document that charts clearly the direction for guiding the physical development of the city."

Charles H. Conrad, executive director of the National Capital Planning Commission, said today he had not yet received a copy of the commissioners' report.

"We have received over 100 official documents commenting on the proposals so far, plus testimony at more than 20 neighborhood meetings, and it goes without saying that we welcome the District Commissioners' views," he said.

The 230-page, 80,000-word 1985 plan is crammed with 314 maps, charts, diagrams, sketches and photographs dealing with existing conditions and proposals for changes through 1985.

SECOND OF THREE STAGES

The proposed plan was the second stage of a three-stage process expected to result in the final adoption of an official 1985 comprehensive plan late this year.

The master-plan proposals call for 16 major urban renewal areas besides four now under way, construction of 110,000 new housing units, and numerous public and private projects to support an expected rise in District jobs from 600,000 to 800,000 in the next 20 years.

At the time the proposed plan was announced, NCPD officials estimated development cost would reach \$8 billion or more, with \$5 billion in private expenditure, \$1.2 billion in District public works funds, and the remainder in federal spending for transit, urban renewal, highways and other construction.

The plan proposes sweeping increases in subsidized housing within the District, and accommodations to social-policy changes.

More than 50,000 units of additional subsidized housing are urged for the city alone, plus a stepped-up program of school construction and expansion of recreation space and other benefits for low- and moderate-income District families.

The NCPD document emphasizes that housing and other metropolitan area social needs can be met only by a program of action that is "areawide."

The commissioners ended their sharp criticism of the plan by offering the resources of the city government to the NCPD "in presenting to the community a revised plan for adoption that addresses itself to the central concerns for the economic and social advancement of the city."

SYLACAUGA HIGH SCHOOL GYM-NASTIC TEAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NICHOLS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, for many years American athletes have brought home a majority of the medals from the summer Olympic games. Next year in

Mexico City, there will be another in the series of summer Olympic games, and the young athletes of America will be challenged to uphold the tradition of American victory. I am able to report with a great deal of enthusiasm that the gymnastic section of our future teams can expect a shot in the arm from my home State of Alabama.

Under the capable and efficient leadership of Mrs. Tom Calvin, the Sylacauga High School gymnastic team, of Sylacauga, Ala., has grown to be the finest girl's gymnastic team in the South. I say this without reservation for in the past 2 years this group of girls has won the Gulf States AAU meet in Houston, Tex., the AAU meet in Tuscaloosa, Ala.; and they have beat in dual competition the gymnastic team of Florida State University. Their prominence has spread throughout the Nation and now this prominence will be spread throughout the world, for the Sylacauga High School gymnastic team has been selected to represent the United States in a goodwill tour to Europe and Asia this winter. This tour is being sponsored by the Department of State with the financial backing of the Eastman Foundation, and will include visits to six countries.

The road to success has not been an easy one for sacrifices have been in order. Each day after school the team has practiced for several hours, many weekends have been spent either practicing or away from home in competition, and now in preparation for the tour, the team is practicing an average of 6 hours a day. Yet, the members of the Sylacauga High Gymnastic Team have been willing to make the sacrifices and to suffer the pain of blisters and bruises, and I think that it is fitting that they should be rewarded with the honor of representing our Nation in a world tour.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mrs. Calvin for she has gone over and beyond the call of duty in giving unselfishly of her time and efforts to developing this great team, and I commend all the girls that have made the sacrifice to participate on the Sylacauga High School gymnastic team for they represent the best of American youth.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert, for the RECORD, a column from the Sylacauga Advance that tells more about this great team, which I believe will furnish Alabama's first gold medal winner in the gymnastic division of the summer Olympics.

ALL EXPENSES PAID—SHS GYMNASTS WILL TOUR EUROPE

Mrs. Tom Calvin's Sylacauga High School Gymnastic Team has hit the jackpot! For when December 18 rolls around, the group will be boarding a plane for an all expense-paid trip to Europe.

The trip, a Goodwill Tour, is sponsored by the U.S. State Department with Eastman (Kodak) Foundation picking up the tab.

Mrs. Calvin said yesterday that Dr. Harland Clark of the Industrial Arts Department at the University of Alabama has made arrangements for the Sylacauga gymnasts to go and he and Mrs. Clark will accompany them.

The tour will include stops in London, Paris, Rome, Athens, Pakistan and on to India. The main demonstrations by the team

will be in India where groups from many countries will appear.

Mrs. Calvin will be accompanied by 12 girls. In addition to those to be in school this year, she will take former students who will be in college. They are Mickey Adams, SuSu Sellers, Lynn Gunter and Ginger Gunter. Others to make the trip will be Melinda Cockerham, Jane Thompson, Beverly Miller, Cindy Winters, Leanna Howard, Lynn Peters and Karen Field.

APPROPRIATIONS BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include tables.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I am including herewith, for the information of Members and others interested, current tabulations showing in summary form the status of the appropriations bills of the session.

HOUSE ACTIONS

Including the space appropriation bill as reported on Friday, which the House is scheduled to consider tomorrow, budget requests for appropriations of some \$138.6 billion at this session in 14 bills have been reduced in the House by \$3,988,939,998. Of that total, \$3,816,483,298 was cut from requests in the 12 bills dealing with fiscal 1968.

Some \$9 billion-plus—roughly—of additional appropriation requests are yet to be reported in appropriation bills dealing with military construction, foreign assistance, and the closing supplemental bill. These bills hinge wholly or almost entirely on annual authorization legislation not yet enacted, or in some instances not reported from committee. The Committee on Appropriations is marking time on them.

SENATE ACTIONS

The Senate has considered seven appropriation bills during the session, not counting the defense bill which it is currently considering. They involve budget requests for appropriations of some \$42.3 billion and in summary, they are above the appropriation budget requests by \$1,563,279,814. This is brought about by the fact that the Senate added slightly over \$2 billion to the House amounts in the agricultural appropriation bill. That bill is pending in conference. And the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare bill is also pending in conference.

FINAL ACTIONS

Five bills have cleared Congress this session—two supplementals for fiscal 1967 and three regular annual bills for fiscal 1968. They appropriate \$23,598,639,802, a sum \$284,206,060 below the corresponding budget requests. Three of the five bills pertain to fiscal 1968, and appropriated \$9,204,188,385, a reduction of \$145,182,825 from the requests.

Mr. Speaker, I include two tables—a summarization of the totals and a listing by individual bills:

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATION BILL TOTALS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF AUG. 21, 1967

[Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills. All figures are rounded amounts]

	Bills for fiscal 1967	Bills for fiscal 1968	Bills for the session
A. House actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered.....	\$14,411,000,000	\$124,163,000,000 ²	\$138,574,000,000
2. Amounts in 14 bills passed by House.....	14,238,000,000	120,347,000,000 ²	134,585,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-173,000,000	-3,816,000,000	-3,989,000,000
B. Senate actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered.....	14,533,000,000	27,795,000,000 ²	42,328,000,000
2. Amounts in 7 bills passed by Senate.....	14,457,000,000	29,434,000,000 ²	43,891,000,000
3. Change from corresponding budget requests.....	-76,000,000	+1,639,000,000	+1,563,000,000
4. Compared with House amounts in these 7 bills.....	+219,000,000	+2,434,000,000	+2,653,000,000
C. Final actions:			
1. Budget requests for appropriations considered.....	14,533,000,000	9,349,000,000	23,882,000,000
2. Amounts approved in 5 bills enacted.....	14,394,000,000	9,204,000,000	23,598,000,000
3. Comparison with corresponding budget requests.....	-139,000,000	-145,000,000	-284,000,000

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,512,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. ² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000) and for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000). Also includes NASA bill as reported from committee. ³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Total authorizations requested in budget \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$700,000,000.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ON BUDGET ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS IN APPROPRIATION BILLS, 90TH CONG., 1ST SESS., AS OF AUG. 21, 1967

[Does not include any "back-door" type appropriations, or permanent appropriations¹ under previous legislation. Does include indefinite appropriations carried in annual appropriation bills]

	Budget estimates considered by House	Passed House	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Passed Senate	Enacted	(+) or (-), latest action compared to budget
Bills for fiscal 1968:						
Treasury-Post Office.....	\$7,613,787,000	\$7,499,230,000	\$7,615,148,000	\$7,555,167,000	\$7,545,641,000	-\$69,507,000
District of Columbia:						
Federal payments.....	63,499,000	59,499,000	-----	-----	-----	-4,000,000
Federal loan appropriation.....	49,600,000	48,100,000	-----	-----	-----	-1,500,000
Interior.....	1,443,793,000	1,365,310,150	1,458,218,000	1,399,359,550	1,382,848,350	-75,369,650
Loan and contract authorizations.....	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(30,700,000)	(16,200,000)	(16,200,000)	(-14,500,000)
Independent offices-HUD.....	\$10,804,642,700 ²	\$10,013,178,782 ²	-----	-----	-----	-791,463,918
Contract authorization.....	(40,000,000)	-----	-----	-----	-----	(-40,000,000)
Labor-HEW.....	\$13,322,603,000 ²	\$13,137,488,000 ²	\$13,424,146,000	13,421,660,000	-----	-2,486,000
State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.....	\$2,342,942,000 ²	\$2,194,026,500 ²	-----	-----	-----	-148,915,500
Legislative.....	231,311,132	228,089,952	276,005,210	275,885,804	275,699,035	-306,175
Agriculture.....	\$5,021,097,400 ²	\$4,770,580,950 ²	\$5,021,097,400 ²	\$6,782,529,789 ²	(909,000,000)	+1,761,432,389
Loan authorization.....	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	(859,600,000)	-----	-----	(+49,400,000)
Defense.....	71,584,000,000	70,295,200,000	-----	-----	-----	-1,288,800,000
Transportation.....	\$1,718,618,772 ⁴	\$1,530,198,372 ⁴	-----	-----	-----	-188,420,400
Public works.....	4,867,813,000	4,622,922,000	-----	-----	-----	-244,891,000
NASA.....	5,100,000,000	\$4,583,400,000 ⁵	-----	-----	-----	\$-516,600,000
Military construction.....	\$2,937,000,000 ⁶	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Foreign assistance.....	(3,818,736,000)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Supplemental (poverty, other deferred items; usual supplementals).....	(*)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Subtotal, 1968 bills.....	124,163,707,004	120,347,223,706	27,794,614,610	29,434,602,143	9,204,188,385	-1,570,827,254
Bills for fiscal 1967:						
Defense supplemental (Vietnam).....	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,275,870,000	12,196,520,000	12,196,520,000	-79,350,000
2d supplemental.....	2,134,932,833	2,041,826,133	2,257,604,652	2,260,246,933	2,197,931,417	-59,673,235
Subtotal, 1967 bills.....	14,410,802,833	14,238,346,133	14,533,474,652	14,456,766,933	14,394,451,417	-139,023,235
Cumulative appropriation totals for the session:						
House (14 bills).....	138,574,509,837	134,585,569,839	-----	-----	-----	-3,988,939,998
Senate (7 bills).....	-----	-----	42,328,089,262	43,891,369,076	-----	+1,563,279,814
Enacted (5 bills).....	-----	-----	23,882,845,862	-----	23,598,639,802	-284,206,060

¹ Permanent appropriations were tentatively estimated in January budget at about \$15,212,066,000 for fiscal year 1968. (All forms of permanent new obligatory authority for 1968 were tentatively estimated in the January budget at \$17,452,899,000.) ² Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for urban renewal and mass transit grants (budget, \$980,000,000; House bill, \$925,000,000). ³ And participation sales authorizations as follows: Independent offices-HUD, \$3,235,000,000 in budget estimates and \$861,000,000 in House bill; Labor-HEW, \$115,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, \$150,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill; Agriculture, \$800,000,000 in budget estimates and House bill, \$700,000,000 in Senate bill. Total authorizations requested in budget, \$4,300,000,000; total in House bills, \$1,946,000,000; total in Senate bills, \$700,000,000. ⁴ Includes advance funding for fiscal 1969 for grants-in-aid for airports (budget, \$75,000,000; House bill, \$65,000,000). ⁵ As reported from committee. ⁶ These are the amounts presently pending consideration in the committee. ⁷ Several billions.

CBS REPORT ON THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection. Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this morning on the CBS morning news with Charles Kurlat substituting for Joseph Benning, I was very impressed with the coverage of the National Guard

at Fort Meade, Md. I thought this coverage was factual, and clearly explained the National Guard's problems.

The main points that were expressed in this news report were:

First, that the Guard is now required to have 72 hours of riot training, whereas, before the training program specified by the Secretary of Defense, included only a few hours of civil defense instruction and no specific riot training.

Second, it was stated that the Guard actually did not have enough equipment to do a thorough job of riot control. They originally were not given enough equipment, especially in communication

equipment, and since the Vietnam war, even more of their radio equipment was taken for Vietnam.

Third, more specific instructions were given on when to shoot or when not to shoot.

The Guard has been unduly criticized by the news media and others on their actions in the riots, mainly on hearsay evidence. Certainly, there were isolated cases where, as you stated, an officer should have been with a small unit of men at a street junction, or the officer's instructions should have been more clearly stated or given in written form.

As a former commander in the Na-

tional Guard, I have been quite disturbed over the criticism the National Guard has received during these riots, when actually 95 percent of the time, the Guard units have saved the day.

Certainly, we cannot forget the tradition and wonderful heritage of the National Guard which dates back to George Washington, who was a guardsman, and comes right along with Jefferson Davis at the Battle of Buena Vista, and then World War I and II, the Korean war, and now to the Vietnam war.

You know, the guardsman has a pretty rough time, in that he has to learn his regular combat assignment and then he has to learn how to face his own brother in civil disturbances, and he has to be able to protect himself without unnecessarily causing the loss of lives.

I again commend the CBS News for its very documented news report this morning.

NASA APPROPRIATION LEGISLATION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Nation's economy is threatened by inflation and when we are spending \$24 billion annually on the war in Vietnam, I am particularly struck by the more than \$4½ billion which will soon be requested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1968.

As an example of untimely NASA spending, \$21,100,000 of the funds requested are to be devoted to research directly applicable to the supersonic transport project. Flight testing involved in this project aggravates the sonic boom problem which has existed for 10 years. Meanwhile, no effective solution has been found or sought to the property inconvenience dealt the residential public by these erratic disturbances. Before more millions are poured into supersonic transport, some consideration should be given to solving the problems created thus far by this costly innovation.

I urge my colleagues to scrutinize the NASA appropriation legislation carefully and to vote against it.

SOCIAL SECURITY IS STILL BARGAIN FOR TYPICAL AMERICAN WORKER

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House overwhelmingly passed

a progressive piece of legislation, H.R. 12080, the Social Security Amendments of 1967, providing a 12½-percent increase in benefits to 23 million Americans.

Although I object to certain provisions of the bill in the aid for families with dependent children and the medicare sections, I supported and voted for the legislation. We have come a long way in the field of social security since President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the original Social Security Act into law on August 14, 1935, which you, Mr. Speaker, made reference to so eloquently just a few days ago.

The proponents and critics of social security have written and said much about this program since the original bill passed Congress in 1935. The U.S. News & World Report, in its August 14, 1967 issue, contained an article on social security under the heading "Is Social Security Still a Bargain?" In clear, simple language and with uncomplicated illustrations, this article indicates that social security is well worth the money a typical American worker pays into the fund, and it is a bargain.

Mr. Speaker, I include the U.S. News & World Report article and examples with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

IS SOCIAL SECURITY STILL A BARGAIN?

How good a buy is your Social Security? In the long run, is the system worth what you put in?

Such questions take on new urgency with a rise in payroll taxes, forcing everybody to raise his ante, on the threshold.

Close scrutiny of the program, with all its ramifications, turns up some surprising answers for those awaiting pay-out day.

A new rise in Social Security pensions and payroll taxes has been drafted in Congress, and once more people are asking some old, familiar questions:

Is Social Security really a good buy for the typical American worker and his family?

Do people get their money's worth?

Could a man do better with a private annuity to provide for himself and his wife in old age?

The answers vary, of course, from one person to another—depending on age, family situation, and such circumstances as the number of years in active work and in retirement.

However, some broad conclusions can be stated—

The vast majority of people now working on jobs covered by Social Security will draw benefits far in excess of what they have paid or will pay in taxes during working years.

In most cases, the return will be larger than the combined tax payments of the worker and his employer.

Boon for retired. Social Security is a real bargain for people already retired, soon to retire, or well along in years.

The system also favors workers with low incomes.

Even the young man who starts out today on a working career of 40 years, paying the maximum payroll tax the whole time, has a good chance of getting more money back than he and his employer pay into the system.

This is especially true if allowance is made for the value of extra protections that Social Security offers against the hazards of life—pensions for disabled workers, benefits for the dependents of a worker who dies before retirement age, hospital and nursing-home care in old age, and so on.

How you will make out. All this, and more, emerges from a new study of the American people's stake in the Social Security system, prepared by the Economic Unit of "U.S. News & World Report."

The examples given in the chart on these pages show how people in various situations will make out on their investment in Social Security.

No allowance is made in these examples for the increases in taxes and benefits approved by the House Ways and Means Committee on August 2. However, those changes will not alter the general ratio of taxes to benefits, because both will go up proportionately. Thus, the broad conclusions stated here will apply under a new law just the same as under present law.

Note also that the benefits shown by the examples in the chart are retirement and survivors' payments only. No allowance is made for the value of disability insurance or medicare.

There are some exceptions to the general rule that Social Security is a good buy from the individual's standpoint. Some people get back little or nothing for the taxes they pay.

One is a worker who dies before retirement, leaving no dependents to draw a survivors' benefits. The worker's estate gets a modest death benefit, and that is all.

A working wife may never draw benefits based on the payroll taxes she herself paid as a worker. In many instances, a woman will find that she does better to be pensioned as the wife of a retired worker.

Then there are a good many people who just never retire. Doctors, lawyers, businessmen, farmers and others often go on working in old age, and never claim pensions from Social Security.

Even these people, however, have the advantage of protection for themselves and their families.

Disability insurance, for example, can be important. A worker is eligible at any age. Conceivably, a man starting in mid-twenties could draw a full family pension for the rest of his life.

Payments to children. Survivors' benefits over a period of years can run into big figures.

Payments to each child, in the event of the father's death, are made until he or she reaches age 18—or age 22 if still in school. When the children go off the rolls, their mother does too, but at age 60 she starts drawing a widow's pension for the rest of her life. All told, such a family might draw as much as \$75,000, \$80,000, even \$100,000 in return for a modest sum paid by the worker in payroll taxes during his lifetime. It is estimated that the aggregate value of survivors' insurance protection alone is 730 billion dollars.

Of every \$1 paid in taxes for Social Security, about 28 cents is for survivors' protection and disability insurance. As for hospital and nursing-home benefits, a person does not need to retire to qualify. People who are older than 65 are entitled to this coverage even if they continue working.

Importance of medicare. In case of severe or prolonged illness, medicare could be the most important part of the whole Social Security system.

Thus, there is a wide and growing range of coverage under the Social Security program. No private insurance company offers such benefits.

If Social Security is such a bargain—with valuable protection piled on top of the promise of benefits exceeding tax payments for nearly every worker—how can the system make ends meet? Is it in danger of going broke?

To begin with, it should be understood that Social Security has other income besides the worker's payroll-tax payments. Those payments are matched by the employer. Then, too, the system draws interest

on the reserve fund, which is about 22 billion dollars.

This also is important: Social Security financing is arranged in such a way that each generation supports the benefits of the next older generation.

For past generations. In other words, people now working pay just enough in Social Security taxes each year to cover the cost of the year's benefits to those already retired and to the dependents of deceased workers.

No generation quite pays its way on Social Security, but the next generation makes up the difference.

In addition, as noted, there are those who pay taxes but draw little or no benefits. Those taxes help to maintain the reserve fund at approximately the amount needed for one year's benefits.

If the system were to run into financial trouble some day, there appears to be little if any doubt that Congress would come to the rescue. Pensions unquestionably would be paid, even if it became necessary to finance them out of the general revenue of the United States Treasury.

Another important point bearing on the question of how good a buy Social Security is for the typical worker: As a practical matter, benefits have become just about inflationproof.

Congress has a history of increasing pensions and survivors' payments as living costs have risen over the years.

How revenues grow. Taxes have been increased too, to help pay for higher pensions. But payroll-tax revenue at each step in the rising rate level of recent years has been higher than anticipated, because wages and salaries have kept going up. This has meant more pay to tax, and thus more revenue to support Social Security.

In Congress, there have been repeated demands for an "escalator clause" in the law to increase pensions automatically as living costs rise.

So far, Congress has shied away from any automatic escalator, but has voted five general raises in benefits since 1950. The increase now being voted will be No. 6.

In this 17-year period, benefits have increased faster than living costs, and important new benefits have been added to the program.

Congress keeps watch. There seems to be no doubt that, in the future, Congress will keep coming through as necessary to preserve the buying power of pensions.

What if a man could invest privately all the money that he and his employer pay in Social Security taxes over a working span of 40 years or so? It would be possible, with such investments, to build up a handsome retirement fund of his own. It is conceivable that, with fortunate investments, he could get a better return than he can expect from Social Security.

The experts, however, point to some advantages of Social Security over private investment. Prices of common stocks rise and fall with business activity, confidence, and profits. Bonds do not offer protection against inflation. Real estate investment is risky. Private insurance to offer the same kind of multiple benefits and protection as does Social Security cannot be had.

Thus, the experts on Social Security maintain that, while the program is no substitute for private investments or insurance, it does provide the assurance of a modest income and protection for millions at cost lower than can be had in any other way.

In fact, for some, minimum Social Security has been provided without any cost at all.

Special benefits. Under changes in the law enacted in 1966, some people 72 or older were given a special benefit of \$35 a month even though they never had worked under Social Security. Others who were covered for only a

short time and paid only nominal taxes became eligible for the special benefit in 1965.

Many people in years past have been able to retire on small pensions after paying as little as \$100 or less in Social Security taxes.

Large numbers of retired couples now draw more in retirement benefits each month than they paid in taxes during their working years.

Those are the extreme cases, and serve to demonstrate the point that there is an important element of welfare, as well as insurance, in the Social Security system.

But for the great majority of people, even those who will pay the maximum taxes in years to come, Social Security turns out to be a good buy. This will continue to be the case under the new law to be enacted by Congress.

WHAT SOCIAL SECURITY COSTS YOU—WHAT YOU GET BACK: SIX EXAMPLES

Taxes and benefits under old-age, survivors and disability insurance. The payroll tax for medicare is included in the tax figures but no medicare payments are included in the benefits.

Example 1:

An employee who paid the maximum Social Security tax from the time the program started in 1937 until he retired in 1948 at age 65. His wife is the same age.

Taxes paid by the employee.....	\$330
Taxes paid by the employer.....	330
<hr/>	
Total taxes paid.....	660
Benefits paid to retired couple so far.....	29,342

Example 2:

An employee who paid the maximum tax for 30 years before retiring last January 1. Both the worker and his wife at retirement were 65 years old.

Taxes paid by the employee.....	\$2,383
Taxes paid by the employer.....	2,383
<hr/>	
Total taxes paid.....	4,766

Benefits to be drawn by the couple, assuming both live out their normal life expectancy.....	37,316
--	--------

Example 3:

A widower with no dependents who paid the maximum tax as an employe for 30 years before retiring last January 1 at the age of 65.

Taxes paid by the employee.....	\$2,383
Taxes paid by the employer.....	2,383
<hr/>	
Total taxes paid.....	4,766

Benefits if he dies at age 70, 5 years after retirement.....	8,154
--	-------

Example 4:

Another widower with no dependents, now age 52, who pays the maximum tax as an employe for 43 years before retiring in 1980.

Taxes to be paid by the employee.....	\$6,766
Taxes to be paid by the employer.....	6,766
<hr/>	
Total taxes to be paid.....	13,532

Benefits to be drawn by the retired worker if he dies at age 75, 5 years after retirement.....	9,180
--	-------

Example 5:

A young salaried worker who paid the maximum tax from 1957 until his death last January at age 32. His wife, age 28, and two children, 7 and 3, survive him.

Taxes paid by the employee.....	\$1,546
Taxes paid by his employer.....	1,546
<hr/>	
Total taxes paid.....	3,092

Benefits to be paid to the family:	
Death benefit, lump sum.....	255
Benefits payable to 1968, when children finish college.....	62,622
Benefits to widow starting at age 60 assuming she lives out her normal life expectancy.....	24,380
<hr/>	
Total benefits.....	87,257

Example 6:

A young lawyer who starts practicing in 1967 at age 25, and pays the maximum tax until he retires in the year 2007. Both he and his wife will then be 65.

Taxes to be paid by the lawyer as a self-employed worker.....	\$20,074
Benefits to be drawn by the lawyer and his wife, assuming both live out their normal life expectancy.....	46,124

Note this: Social Security promises disability benefits, as well as pensions and hospital care in old age and protection for the worker's family in case of his death before retirement age. One might wonder how the system can offer all this and still survive if, as might be indicated by the examples, the typical worker gets far more out of Social Security than he pays in taxes. Remember these points:

Social Security has interest income on its 22-billion-dollar reserve fund to help pay the cost of benefits.

Many workers pay Social Security taxes for years but never draw any benefits—either because they die before retirement age, leaving no dependent, or else keep working after retirement age and claim no benefits.

Social Security financing is arranged so that each working generation pays part of the bill for the generation already retired. The cost of pensions is just about matched each year by the income of the system, so that Social Security is close to a pay-as-you-go basis.

No allowance is made in the examples above for any increases in Social Security taxes and benefits beyond those provided by present law.

THE WINKLER REPORT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, there has been a growing interest in the field of radiology and health. In fact, hearings will be conducted in the Senate next week dealing with this subject.

One of the advances which has been made in this general field has come about through the efforts of a young and conscientious dentist from my district, Dr. Fred Medwedeff, of Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. Medwedeff has developed a dental X-ray unit collimating device designed to reduce exposure in the making of dental X-ray films.

The device has been tested by the Public Health Service of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Division of Radiological Health.

A copy of the Public Health Service report on this study was forwarded to me in early 1964. The study is generally referred to as the Winkler Report, prepared by Keith Winkler, D.D.S., Senior

Dental Surgeon, Dental X-Ray Program, State Assistance Branch, Division of Radiological Health, Bureau of State Services (EH), Public Health Service.

Because of the interest in this general field, I include the Winkler Report in the body of the RECORD at this point and commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, DIVISION OF RADIOLOGICAL HEALTH, STATE ASSISTANCE BRANCH

Subject: Technical Report on a Dental Collimating Device Designed by Dr. Fred Medwedeff.

This is to transmit publications or publications information relating to programs of the State Assistance Branch.

Remarks: This report covers the essential technical data concerning the Medwedeff collimating device, which is commercially available. The evaluation conducted by SAB was limited to a study of the radiation reduction claims attributed to the device. Evaluation of its performance and potential acceptability and the feasibility of its use in routine dental radiography are considered to be a responsibility centered elsewhere.

We believe radiological health program personnel in State health departments should have available to them information contained in this report for whatever uses they care to make of it.

Initial distribution: DRH Division, Branch, and Office Chiefs; Program Directors, Rad. Health, Regions I-IX; Program Directors, Rad. Health, for Distribution to State Rad. Health Program Chiefs; DRH State Assignees; Regional Laboratory Chiefs, including RERA and ERHT, SEC; Schools Participating in Radiation Health Specialist Training Program.

LABORATORY EVALUATION OF A DENTAL X-RAY UNIT COLLIMATING DEVICE

(Prepared by: Keith Winkler, D.D.S., Senior Dental Surgeon, Dental X-Ray Program, State Assistance Branch, Division of Radiological Health, Bureau of State Services (EH), Public Health Service, May 22, 1964.)

FOREWORD

The Public Health Service is actively promoting methods of X-ray usage which will obtain the best and most complete diagnostic information with the least practicable amount of radiation exposure to patients and those operating X-ray equipment.

As part of its program to aid in reducing unnecessary or unproductive radiation, the Division of Radiological Health of the Public Health Service encourages the development and use of exposure reducing and quality improving devices. This is done through seminars, support of education and research, and by conducting limited investigations of X-ray techniques and devices when such investigations are clearly in the public interest.

Fred M. Medwedeff, D.D.S., a private practitioner of Nashville, Tennessee, has designed and constructed collimating devices for use with dental X-ray units to expose dental X-ray films. If properly used, these devices project X-rays to the skin level in the form of a rectangular beam which is smaller in area size than the round 2 1/4" to 3" diameter beam projected by most up-to-date dental X-ray units. The smaller the X-ray beam at the skin level, the less exposure obviously occurs to deeper underlying tissues.

A test report of the physical parameters of the Medwedeff device was conducted in order to supply data essential to individuals representing professional organizations and State health departments who might be interested in conducting more extensive evaluations of

this device, or who might be interested in incorporating this device in their clinical or public health programs.

RUSSELL I. PIERCE, M.D.,
Chief, State Assistance Branch,
Division of Radiological Health.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this evaluation is to make a comparison of X-ray exposures to various areas of the body with and without the use of the "Medwedeff Precision X-ray Device."

METHODS

In evaluating the physical parameters related to the Medwedeff X-ray device, two different procedures were used:

1. A comparison of dosimeter readings at the skin surface and inside an Alderson phantom at points in and out of the primary beam and in the region of organs of interest was made.

2. A comparison of exposure rate readings scattered in the direction of the gonads was made with and without the device in place.

The first procedure was carried out under three different dental X-ray machine operating conditions. The second procedure was carried out under (2) and (3) as listed below:

1. *The uncorrected condition.*—This condition is intended to simulate conditions as they existed before the Division of Radiological Health and other interested health groups began making recommendations to reduce radiation to the patient and operator. The X-ray machine has a 4" useful beam, 0.5 mm total aluminum equivalent filtration, and a 16" plastic unlined open cone. In this report, we shall refer to this as the uncorrected condition.

2. *The recommended condition.*—This condition is intended to simulate conditions as recommended by the Division of Radiological Health, the X-ray machine has a 2 3/4" useful beam, 2.0 mm total aluminum equivalent filtration, and a 16" lead-lined open cone. In this report we shall refer to this as the recommended condition.

3. *The recommended condition plus the Medwedeff device.*—In the third condition, the X-ray machine and film are the same as in the corrected condition, with the additional use of the "Medwedeff Precision X-ray Device". In this report we shall refer to this as the Medwedeff condition.

THE FIRST EVALUATION PROCEDURE

In this procedure, a Weber 12R X-ray machine, operated at 90 kVp and 15 ma, was

used to expose capsules of lithium fluoride thermoluminescent dosimeters which had been placed within and upon the head and neck of an Alderson phantom. These dosimeters were left in position during a full-mouth and bitewing series of X-ray exposures. Identical sets of exposures were made in each of the three conditions, that is, the *uncorrected X-ray machine*, the *X-ray machine operating under recommended conditions* and the *X-ray machine using the Medwedeff device*.

After exposure, the dosimeters were read on the TLD readout system. The resulting exposure readings were converted to the exposure which would have resulted from the time used to expose ultra-fast X-ray film. The results were tabulated for comparing exposures to various areas and organs of the head and neck. Table I compares the exposure distribution under the three conditions.

THE SECOND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

In this procedure, an attempt was made to measure the effect of the device on X-ray scatter to the gonadal region. A Victoreen ratemeter was used with the 250 mr size chamber placed about one-half meter from the end of the pointer cone inferiorly. Readings were made with the 2 3/4" beam, 16" lead-lined column, 2 mm aluminum equivalent filtration and with the Medwedeff device in place, using various angulations to simulate bitewing and periapical position of the X-ray machine.

The gonadal exposure for the series runs approximately between .04 and .4 mr for individual exposures in the 22-film series. The addition of the Medwedeff device reduced this to the range of .008—.16 mr for individual exposures within the same 22-film series.

The extremely low gonadal dose in either case makes evaluation of this factor extremely difficult, and the above can be considered only approximate and tentative.

SUMMARY

An evaluation of exposure reduction effected by proper use of the Medwedeff device was made. Using thermoluminescent dosimetry and an Alderson phantom, comparisons of the magnitude of X-ray exposures to various areas and organs of the body under varied conditions were made. A table showing the effects of alterations of a dental X-ray machine to correct filtration and beam diameter. These comparisons demonstrated the effect of using the Medwedeff device.

There was no attempt to evaluate the device from a clinical feasibility standpoint.

TABLE I.—COMPARISON OF ACCUMULATED EXPOSURE TO SELECTED AREAS FOR 22-FILM BITEWING AND FULL-MOUTH SERIES USING ULTRAFAST FILM

Organ or area of interest	Exposure in roentgens			Percent reduction	
	With uncorrected machine	Recommended machine conditions	Recommended machine conditions with Medwedeff device	From uncorrected machine to recommended condition	Additional reduction by Medwedeff device
End of column.....	7.61	3.85	3.85	49.4	0
Surface of skin, area of bicuspid teeth ¹	4.22	1.61	.41	61.8	28.5
Surface of skin, area of 3d molar teeth.....	3.30	1.22	.69	63.0	16.1
Surface of skin, area of ascending ramus of mandible.....	1.73	.71	.18	59.0	30.6
Corneal surface of eye.....	1.13	.37	.02	67.3	30.9
Marrow space, mandibular bone area, 3d molar.....	.78	.52	.19	33.3	42.3
Sublingual salivary gland.....	.66	.57	.09	14.2	72.2
Parotid salivary gland.....	.43	.24	.04	44.2	46.5
Thyroid gland.....	.35	.10	.01	71.4	25.7
Spinal cord area C-1.....	.156	.05	.01	67.9	25.7
Pituitary gland.....	.062	.014	.003	77.4	17.8

¹ No area of the body received a higher exposure than this area.

LATIN AMERICAN YOUTH SUPPORTS ALLIANCE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his re-

marks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as part of the observance of the sixth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, the Pan American Development Foundation sponsored an essay contest among Latin American high school students on the Alliance as a challenge for youth. And on this very day they are here in Washington.

I have read some excerpts from these prize winning essays and I wish my colleagues to know about them because they are indeed inspiring.

Without exception, these young people, both boys and girls, show a clear understanding of the principles and goals of hemispheric development. Without exception they see the Alliance as a call for action, as a spur to national self-help and multilateral cooperation.

Seventeen-year-old Emigdio Flores Calpineiro comes from Puno, an area in the Peruvian altiplano that knows much poverty. He says:

We young people must unite with others to promote economic and social progress. . . . We can act with our own families. And if we are receptive to ideas of change and progress we will find a thousand ways in which to help our people effectively.

Dina America Flores, a student from El Salvador, says:

What the Alliance for Progress means to me is a "gran revolucion del sudor y no de la sangre" . . . a great revolution of sweat, not of blood.

Sergio Guimaraes Brito is a 17-year-old from the vast cattle raising state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. He says:

Development has to be and should be built day by day—by us. We must struggle every day to free Latin America a little more from the chains of underdevelopment.

Another young Brazilian, Creso Luiz de Moraes from Parana, calls to "Latin American youth, which has more ties with tomorrow, which has idealism as its arms . . . we believe this young generation will welcome the challenge of economic and social progress done by man, for man." These young people are idealistic, but they are also realistic. They know that development is not achieved by miracles but by long, hard, persistent effort.

From far out in the Caribbean comes another prize winner, Luis Caminero of the Dominican Republic, a country that has suffered greatly from the ills of underdevelopment. He says:

Although we, the younger generation, cannot offer our country large sums of money, we can offer as our contribution our studies, our struggles and our longings in thanks for having been born under a flag whose colors of vermilion and sea blue and whose white cross symbolize redemption.

And a compatriot, Pedro Antonio Mendoza, urges that Dominican youth, with Alliance help, establish more centers where young people can carry on useful community development work while they also continue their studies. This is being done in Colombia, Mexico, and Venezuela and is beginning in the Dominican Republic. The new Dominican Development Foundation, a private organization established with the help of the Pan American Development Foundation, and

the first of a network of development foundations being established in Latin America, is beginning projects of this kind.

And so we salute these dynamic development institutions and the winners of the Alliance essay contest. They prove that the goals of the Alliance are right and that its aims are gaining understanding and support among the younger generation who will be the forgers of a great and shining Latin American civilization in the future.

AUGUST 19—NATIONAL AVIATION DAY

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the aeronautics industry has come a long way since Orville and Wilbur Wright made their historic flight at Kittyhawk, N.C., and got the industry off the ground.

The great pioneering spirit of America, which enabled our forefathers to open up an entire continent, drove those dedicated brothers and the many who have followed them down to the present, to find a faster, safer, and more reliable means of travel.

I remember when I was in the other body and Orville Wright came to me asking me to introduce a bill to establish a "National Aviation Day" on August 19 of each year. Over the years it has given me everlasting pleasure to know that I was able to honor a great American and a now great industry. My 1939 Senate Joint Resolution 111 was cosponsored in the House at that time by a young Congressman, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, who was then destined for a great career in the public service, and is now a very distinguished and able Senator from West Virginia.

I feel I have grown up with the aviation industry in our country. I was only 38 when I worked to establish a National Aviation Day, and air transportation and flying were still in their infancy. In my speech on behalf of the joint resolution, I urged the establishment of Aviation Day as a means of encouraging the formation of a sentiment that would be favorable to the development of the aviation facilities of the United States.

I would like to salute all of those who, since the Wright brothers, have made aviation a major force in our country's life—to those who have made air transportation a great convenience and a prime element in our economic efficiency, to those who have developed our modern aircraft and our airports and other aviation facilities, and especially to those thousands of flying enthusiasts who, through their clubs and events, have made aviation a part of our national consciousness.

Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday was National Aviation Day, and at Dulles Airport there was an exposition of many of the greatest and most historic moments

in the field of aviation, which was an excellent commemoration of this great day.

STATEMENT OF FLOYD CHRISTIAN

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I bring to your attention a statement by Floyd Christian, superintendent for public instruction from my State of Florida, which he made on the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. He talks about the "ever-growing responsibility of educating our children for a rapidly changing world" which the Public Broadcasting Act will provide. Public Broadcasting has my support as legislation vital to the upgrading of education in the homes and schools of America. I have sponsored a bill for public broadcasting, and I endorse the following comments by Mr. Christian:

STATEMENT OF FLOYD CHRISTIAN, SUPERINTENDENT FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION FOR THE STATE OF FLORIDA

I am Floyd Christian, Superintendent for Public Instruction for the State of Florida. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you in support of the Public Broadcasting Act which I endorse enthusiastically. The Senate, after its hearings and deliberations felt so strongly that radio has a potential in education equal to that of television, that it changed the title of S. 1160, as well as provisions within the Act, to fully recognize both of these important resources. Being responsible for public education in our State, I am, of course, most concerned with Title III of the Act, that which authorizes a comprehensive study of instructional radio and television. I am convinced that the educational task before us cannot be successfully carried out without the development of every tool at our disposal. Radio and television have already demonstrated that they are important and necessary parts of our educational system. The Public Broadcasting Act will make it possible for these facilities to be expanded so that they may make an even greater contribution in our ever-growing responsibility of educating our children for a rapidly changing world.

I would like to bring to your attention an example of the use of radio in public instruction in Florida. WTHS in Miami, which is operated by the Dade County Public Schools, broadcasts to the classrooms of grades 1-6 in the area. As a result of a survey taken in February of this year, they estimate their listening audience of 243,840 pupil periods a week and 7,304,400 in a year. I am incorporating for the record a copy of the results of that survey as well as their operating budget for a year which, including costs for staff salaries, teachers' manuals and program purchases, totals only \$21,150.00 a year.

The program schedule includes science, social studies, government and history, music, literature, language arts, health and safety, geography, and Spanish. If we can enhance and enrich the educational experience of so many children in so many varied areas at this small cost, the contribution that well-financed stations operating throughout the state, and throughout the nation could make to the education process seems unlimited.

We need more stations like WTHS but we also need to provide them with personnel and equipment for local production. We must work toward the interconnection of such stations so that their resources may be shared instantly and adequately, and we must carry to the educationally backward rural areas of our states the skills, experiences, and cultural advantages of our urban schools. To do these things most effectively, we must study the existing uses of instructional radio as a basis for future development and I am pleased that Title III of the Public Broadcasting Act provides for such study.

I have mentioned our rural areas which comprise 3/10th out of the total population. In Florida there are also many migrants, especially in the southern part of the state, and we are already at work on a project to

help them through radio. The Palm Beach County School System, with the endorsement of the State Department of Education, has plans for an FM station to serve specifically the Spanish speaking migrant workers in the area and their children. It is a family, school, and community project aimed at developing literacy and citizenship responsibilities which will, in course, increase understanding of the schools on the part of parents and success of the children attending them.

On another level, that of junior college education, we are also looking to radio to help carry out our educational objectives. In September we'll begin a study of the feasibility of placing an educational radio station on each of our junior college campuses to be linked in a state-wide live network. We have

already requested that non-commercial channels be reserved in the specified cities and hope that within several years these educational institutions will be able to share their resources by means of radio to the great benefit and enrichment of all the junior colleges.

You can see from the examples I have cited, that we place great faith in the potential of radio in serving Florida's educational needs. As the state grows, so will educational radio have to grow with it in reaching more of our young people, with more and better programs, and with specialized services such as the one I've already mentioned for migrants. We will need help and guidance and, not least, financial support. We look to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 for such assistance.

RESULTS OF RADIO SURVEY TAKEN BY EDUCATIONAL RADIO STATION WTHS IN MIAMI, FLA., FEB. 13-17, 1967

[Participants: Elementary schools of Dade County, Fla., grades 1 to 6, Headstart, and special education]

Program title	Day	Time	Intended level	Number of classes	Number of pupils ¹	Total classes	Total pupils	
Adventures in Research (science)	Tuesday	10:45	6 to 12	7	210	14.0	420	
	Thursday	12:30		5	150			
	Friday	11:30		2	60			
American Adventure (social studies)	Tuesday	11:00	10 to 12	3	90	5.0	150	
	Wednesday	12:00		2	60			
	Monday	12:00		3	90			
BBC World Report (current events)	Wednesday	2:15	9 to 12	3	90	13.0	390	
	Friday	10:45		7	210			
	Wednesday	9:30		11	330			
Exploring Science (science)	Thursday	12:45	3	18	540	34.0	1,020	
	Friday	11:15		5	150			
	Monday	10:45		11	330			
Footsteps of the Free (government and history)	Tuesday	2:15	4 to 9	28	840	45.0	1,350	
	Thursday	12:00		6	180			
	Monday	12:15		74	2,220			
It's Time for Music! (music)	Wednesday	9:45	1 to 3	31	930	127.0	3,810	
	Thursday	11:30		22	660			
	Monday	9:30		58	1,740			
Let's Find Out! (science)	Tuesday	12:45	1	45	1,350	147.0	4,310	
	Wednesday	11:15		44	1,320			
	Tuesday	9:30		24	720			
Do.....	Wednesday	12:45	2	38	1,140	70.0	2,100	
	Thursday	11:15		8	240			
	Monday	10:15		31	930			
Let's Make Music! (music)	Thursday	11:00	4 to 6	16	480	52.0	1,560	
	Friday	11:45		5	150			
	Monday	12:45		6	180			
Lives of Man (social studies)	Wednesday	11:45	5 to 9	2	60	26.0	780	
	Friday	11:30		18	540			
	Monday	11:30		14	420			
The Man and His Music (music)	Wednesday	10:15	5 to 9	4	120	22.0	660	
	Thursday	9:45		4	120			
	Monday	11:15		0	0			
Meet Mister Shakespeare (literature)	Tuesday	12:15	9 to 12	2	60	3.0	90	
	Thursday	11:45		1	30			
	Tuesday	11:30		59	1,770			
Poly and Puffy (language arts)	Thursday	12:15	1 to 3	46	1,380	143.0	4,290	
	Friday	10:15		38	1,140			
	Friday	12:00		22	660			
Portraits in Music	Tuesday	12:30	Adult	106	3,180	22.0	660	
	Thursday	10:45		12	360			
	Friday	9:30		30	900			
Safe and Sound (health and safety)	Monday	9:45	1 to 3	16	480	148.0	4,440	
	Tuesday	11:45		7	210			
	Wednesday	11:00		12	360			
Tales From the Four Winds (language arts)	Monday	11:00	1 to 4	24	720	166.0	4,980	
	Wednesday	12:30		114	420			
	Thursday	9:30		28	840			
They Met The Challenge (social studies)	Tuesday	12:00	4 to 9	17	510	34.0	1,020	
	Thursday	10:15		9	270			
	Friday	11:00		8	240			
This Land Is Your Land (geography)	Monday	2:15	5 to 6	8	240	39.0	1,170	
	Tuesday	10:15		8	240			
	Wednesday	11:30		23	690			
Uncle Dan (natural science)	Monday	12:30	1 to 4	139	4,170	213.0	6,390	
	Tuesday	9:45		43	1,290			
	Wednesday	10:45		31	930			
When Men Are Free (government and history)	Monday	11:45	4 to 9	26	780	48.0	1,440	
	Thursday	2:15		14	420			
	Friday	9:45		8	240			
Conversational Spanish	Monday through Thursday	8:40	1	678	20,340	975.0	29,250	
	Friday	1:00		297	8,910			
	Monday through Thursday	8:60		466	13,980			
Do.....	Friday	1:10	2	283	8,490	749.0	22,40	
	Monday through Thursday	9:00		234	7,020			
	Friday	1:20		179	5,370			
Do.....	Monday through Thursday	9:10	4	136	4,080	283.0	8,490	
	Friday	1:30		147	4,410			
	Monday through Thursday	1:20		260	7,800			
Do.....	Friday	1:40	5 to 6	188	5,640	448.0	13,440	
	Monday through Thursday	10:00		44	1,320			
	Friday	2:00		21	630			
Aero-Space Age (science)	Monday through Friday	8:30	All	3,313	99,390	3,313	99,390	
	Monday through Friday	8:32		All	364			10,920
	Monday through Friday	8:32		All	364			10,920
Morning Exercises (bugle call, pledge to flag, and national anthem)	Monday through Friday	8:32	All	364	10,920	364.0	10,920	
Estimated listening audience in 1 week						8,116.0	243,840	
Estimated audience per day						1,623.2	48,696	
Estimated audience per year						243,480.0	7,304,400	

¹ Number of pupils derived by estimating 30 pupils per classroom.

Estimated WTHS (FM) radio operational costs per year	
Tape supplies: Recording tape, leader, and timing leader (2/3 of supplies used for TV operation)-----	\$500
Record subscriptions: RCA Victor and Columbia (classical and pop)---	400
National educational radio affiliation: Provides in-school programs-----	800
Program line (rented from A.T. & T.)-----	800
Maintenance-----	300
Salaries:	
Program director (also serves as announcer, music director, and writer)-----	8,600
Transmitter engineer (operates 2 TV and 1 FM transmitter) (divide salary by 1/3)-----	2,900
Publications: Production cost of teacher's radio manual-----	4,000
Office supplies-----	50
Equipment replacement purchased within last 10 years—cost divided by 10 (transmitter, antenna, console, and turntable)-----	2,800
Total yearly cost-----	21,150

NOTE.—Cost of operation per listener per year, \$000.003. Actual operating expense (excluding salaries, new equipment, and publications) and about \$3,000 yearly.

STATEMENT OF ALBERT L. HULSEN, CHAIRMAN, EASTERN EDUCATIONAL RADIO NETWORK

The following is submitted in support of H.R. 6736, Public Television Act of 1967, which the Eastern Educational Radio Network (EERN) believes will contribute significantly to the development of a viable non-commercial broadcasting service.

The EERN is encouraged, in particular, by the inclusion of radio in this bill, believing that the concurrent development of educational radio and television assures the most efficient and economical use of these educational media.

The Eastern Educational Radio Network is an association of eight non-commercial FM stations, including:

WAER—Syracuse, New York.
WAMC—Albany, New York.
WAMU—Washington, D.C.
WFCR—Amherst, Massachusetts.
WGBH—Boston, Massachusetts.
WRFK—Richmond, Virginia.
WRVR—New York City, New York.
WUHY—Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Three of these stations (WAMC, WFCR, WGBH) are interconnected for live network broadcasting, with planning well underway to include a fourth station (WRVR) in the near future. All members exchange programs by tape recording and participate in the production of cooperative program series. These stations serve the most populated area in the United States and collectively, have a potential audience of over 25 million listeners.

To the EERN and its audience, an improvement in the quality of educational radio programs will be the most significant contribution. The EERN believes this goal can be achieved most rapidly through live networking, which will permit by authorizing grants for the construction of interconnection facilities.

1. At the basic level, interconnection will make the present program resources of each EERN station available instantaneously to all other network stations. Program selectivity will be increased, permitting the radio audience to receive the most significant programming of the eight stations combined, rather than that of the local outlet only.

2. Live exchange of programming will free each station's staff from the necessity of producing quantity—to fill up the broadcast day—and producing programs duplicated by all stations. Time saved will be utilized to improve continuing series or to establish

new, more significant programs. Again, both local and network audiences will benefit.

CASSIUS CLAY

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, many times in my career as a public servant I have had my small disagreements with the members of the newspaper world, but today I rise to commend Mr. John Spolski, a sports columnist for the Sanford Herald of Sanford, Fla.

Mr. Spolski, in his column "Spolski on Sports," has written a series of highly informative articles on the behavior of Cassius Clay, a famous athlete but an infamous American.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include excerpts from these columns at this point in the RECORD for the further information of those who may read this RECORD:

TELL ME MORE, BIG DADDY

For those of you who've been out on a hunting stand, you'll probably appreciate the next more than the average sports fan.

I can be awfully patient waiting . . . sooner or later, something is going to move . . . in the meantime, I'll puff on my weed and wait it out . . . just like you, C.C.B. (Cassius Cry Baby).

Two more weeks and then your trial. Like I said, I can hardly wait — — — but I'll just force myself to do it.

I WISH I COULDA SAID THAT!

It's that time of the year again. You know, right around springtime . . . you sorta get a lazy streak in you (unless you're like a certain sports writer who has that feeling constantly).

Then there are those other times, like right now, when you start day dreaming . . . (maybe, it's because my vacation starts tomorrow for an overdue two-week siesta up in the "pretzels and beer capital of the world—Reading, Pa.).

Go ahead and say something that will etch itself into history's scrolls, John. Wait . . . I think, I think there's one coming.

"My only regret is that I have but (gee, that's stirring, John. History will never forget you, S.O.S.) . . .

"My only regret is that I have but one more column before vacation, cause in less than 10 days time, there's gonna be a funny little trial somewhere out thar' in Texas for a fellow who has a bigger mouth than his ten-gallon hat and he keeps on repeatin', 'I Ain't goin' . . . I Ain't goin'.'"

Wasn't that some kind of a "tribunal" they all had in Cleveland last week, though? Great Negro athletes like Jimmy Brown, Lew Alcindor, Bill Russell, Bobby Mitchell and Willie Davis, "Wanting to see if we could be of help to him."

Look, fellahs, all yah gotta do is send out an S.O.S. I'd be very happy to have a heart-to-heart "chat" with this sterling citizen.

But like I said last week, Big Daddy, I can wait. I can wait.

AND THEN THERE'S THAT OTHER FELLAH

And since we were talking about big prices . . . and the big town, how about the latest good news on "my buddy" the Big Wind, Cassius (Ah Ain't In Yet, John) Clay.

Whooeee, but was I ever doing the jig in merry ole New York when I read that news release! However, I want it made clear for the record that I am completely innocent of the insinuations made that a certain telegram arrived here at The Sanford Herald, which read, "Hooray. Am waving the American flag from the top of the Empire State Building. Also, have controlling stock on the fastest moving item in NYC . . . a lapel button reading—"So Long Cassius."

Now you just know that I'd never be a part of something uncouth like that, don't you? (And besides, I was running out of dough and the darn thing cost me \$1.60 to send it!)

No sir, I'll just wait for those wheels of justice to grind-on. And I only wish I knew the names of the jurors who deliberated all of 20 minutes on the case . . . surely would like to send them a commendation for a job well done.

By the way, if the story's correct and he marries that European "babe" in September isn't that contrary to the Black Muslim teachings? Better brush-up on your lessons, Minister Muhammed.

Since this is Fourth of July week, it's only appropriate that we reflect on patriotism. So, therefore, we need a sterling example. Lemme see . . . there was little ole George who didn't want to tell a fib and then there was (now don't go getting ahead of me!) . . . that super zealot Cassius, who didn't want to go into the Army.

This is what really ticks me off. Did you read that Sports Illustrated story about Bill Russell defending our deposed boxing champion?

Russell says something to the effect that Cassius has a fast, smart mind and isn't being led by some sinister group.

Well, how 'cum he flunked his first draft examination due to the mental exam . . . and why didn't he ask for a deferment at that time for his religious beliefs?

Now don't get me wrong about some of the thing's he's said about Vietnam. As a matter of fact, I think that there are more than a few of us who are fed up with the Pentagon Pros who started with a few thousand as advisers over there and are now clamoring for 600,000 ground forces.

A little more than a year ago they assured us that 200,000 would be sufficient and now we hear this kind of nonsense!

But then, that's another pet peeve of yours truly.

WAS THE IMAGE MADE OF CLAY?

(NOTE.—Times change and so do people. Four years ago, Dave Burgin was a Pfc. in the United States Army working for the Armed Forces News Service. At that time Muhammad Ali was publicity-hungry Cassius Clay with interviews for everybody—even the U.S. Army. Dave Burgin remembers the day in July, 1963, and the interview. And how Cassius Clay had different feelings about the Army.)

(By Dave Burgin)

NEW YORK.—In July, 1963, I was standing on the corner of 57th and Broadway, hating New York's wet heat, my Army uniform with Pfc. stripes, 65 cents in my pocket.

Sixteen more months to be a human being again!

The first thing I noticed when the cab stopped in front of me was the driver, a Negro, laughing hysterically, wiping tears from his eyes, pounding the steering wheel with both hands.

The first young man to step from the taxi wasn't familiar. The face that followed was, vaguely,

"Hey, aren't you Cassius Clay?"

"The very same, soldier," Clay said, his grin wide, his eyes roaming. "Tell him, Rudy. Hey, Rudy, stop lookin' at the foxes! I am the greatest, my friend. You didn't recognize

me. You didn't see my picture in Sports Illustrated? Hey, Rudy, what's that address where we goin'?"

Clay's handshake was limp. He eyeballed lunch-breaking secretaries or kidded with passersby who stared.

"You a sport writer?" Clay said. "An Army sports writer? C'mon, man, you ain't even an officer."

No, but the armed forces have newspapers, too. How about an interview for the service newspapers?

"Sure, my man," Clay said. "No sweat. Anything for the Army."

The interview at the Armed Forces Press and Radio office turned out to be Clay's interview. He fired questions about what the Army was like. He wanted to know about KP and marching and how long did it take to make sergeant.

"Being a private," he was told, "is like being a Negro at a Ku Klux Klan meeting."

"Yeah, I know what you mean," said Rudy Clay, Cassius' brother. They both laughed.

The Clay brothers didn't have a care in the world that day. "We got bread (money)," Cassius said. "We got foxes (girls). I'm hip to English foxes. They the best in the world."

They laughed and joked and Cassius threw lines about the service as enlisted-men writers, who represented all the services, gathered to hear him. "You mean the Army and the Marines work in the same office?" he asked.

Air Force Col. Joe Hornsby came in and introduced himself. Clay greeted him, "Chief birdman." The colonel later wrote a commendation letter for "securing" the Clay interview.

"I want to say hello to all you service mens (sic) over there in Germany and all those other places," Clay said into a radio microphone. "You're all doin' a good job and when I finally get to the Big Ugly Bear (Sonny Liston), I'll be thinking of you."

What did he plan to do about military service?

"When I go into the service," he answered, "will Uncle Sam let me take my heavyweight title with me?"

That hot July day in New York was a long time ago. Vietnam was a trouble spot then, but nothing to what it is today. President Kennedy had not been murdered.

Had Clay been asked about the Black Muslims, I'm sure he would have replied, "Black what?"

Used to be that whenever the phone would ring at home, I'd cringe and try to imitate one of the silver screen's tough guys to scare off some of those irate callers.

But now, they're mostly all complimentary (So, yah can't be a loser forever, S.O.S.) here of late and the flowers are pretty evenly dispatched between our bric-a-bracs on the Sanford Municipal Stadium and Cassius-baby.

Come to think of it, we've been letting you off the griddle here-of-late, eh, Muhammad?

Lo these many weeks we've been writing on Clay's open defiance. I honestly felt that if it weren't for your calls and letters that I was maybe like, beating-my-head against the proverbial brick wall.

I feel that if any one individual contributed to the contagious disrespect for law and love of country, then it would have to be our disposed fighting king.

But then that's another story. However, while chaperoning the three bowling youths from our state this past weekend in Washington, D.C., I had the honor of breaking bread with Senator Claude Pepper. (Now don't go getting into a dither about that title, cause he was a Senator and I'm not too sure he won't be a repeater!) Anyhow, little ole S.O.S. felt the urge and cast all caution to the wind and really unloaded. . . "just like any citizen has the right to do, right?"

Included in our repertoire were the riots,

Vietnam, taxes, etc., etc., and "How cum a character like Cassius can have his way?"

I even got you local folks into the act by telling him how ticked-off you all were . . . and then the good Congressman really surprised me by asking that all of our S.O.S. soundings on (Mr. ugh, scratch that) Clay be submitted to his office and that he was going to have them read into the Congressional Records!

Well, Sir, now that I've got your ear, you can bet my last tax dollar I'll be featuring more on the pass-port-less puncher.

A MESSAGE FROM ISRAEL

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from a native Israeli thanking me for my support of her nation on the House floor. I have always believed the rights and privileges of independent and sovereign nations were inviolable, and must be protected both by the nation encroached upon and by the rest of the peace-loving nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully insert this letter following my remarks, because I believe it carries a very important message to the citizens of our Nation and those of the many other nations in the world—"May all your days be days of pleasantness and all your paths be paths of peace."

RAMOT REMEZ, HAIFA, ISRAEL,
June 29, 1967.

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER,
Congress of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEPPER: Haifa is a far cry from Dade County, and, due to the unusual circumstances in Israel, this thank you letter has been somewhat delayed.

My sister, Mrs. J. Goldberg of 9110 S.W. 17th Terrace in Miami, has kept me informed about your constant and unswerving manifestations of support for Israel on the floor of Congress and in addition she has appraised me of the fact that your voice is almost the only one heard in behalf of this small valiant country, a "voice in the wilderness".

In addition to the fact that your position is correct based on moral and humanitarian considerations it is also sound reasoning as far as foreign policy for an American representative, whose prime consideration must perforce be the interests of his constituents in particular and the nation as a whole. I want you to know that together with the Arabs fighting on the Syrian Heights were Russian technicians. In addition to the personnel most of the equipment and arms captured were of Russian and other Communist country manufacture.

Today I am writing to you as a third generation American who, as a result of the fine education received in the U.S. schools and the lofty ideals inculcated in these schools, has chosen to contribute to the progress of this small nation whose imprint on history is all out of proportion to its physical size.

If your children can rest easily in their beds and have security all of their waking moments it is because of what has been accomplished here within the last few weeks. In short all of the conditions for strife have

been removed by the winning of the war by Israel. How this was done defies all logical explanation. Overwhelmed by superior arms and outnumbered many times over, the Israelis have accomplished what can only be explained as a miracle of God.

Rest assured, esteemed Mr. Pepper, that the Holy Places will be respected. It could not be otherwise in the Holy City of the Chosen People.

Again for your moral integrity I thank you. However you know that the elite of humanity have always been few in number, like the author of the Sermon on the Mount.

If you come to Israel one day, and come you must, my family would be honored if you would grace our table with your presence.

"May all your days be days of pleasantness and all your paths be paths of peace."

Sincerely,

GLADYS COHEN-ALLORO.

THE 1967 VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS: A SIGN OF CONTINUING PROGRESS

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, during the past 30 years—during my service in the Senate and House—Congress has not only accepted its role as a partner of the States in the provision of rehabilitation services for all Americans, but has gone beyond the furnishing of money to the suggestion of new and imaginative programs. Working with the executive branch and with the States, Congress has consistently enlarged and improved the Vocational Rehabilitation Act until today the goal of rehabilitation for all who want and need it is almost within reach.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967, which I was proud to introduce as H.R. 9683, and which has just passed this body will first of all increase authorizations for the Federal share of the program from \$400 million at present to \$500 million in 1969 and \$600 million in 1970. These increases will enable the States, and private agencies working cooperatively with them, to enlarge their programs of service to the disabled. There are few things more inspiring than the rehabilitation of a seriously disabled individual for the world of work and self-sufficiency. Certainly there are few other programs in which we can see positive results so quickly and clearly. Not only does rehabilitation give a man more self-respect, but he becomes a contributing member of the community, no longer in need of public assistance and even able to pay back the cost of rehabilitation through his tax dollars.

The amendments include provision for a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, which would offer them the intensive, specialized services they need, and would also be a training facility for those interested in working with and for the deaf-blind.

The amendments also authorize project grants for services for migratory agricultural workers. The Federal Government will pay up to 90 percent of the

cost of projects for the provision of vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals who are migratory agricultural workers. As a Member from Florida, a State which must use migrants to help harvest our fruit and produce, I am well aware of the special burdens which these people face. Their need for State services is great, and they are the group least likely to receive them. The fate of the migrant struck with disability far from home is especially tragic.

Residency requirements for vocational rehabilitation services are clearly outmoded, and this legislation would abolish them by 1969. Disability occurs without warning: it does not wait until the individual has established residency. In many cases, rehabilitation is easier the sooner it is begun, so in the long run, residency requirements may prove more expensive than rehabilitation of the disabled solely on the basis of their need for such services. Today the United States has a highly mobile population, and we must face that fact in planning Government programs.

Finally, these 1967 amendments grant an extension of 1 year for the current effort in statewide planning for rehabilitation services. In many States, this detailed planning has barely begun, and we must assure the States that they will have the time needed to design plans for the next decade of service. The quality of planning is vital to the achievement of our national rehabilitation goals.

Vocational rehabilitation is noncontroversial, for it is in the finest American tradition of encouraging self-help and individual courage. All Americans who are able should have the opportunity to work, and for the disabled rehabilitation gives them their second, or in some cases their first, chance at life. I have always supported vocational rehabilitation legislation, because it is my profound belief that Americans should have the opportunity to achieve success through work, and am extremely gratified today to know that my efforts have at last achieved the passage of this vitally important legislation for the American people.

REVITALIZATION OF THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BY H.R. 11978

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested in supplying all of our citizens with equal opportunities to receive an education. In a great democratic nation such as ours, education is the surest way to meet the challenge of the future.

Toward this end I have introduced a bill, H.R. 11978, which would offer better incentives to banks who would participate in a guaranteed student loan program. The revitalization of such a pro-

gram would enable more people to pursue a higher education without the immediate problem of financial worries.

I was privileged to testify Thursday, August 17, before the House Special Subcommittee on Education on this matter. Mr. Speaker, I am including that testimony after my remarks for the further information of those who may read this RECORD:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLAUDE PEPPER BEFORE THE HOUSE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, AUGUST 17, 1967

(Re H.R. 11978, a bill to provide better incentives for participation of private lending institutions in the student loan program)

Madam Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the excellent House Special Subcommittee on Education for granting me the opportunity to testify on the need to revitalize the guaranteed student loan program. I would also like to commend the Committee on the excellent job of investigation it has been doing and, I am sure, will continue to do this highly important matter.

The guaranteed student loan program which was authorized by the Higher Education Act of 1965, has met with severe setbacks to date and has been unable to meet the needs of many of those desiring student loans. The operation of this program depended on the willingness of the banks and other lending institutions to make their funds available to qualified students. For many months now it has been apparent that these private lenders have been reluctant for various reasons to commit sufficient funds to this program to make it a success.

The average cost today of attending a public college or university is estimated by the Office of Education to be \$1,020 an academic year—and for a private college or university, \$2,066 a year. At this same time, the Bureau of the Census put the median money income of American families with heads under 65 years old 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.

There have been two main problems which prevented the guaranteed student loan program from operating to its capacities.

First, the banks and other lenders contend that the maximum interest rate of 6 per cent does not cover the cost of the loan to the lender in today's tight money market. Student loans, to have any effectiveness, must be given for comparatively long terms—thusly, they do not contribute to bank liquidity through repayment of principal as some other loans do. These loans are repaid within 5 to 10 years after graduation which creates a long time lag in the rollover time of this money.

Second, there is a burdensome amount of paper work involved in making and processing these loans. Student loans, because of the extra time and paper work involved, cost more than most other type of loans.

These pressing problems must be remedied before the lenders will decide to allocate more of their limited funds for the purpose of student loans. In our hand, the hands of the Congress, rest the future of a great part of America's youth. Given this great responsibility, we must act immediately and definitely to change the atmosphere regarding student loans.

I have introduced amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 which would

increase the effectiveness of this program of student loans. Since the main obstacles of the efficient functioning of this program are the maximum interest rate allowable on loans, and the cumbersome and costly paper work involved in making these loans, my amendments concern themselves largely with these two areas.

I would authorize the President of the United States, after consultation with the Federal Reserve Board, to set interest rates, by Executive Order, in excess of 6% when the President has determined that such a rate is necessary for this program to be fully realized in any region of the country, and would provide for Federal payment of the additional interest cost—in fact all of the interest cost over 3%.

I am aware that eleven 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% 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 figure set by an Executive Order would be a ceiling, not a mandatory rate and would prevent the establishment by the Federal Government of any arbitrary interest barrier 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.

Furthermore, private lenders should 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 \$1.00 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.

Madam Chairman, my proposals are not excessive in view of the needs of our young people or the magnitude of the problem of obtaining full participation of our private lenders. Recently a leading banker in my area stated that my proposed amendments are still not a sufficient lure to bring his bank into this program. From this, it would seem that perhaps my programs do not go far enough. But I am hopeful that these improved incentives, combined with a spirit of public service, will be sufficient to make this program more effective and meaningful for the education of our young people. If we should fail to make this program fully effective, we would have to resort to an expansion of our programs of direct Federal loans; but I hope this will not be necessary. I believe my amendment will remove the banks' major objections to participating in this student loan program.

A democracy such as ours depends for its health and survival upon educating our youth to the best of our ability, and denying to no one the opportunity of receiving a higher education.

I think an improved guaranteed loan program is the best way to assure this educational opportunity for all of our young people who are capable of benefiting from a higher education. I urge the distinguished members of this Subcommittee to recommend a program of improved incentives which will enable this program to fulfill the hopes we had for it when we adopted the Higher Education Act of 1965.

THE OLDER WORKERS' EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967

Mr. PRYOR, 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. Speaker, as you know, my interest in the problems of our Nation's senior citizens and older workers is one of long standing. Earlier this session, I introduced a resolution to create a Select Committee on the Aged and Aging. Such a committee would serve a useful function and complement the work of the Senate Special Committee on Aging. I have also sponsored legislation to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, believing that the good programs started under this act must be continued. But, as beneficial as the programs provided under the Older Americans Act have proven to be during their short existence, expansion of all activities in this field is desperately needed.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduced H.R. 12405, a comprehensive bill aimed at attacking the problems facing our Nation's older workers and senior citizens on several fronts.

Last Thursday I was privileged to be able to testify on my bill before the distinguished House General Subcommittee on Labor. I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD my testimony as well as a copy of my bill, so that it may be available to all interested persons.

The material referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. CLAUDE PEPPER, BEFORE THE HOUSE GENERAL LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, REGARDING H.R. 12405, THE OLDER WORKERS' EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967, AUGUST 17, 1967

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the excellent House General Subcommittee on Labor for giving me this opportunity to testify as to the need to provide greater working opportunities for older workers. I would also like to commend this committee for the excellent job of investigation it has been doing and, I am sure, will continue to do on this matter of vital importance to our nation.

The problems facing our senior citizens have been receiving increased attention in the past several years, both in the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. All of the investigations and studies made so far point to the inescapable conclusion that something must be done to solve the employment problems of older workers, yet very few substantive programs have resulted from these reports and hearings. We must provide meaningful opportunities for employment to the thousands of workers 45 and over who are well qualified but nevertheless denied jobs which they may desperately need because someone has arbitrarily decided that they are "too old."

Although statistics show that as a nation we are growing younger, the absolute number of older persons in the society continues to increase. By 1975, it is estimated that almost 65 million persons will be 45 and over. Today, the worker aged 45 or over comprises 27% of all the unemployed and 40% of the long-term unemployed and these workers receive more than 3/4 of a billion dollars in unemployment insurance each year. In 1965, the

Secretary of Labor reported to the Congress that approximately half of all private job openings were barred to applicants over 55; a quarter to those over 45; and almost all to those over 65. At the same time that the older workers are being forced by new technological advances to retire earlier, medical science is discovering ways to enable them to live longer. We are thus faced with the serious prospect of privation and poverty for a great number of this expanding population who will be involuntarily retired in the years ahead. There are, of course, many areas of study which should be pursued in order to solve this dilemma, but the most important single thing which we can do is to provide older workers with the opportunity to work and to support themselves as they have been doing all their lives.

Not only is employment important to the economic well-being of our older population, it is also important to their mental and physical health. In a recent position statement on the employment of older people the American Medical Association stated, "It is difficult to prove that physical or mental illness can be directly caused by denial of employment opportunities . . . However, few physicians deny that such a relationship exists." Many older persons, educated to the pioneer concept of work as a good in itself and leisure time as wasted time, are unable or unwilling to adapt to the creative use of their leisure time. They need to feel that they are in some way performing a contribution to society.

The bill which I introduced yesterday—"The Older Workers Employment Act of 1967"—attempts to attack this problem facing the older American on several fronts, combining all the best features of several earlier bills I introduced, including H.R. 9207 and H.R. 9893. It not only prohibits arbitrary discrimination against hiring older workers, but also offers meaningful job opportunities to many who could not otherwise find employment, provides for the construction of senior centers, and provides for the study and investigation of possible alternative answers to the problems now confronting us.

I am primarily concerned with emphasizing that the problem of the older worker is one of the greatest importance. Considered purely from the psychological point of view, if the involuntary unemployment of the older worker continues to increase, we shall have on our hands a great problem in the re-education of these people so that they may face the prospect of 20 to 25 years of retirement without anxiety and depression. Economic aspects of involuntary unemployment—or early retirement—are of even more serious consequence, for the importance of earned income to the budget of many of the elderly is paramount.

The bill which I have introduced is aimed at these problems. It will operate by "providing these age groups with opportunities for useful work, part-time and full-time, paid and volunteer, will bring them needed income, will benefit their physical and mental health; and will be a means of providing services needed by all age groups which are not now being provided."

Older workers often find it very difficult to surmount the assumption that they are unable physically or mentally to handle any new work because of their age. Title II of my bill would attempt to fight this discrimination by making it unlawful for employers, employment agencies, or labor organizations to discriminate against any individual solely because of age, except in cases where age is a bona fide occupational qualification. Violation of these prohibitions would be punishable by civil penalties. Administration of the bill would be in the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor, with the Secretary of Labor empowered to carry on a continuing program of education and information.

The elimination of age discrimination in employment will be a major step towards the goal of a better life for older citizens, but while it insures that available jobs will not be refused to qualified applicants, it does not insure a job for every older worker who wants one. In this day of rapidly improving technology, many older workers find their skills outmoded and their jobs abolished as new and more efficient methods of production are adopted. In order to combat the tightening job market, it will be necessary to provide work opportunities for older persons. Title III of my bill will help to increase the availability of work by anticipating jobs on Federally supported programs and authorizing the Secretary of Labor to provide training for older workers to fill these jobs.

To create further job openings, the Older Americans Act of 1965 will be amended to provide for a Senior Service Corps. The Secretary of Health Education and Welfare will be authorized to supply part-time paid jobs in community service programs to workers aged 60 and over who are unable to secure full-time employment or to those who need to supplement an inadequate retirement income. Such jobs would provide a viable solution to the problem facing the worker who has exhausted his other means of support, but has not as yet found suitable employment. Those senior citizens who do not need jobs, but desire to work in community service programs on a volunteer basis, would be encouraged to work in the Senior Service Corps, and they would be eligible to receive out-of-pocket expenses from the program.

The Act would be further amended to provide the authorization of a special grant program to provide for the construction and operation of senior citizen activity centers. Some of these have been operated by pioneering communities for a number of years and represent the most significant and promising new instrumentality yet devised to meet the many and varied needs of older people. A center facility, adequately staffed and effectively operated, permits older people to develop programs which explore their interests and provide new opportunities for self-improvement. Centers can provide intellectual and recreational stimulation, offer private and personal counseling, provide referral services, and offer information about other services available to the elderly in their communities.

Many communities which are anxious to begin such a program, do not have the available funds. My bill would provide "seed money" to enable communities to begin developing these programs.

In order to open the way to constructive and satisfying roles in employment and retirement, a great deal of further study is needed. Therefore, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare are authorized under Title IV of my bill to conduct and support research programs in such areas as: early or flexible retirement plans, continuing education and retraining programs for workers who are employed in order to prepare them for new jobs, and advance planning of manpower requirements. In addition, there is authorized to be appointed by the President, a Commission on Lifetime Adult Education. This commission may hold hearings and study the aforementioned proposals in order to make legislative recommendations on these problems, and shall cease to exist after its report has been filed.

Finally, the Secretary of Labor is directed to study the feasibility and desirability of a transitional allowance system for older workers between the ages of 55 and 65 who are unemployed and have exhausted their unemployment compensation. Within two years of the Secretary's report, the President will be directed to submit a report to Congress on the means to eliminate the gaps and inadequacies in workmen's compensation and

disability insurance systems, particularly as they adversely affect the employment of older workers.

Mr. Chairman, the problems which plague the older worker today are indeed serious. As the longevity of our population increases, we shall probably move into an era where the periods of education, work, and retirement in a man's lifetime will assume equal importance. By acting now to give each man the opportunity to work as long as he chooses and to enter retirement willingly, we will have taken a great step toward insuring a happy and satisfying working life culminating in a constructive and useful retirement. But we must act now, for today's older worker has no time to wait.

I urge the members of this excellent subcommittee to recommend an expanded program to solve the employment problems of the older worker and the senior citizen, so that they may be able to increase their standard of living, while at the same time aid in decreasing the growing poverty which has ensnared so much of our nation.

H.R. 12405

A bill to provide greater working opportunities for older workers, and for other purposes

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 "Older Workers Employment Act of 1967".

TITLE I—STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(1) in the face of rising productivity and affluence, older workers find themselves disadvantaged in their efforts to retain employment, and especially to regain employment when displaced from jobs;

(2) in a society faced with unmatched demands for skills in the private sector of the economy, and with a mounting backlog of unmet needs in the public and nonprofit sector, older workers find little opportunity for useful and rewarding activity;

(3) the setting of arbitrary age limits regardless of potential for job performance has become a common practice, and certain otherwise desirable practice may work to the disadvantage of older persons, so that most jobs are closed to applicants over age fifty-five, and a large proportion closed to those over age forty-five;

(4) the incidence of unemployment, especially long-term unemployment with resultant deterioration of skill, morale, and employer acceptability is, relative to the younger ages, high among workers of age forty-five and over; their numbers are great and growing; and their employment problems grave, yielding to no single, simple solution;

(5) as a consequence largely of unemployment or of employment in low-skilled jobs, or retirement with severely reduced incomes, millions of persons age forty-five and over live in poverty;

(6) more than a million men between the ages of fifty-five and sixty-four have given up the active search for work, most through loss of hope of employment; for millions of men and women their only choice is to retire between the ages of sixty-two to sixty-four on low and inadequate benefits continuing throughout their lifetime; for those in their middle ages, the option of retirement is not available;

(7) for those who are employed, there is almost no opportunity for continued training and education, including planning and preparation for retirement, to meet the changes which lie ahead in their working lives and the years beyond;

(8) the loss to the economy of the potential production of goods and services and the

costs of unemployment compensation and public assistance, can be reckoned in billions of dollars;

(9) the loss to the individual in terms of frustration, impaired morale, loss of the sense of worth and dignity, and of status within the family and society, are incalculable; and

(10) providing these age groups with opportunities for useful work, part-time and full-time, paid and volunteer, will bring them needed income, or supplement their income; will benefit their physical and mental health; and will be a means of providing services needed by all age groups, which are not now being provided.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 102. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to establish and to stimulate programs which will—

(1) afford the older worker a range of real and reasonable alternatives from among which he can make a free choice depending on his individual needs and capacities;

(2) help clear the obstacles which confront the older jobseeker and eliminate arbitrary discriminatory practices which deny work to qualified persons solely on account of age;

(3) increase the availability of jobs by finding new work opportunities, including part-time employment in needed community services to supplement income and to facilitate the transition to full retirement or the return to full-time work;

(4) improve and extend existing programs intended to facilitate the matching of skills and jobs, and to cushion the impact of unemployment;

(5) pave the way for older workers, employers, labor unions, and educational institutions to prepare for and adjust to anticipated changes in technology in jobs, in educational requirement, and in personnel practices, and to prepare for satisfying retirement; and

(6) make maximum use of existing programs and agencies and provide the special efforts required to improve significantly the employment prospects of older workers.

TITLE II—PROHIBITION OF AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

EDUCATION AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Labor shall undertake studies and provide information to labor unions, management, and the general public concerning the needs and abilities of older workers, and their potentials for continued employment and contribution to the economy. In order to achieve the purposes of this title, the Secretary of Labor shall carry on a continuing program of education and information, under which he may, among other measures—

(1) undertake research, and promote research, with a view to reducing barriers to the employment of older persons, and the promotion of measures for utilizing their skills;

(2) publish and otherwise make available to employers, professional societies, the various media of communication, and other interested persons the findings of studies and other materials for the promotion of employment; and

(3) sponsor and assist State and community informational and educational programs.

PROHIBITION OF AGE DISCRIMINATION

SEC. 202. (a) It shall be unlawful for an employer—

(1) to fall or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual or otherwise discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's age; or

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify his employees in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment

opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee, because of such individual's age.

(b) It shall be unlawful for an employment agency to fall or refuse to refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of such individual's age, or to classify or refer for employment any individual on the basis of such individual's age.

(c) It shall be unlawful for a labor organization—

(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual because of his age;

(2) to limit, segregate, or classify its membership, or to classify or fail or refuse to refer for employment any individual, in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of employment opportunities, or would limit such employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment because of such individual's age; or

(3) to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

(d) It shall be unlawful for an employer to discriminate against any of his employees or applicants for employment, for an employment agency to discriminate against any individual, or for a labor organization to discriminate against any member thereof or applicant for membership, because such individual, member, or applicant for membership, has opposed any practice made unlawful by this section, or because such individual, member, or applicant for membership has made a charge, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this title.

(e) It shall be unlawful for an employer, labor organization, or employment agency to print or publish, or cause to be printed or published, any notice or advertisement relating to employment by such an employer or membership in or any classification or referral for employment by such a labor organization, or relating to any classification or referral for employment by such an employment agency, indicating any preference, limitation, specification, or discrimination, based on age.

(f) It shall not be unlawful for an employer, employment agency, or labor organization—

(1) to take any action otherwise prohibited under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (e) of this section where age is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the performance of the usual duties of a particular occupation, or where the differentiation is based on reasonable factors other than age;

(2) to observe a seniority system or any retirement, pension, employee benefit or insurance plan, which is not merely a subterfuge to evade the purposes of this Act, except that no such retirement, pension, employee benefit, or insurance plan shall excuse the failure to hire any individual; or

(3) to discharge or otherwise discipline an individual for good cause.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall carry out the provisions of this title through the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. The Secretary is authorized to employ such additional employees, consultants, and experts as are necessary to assist him in the performance of his functions under this title.

(b) The Secretary shall have the power to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies, and to cooperate with and furnish technical assistance to employers, labor organizations, and employment agencies to aid in effectuating the purposes of this title.

LIABILITY

SEC. 204. (a) Any person who violates the provisions of section 202 of this title shall be liable to any employee or applicant for employment affected in the amount of the compensation which would have been paid to him had no violation of this title occurred, and in the case of willful violation of this title, in an additional equal amount as punitive damages. An action to recover such liability and for such equitable relief as may be appropriate, including, without limitation, a judgment compelling reinstatement, promotion, or hiring, may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more employees or applicants for employment for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees or applicants for employment similarly situated. But no such action shall be commenced by or on behalf of any employee or applicant for employment until sixty days after a charge relating to the unlawful acts upon which the action is based has been filed with the Secretary by or on behalf of such employee or applicant for employment. No employee or applicant for employment shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he gives his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The right provided by this subsection of an employee or applicant for employment to bring or join in an action shall terminate upon the filing of a complaint by the Secretary of Labor in an action under section 205, but only to the extent of the relief sought on behalf of such employee or applicant for employment in such action by the Secretary.

(b) In any action brought under this section the court shall allow to the plaintiff, if the prevailing party, reasonable attorney's fees as part of the costs.

(c) Any action authorized by this section may be commenced within two years after the cause of action accrued, except that a cause of action arising out of a willful violation may be commenced within three years after the cause of action accrued. Any such action not commenced within the period authorized by this section shall be forever barred.

ENFORCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY

SEC. 205. (a) Whenever the Secretary on his own investigation, or upon the basis of a written charge by or on behalf of any person claiming to be adversely affected or aggrieved, has reason to believe that a practice made unlawful by this title has been committed, he shall, prior to instituting any action under subsection (b) of this section, endeavor to eliminate any such practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

(b) (1) If the Secretary fails to effect voluntary compliance with this title as provided in subsection (a), he may, upon the request of any employee or applicant for employment, bring an action on behalf of such individual in any court of competent jurisdiction for any relief to which such individual would be entitled under section 204. The consent of any individual to the bringing of any such an action by the Secretary, unless such action is dismissed without prejudice on motion of the Secretary, shall constitute a waiver by such individual of any right of action he may have under section 204. Any sums recovered by the Secretary on behalf of an individual pursuant to this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the individual or individuals affected. Any such sums not paid to an individual because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(2) Any action authorized by this subsection may be commenced within two years after the cause of action occurred, except

that a cause of action arising out of a willful violation may be commenced within three years after the cause of action occurred. Any such action not commenced within the period authorized by this paragraph shall be forever barred. In determining when such action is commenced by the Secretary under this subsection, it shall be considered to be commenced in the case of any individual claimant on the date on which the complaint is filed, if he is specifically named as a party plaintiff in the complaint, or if his name did not so appear, on the date his name is added as a party plaintiff in such action.

(c) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payment of part or all of the compensation for which liability is imposed by section 204 of this title, and the agreement of any individual to accept such payment shall, upon payment in full, constitute a waiver by such individual of any right he may have under such section 204.

JURISDICTION

SEC. 206. The District courts, together with the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of this title and to grant such other legal or equitable relief, including without limitation, judgments compelling reinstatement, promotion, or hiring and enforcing the liability imposed by section 204 of this title, as may be appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this title.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 207. Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Secretary setting forth information as the Secretary deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this title.

INVESTIGATIONS, INSPECTIONS, AND RECORDS

SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary or his designated representatives may investigate and gather data regarding the conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this title, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcripts thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this title, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this title.

(b) With the consent and cooperation of State agencies charged with the administration of State labor laws, the Secretary may for the purpose of carrying out his functions and duties under this title, utilize the services of State and local agencies and their employees and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, may reimburse such State and local agencies and their employees for service rendered for such purpose.

(c) Every employer subject to any provision of this title or of any order issued under this title shall make, keep, and preserve such records of the persons employed by him and of the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices or employment maintained by him, and shall preserve such records for such periods of time, and shall make such reports therefrom to the Secretary as he shall prescribe by regulation or order as necessary or appropriate for the enforcement of the provisions of this title or the regulations or orders thereunder.

(d) For the purpose of any hearing or investigation provided for in this Act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914 (15 U.S.C. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 209. In accordance with the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretary of Labor, may issue such rules and regulations as he may consider necessary or appropriate for carrying out this title, and may establish such reasonable exemptions to and from any or all provisions of this title as he may find necessary and proper in the public interest.

CRIMINAL PENALTIES

SEC. 210. Whoever forcibly resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with a duly authorized representative of the Secretary while such representative is engaged in the performance of duties under this title shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both: *Provided however*, That no person shall be imprisoned under this section except when there has been a prior conviction hereunder.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 211. For the purposes of this title:

(a) The term "person" means one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, labor organizations, corporations, business trusts, legal representatives, or any organized groups of persons.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has twenty-five or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year; except that prior to June 30, 1968, employers having fewer than fifty employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year shall not be considered employers. The term also means any agent of such a person, but such term does not include the United States, a corporation wholly owned by the Government of the United States, or a State or political subdivision thereof.

(c) The term "employment agency" means any person regularly undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees for an employer and includes an agent of such a person; but shall not include an agency of the United States, or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State, except that such term shall include the United States Employment Service and the system of State and local employment services receiving Federal assistance.

(d) The term "labor organization" means a labor organization engaged in an industry affecting commerce, and any agent of such an organization, and includes any organization of any kind, any agency, or employee representation committee, group, association, or plan so engaged in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment, and any conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council so engaged which is subordinate to a national or international labor organization.

(e) A labor organization shall be deemed to be engaged in an industry affecting commerce if (1) it maintains or operates a hiring hall or hiring office which procures employees for an employer or procures for employees opportunities to work for an employer, or (2) the number of its members (or, where it is a labor organization composed of other labor organizations or their representatives, if the aggregate number of the members of such other labor organization) is fifty or more prior to July 1, 1968, or twenty-five or more on or after July 1, 1968, and if such labor organization—

(1) is the certified representative of employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended; or

(2) although not certified, is a national or international labor organization or a local labor organization recognized or acting as the representative of employees of an employer or employers engaged in an industry affecting commerce; or

(3) has chartered a local labor organization or subsidiary body which is representing or actively seeking to represent employees of employers within the meaning of paragraph (1) or (2); or

(4) has been chartered by a labor organization representing or actively seeking to represent employees within the meaning of paragraph (1) or (2) as the local or subordinate body through which such employees may enjoy membership or become affiliated with such labor organization; or

(5) is a conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council subordinate to a national or international labor organization, which includes a labor organization engaged in an industry affecting commerce within the meaning of any of the preceding paragraphs of this subsection.

(f) The term "employee" means an individual employed by an employer.

(g) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States; or between a State and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia, or a possession of the United States; or between points in the same State but through a point outside thereof.

(h) The term "industry affecting commerce" means any activity, business, or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry "affecting commerce" within the meaning of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

(i) The term "State" means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

LIMITATION

SEC. 212. The prohibitions in this title shall be limited to individuals who are at least forty-five years of age but less than sixty-five years of age. In order to effectuate the purposes of this title the Secretary may (notwithstanding the preceding sentence) by rule or regulation issued under section 209 of this title provide for appropriate adjustments, either upward or downward, in the maximum and minimum age limits provided in this section.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIP

SEC. 213. Nothing in this title shall affect the jurisdiction of any agency of any State performing like functions with regard to discriminatory employment practices on account of age, except that in cases in which, by reason of the performance of services by an employee in more than one State, there is a danger of conflicting State standards applicable to such employee, the Secretary may, by order published in the Federal Register, prescribe that no State, or political subdivision thereof, shall establish an age standard with respect to such employee which differs from the Federal age standard prescribed in accordance with the provisions of this Act in the Secretary's order.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 214. This title shall become effective one hundred and eighty days after enactment, except that (1) the Secretary of Labor may extend the delay in effective date of any provision of this title up to an additional ninety days thereafter if he finds that such time is necessary in permitting adjustments to the provisions hereof, (2) on or after the date of enactment the Secretary of Labor is authorized to issue such rules and regula-

tions as may be necessary to carry out its provisions.

TITLE III—WORK OPPORTUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICE PROGRAMS

PART A—PROVISION OF WORK OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER PERSONS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 301. The purpose of this part is to increase the availability of work for older workers; and to anticipate new job opportunities created by federally supported programs and provide advance training.

PROVISION OF WORK OPPORTUNITIES

SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall review future Federal programs and identify those which may be expected to require significant numbers of workers. In accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may, if he deems it desirable for effectuating the purposes of this part, require all Federal contracting agencies to insert in the advertised specifications of every contract likely to require the employment of a significant number of workers provisions requiring the contractor to file with any bid a report describing expected staffing patterns or other estimates of the kind and number for employees to be used in such performance.

(b) Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds that the manpower requirements of any contract or contracts may not be readily met by present employees of a contractor or his subcontractors or other qualified workers in the local labor area, the Secretary may make arrangements for providing appropriate training of older workers and others designed to meet the employment needs involved. Such training will be carried out in accordance with the requirements for title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (76 Stat. 23). Nothing in this section shall be construed to obligate any contractor or subcontractor to hire any individual trained under the provisions of this section.

(c) The Secretary of Labor may provide whole or exemptions (in whole or part) from the requirements of this section if he finds that such requirements would not substantially serve the purposes of this Act or would seriously impair the conduct of contract performance.

(d) The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations for coordinating the duties of contracting agencies under this section and for providing for the uniform administration of its provisions.

CONSULTATION WITH OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall consult with and advise the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the heads of other departments and agencies responsible for the administration of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, for the purpose of maximizing employment opportunities for older persons with programs supported by that Act. The Secretary shall make recommendations to the responsible agencies with respect to programs and policies which will assure that jobs to the older poor will be available to a degree reasonably consistent with their representation among all the poor, so that they will be offered employment, or prepared for employment, or receive other training to ameliorate their condition.

EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING AND REFERRAL

SEC. 304. (a) The Secretary may, where appropriate, make special provisions through the Federal-State employment service, or with the advice and assistance of the employment service, by means of grants to or contracts with nonprofit volunteer agencies for the registration, counseling, selection, and referral for part-time or temporary employment of older persons who wish such work until full-time opportunities are available, or wish to supplement their income.

(b) No grant to or contract with a private nonprofit agency shall be made under this section in an amount greater than 50 per centum of the total expenses of such group or organization for carrying out its activities relating to employment of older workers.

PART B—COMMUNITY SENIOR SERVICE PROGRAM

SENIOR SERVICE CORPS; CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

SEC. 311. The Older Americans Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VI as title VIII and sections 601, 602, and 603 as sections 801, 802, and 803, respectively, and by adding after title V the following new titles:

"TITLE VI—OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM

"STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 601. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that there are millions of Americans aged sixty or over who are forced into idleness and inactivity by unemployment, compulsory retirement policies, or lack of opportunities for meaningful community service projects;

"(2) that certain grave consequences of such enforced idleness are impaired morale and physical, mental, and psychological health among members of this age group who are forced to endure the frustration, feeling of futility, and loss of self-respect;

"(3) that another consequence of such enforced idleness is inadequate incomes for this age group, many of whom receive pensions and other retirement incomes which are totally inadequate, and others of whom have not yet reached ages of eligibility for such pensions;

"(4) that there are needs in every community and area of the Nation which are not now being met, not because of the lack of manpower to meet those needs, but rather because of the lack of adequate arrangements for utilizing available manpower to meet them;

"(5) that individuals aged sixty or over are capable and qualified to perform services which would meet many of those needs and that there is an important potential national asset in the talents, abilities, experience, training, and energy of Americans in that age group who have been forced into unwanted inactivity; and

"(6) that providing this age group with opportunities for service will better their morale, will benefit their physical, mental, and psychological health, can in many cases, provide them with needed income supplementation and will be a means of providing services needed by all age groups which are not now being provided.

"DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 602. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this title the Secretary is authorized to assist and cooperate with State agencies designated pursuant to section 303(a)(1) in developing programs meeting the requirements of section 603.

"(b) The Secretary's functions under this title shall be carried out through the Commissioner.

"AUTHORIZATION FOR OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAM

"SEC. 603. (a) The Secretary may enter into agreements providing for the payment by him (subject to subsection (b)) of part or all of the cost of older Americans community service programs, approved by the State agency designated under title III, if he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) only individuals aged sixty and over will provide services in the program (except for administrative purposes) and such services will be performed in the community where such individuals reside or in nearby communities either (A) on publicly owned and operated facilities or projects, or (B) on local projects sponsored by private nonprofit

organizations (other than political parties), other than projects involving the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will permit or contribute to an undertaking or service in the public interest that would not otherwise be provided;

"(3) the programs will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

"(4) the program includes such short-term training as may be necessary to make the most effective use of the skills and talents of those individuals aged sixty and over who are participating;

"(5) any rates of pay and other conditions of service, which may be fixed by the sponsor of each individual project, will be appropriate and reasonable, and except in unusual circumstances no individual will total annual payments any larger than the product computed under section 203(f)(3) of the Social Security Act as amended;

"(6) the program is being established and will be carried out with the advice of competent specialists in problems of older persons;

"(7) the program provides that the State agency will administer or supervise its administration, will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(8) the program is closely coordinated with, wherever appropriate, and makes the most efficient use of the experience and programs of, the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and any other relevant Federal and State programs; and

"(9) the program is developed, conducted, and administered with maximum feasible participation of persons who have attained sixty years of age.

"(b) The Secretary shall not pay, pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (a), more than 90 per centum of the cost of any program which is the subject of such agreement out of funds which are appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this title for any fiscal year which begins after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. In determining, for purposes of the preceding sentence, the cost of any such program, the Secretary shall attribute fair market value to services and facilities contributed to such program from non-Federal sources.

"(c) The Secretary shall obtain from State employment services recommendations concerning the localities in which programs under this title are most needed in the light of the employment situation and the types of skills possessed by available older workers.

"(d) The Secretary may request State agencies on aging, where duly constituted, to recommend a program for the use of funds provided under this title in the State, and to make recommendations for approval of specific projects.

"PARTICIPANTS IN OLDER AMERICANS COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS ARE NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

"Sec. 604. Individuals providing their services under any State program pursuant to this title shall not be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave, unemployment compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE

"Sec. 605. The Secretary shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable dis-

tribution of assistance under this title among the States. No State may receive more than 12 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this title.

"PAYMENTS

"Sec. 606. Payments under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

"TITLE VII—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CENTERS

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 701. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the next four years, the sum of \$10,000,000 for grants to States for paying part of the costs of constructing and equipping new centers or for expansion of existing centers providing recreational and other leisure-time activities and information, counseling, and referral services for older persons and assisting such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services.

"ALLOTMENTS

"Sec. 702. (a) From the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under section 701 (or such larger amount as may be specified in the Act making the appropriation each State shall receive an allotment which bears the same ratio to such amount as the population aged sixty or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty or over in all the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the best and most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished him by the Department of Commerce. The allotment of any State under the preceding sentence which is less than 1 per centum of the total of the allotments to all the States under such sentence shall be increased to 1 per centum of such total, the amounts required for this purpose being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of each of the remaining States under such sentence, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than 1 per centum of such total.

"(b) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) shall be available for payment of 60 per centum of the costs of any project (or such lower percentage of such costs as the State may request for such project) for construction in such State of centers described in section 701, but only if such State has a State plan approved under title III, the provisions of such State plan required by section 303(a), other than paragraph (2), are applicable with respect to projects for which applications are made under this title, such project is approved by the State agency established or designated as provided in clause (1) of such section and by the Secretary, and such approval occurs during the year for which the allotment is made or the succeeding year."

ENCOURAGEMENT OF VOLUNTARY SERVICE PROGRAMS

Sec. 312. (a) In order to help retired persons to avail themselves of opportunities for voluntary service in their community, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into agreements with State and local public agencies and private nonprofit organizations providing for the payment of part or all of the costs for the development, operation, or both of volunteer service programs under this section, if he determines in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe that—

(1) volunteers shall not be compensated for other than transportation, meals, and other out-of-pocket expenses incident to their services; and

(2) the program is coordinated with programs herein authorized to be performed

under this Act by the Secretary of Labor and related programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity, and with other related Federal and State programs.

TITLE IV—EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION AND RETIREMENT

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Sec. 401. The purpose of this title is to stimulate study, planning and action to achieve the objectives of this Act; to encourage and point the way to adjustments by employers, labor, and educational institutions; to encourage better preparation by older workers for anticipated changes; to explore further steps to be taken by the Federal Government; and, in general, to open the way to constructive and satisfying roles in employment and retirement.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Sec. 402. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to conduct research for the purposes of this Act through services and facilities within his authority and through grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, including membership organizations of older persons, and contracts with any such nonprofit agency or with labor and management organizations or with any individuals—

(1) to study, and to find, test, and promote solutions to institutional arrangements which may work to the disadvantage of older workers in such matters as pensions and other private annuity coverage, workmen's compensation and disability income, seniority in collective bargaining;

(2) to explore proposals for systems of continuing educational and training opportunity to prepare workers, while still employed, for job changes, to reduce their vulnerability to displacement, and to consider methods of financing such educational programs and interweaving them into the individual's working life, including such proposals as sabbaticals and contributory educational insurance;

(3) to develop principles and guides for job redesign and effective methods for training older persons; and

(4) to develop techniques, guidelines, and models for advance planning of manpower requirements, for encouraging the employment of older workers through tax incentives or other aids.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct research for the purposes of this Act through services and facilities within his authority and through grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, including membership organizations of older persons, and contracts with any such nonprofit agency or with labor and management organizations or with any individuals—

(1) to explore and evaluate proposals related to early or flexible or phased retirement; and proposals related to planning, preparation for, and adjustment to retirement, including the causes of successful and unsuccessful adjustment;

(2) to open the way to satisfying activity in retirement;

(3) to explore, forecast, and define goals in the relationship between work, leisure, and income with reference to a changing economy and social expectations, and to a balance of the interests of all groups in the population; and

(4) to develop programs of public service employment by which the Government may provide work for older persons otherwise deprived of opportunity in useful community enterprises.

COMMISSION ON LIFELONG ADULT EDUCATION

Sec. 403. (a) The President is empowered to appoint a Commission on Lifelong Adult Education for the purpose of early and thor-

ough exploration of the areas described in sections 402(a)(2) and 402(b)(2). The Commission shall be composed of twelve members appointed from among persons outside the Government with a competency in the areas to be dealt with by the Commission. The Commission shall be broadly representative and shall include at least two members drawn from each of the following fields: labor, management, and education.

(b) The Commission, or on authority of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions, hold such hearings as the Commission may deem advisable.

(c) The Commission shall make a comprehensive study of the areas described in sections 402(a)(2) and 402(b)(2) of this title and shall present its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress for such legislation as appropriate for the purpose of establishing and financing such programs and policies by June 30, 1970. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report.

STUDY OF OLDER WORKER TRANSITIONAL ALLOWANCES

SEC. 404. The Secretary of Labor shall study the feasibility and advisability of establishing a program of transitional allowances for unemployed workers between age fifty-five and sixty-five who have inadequate financial resources, have exhausted their unemployment compensation and have no prospects of employment. On or before February 1, 1968, the Secretary will report to the Congress and the President his findings and recommendations with respect to such a program of allowances.

COMPENSATION AND DISABILITY INSURANCE

SEC. 405. The President shall submit a report to the Congress by February 28, 1970, on means of eliminating the gaps and inadequacies in workmen's compensation and disability insurance systems, particularly as they affect adversely the employment of older workers.

EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS

SEC. 406. Section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to employment of experts and consultants for purposes of sections 403 and 405 of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL

PROGRAM LEADERSHIP, DEVELOPMENT, AND COORDINATION

SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in carrying out their respective responsibilities under this Act may assign functions as they deem desirable, and may improve and expand existing services and facilities within their authority to carry out their respective functions, utilize the services of other agencies when desirable, and initiate new related services insofar as feasible to facilitate the continued employment of older workers and their adjustments when out of work or retired.

(b) In addition to any other provisions for the administration of this Act, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall each designate staff in his department whose primary responsibility shall be to provide overall program leadership, development, and coordination and to provide a central point for information on and special attention to the problems of the older worker and the programs concerned.

(c) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to—

(1) employ or engage experts and consultants or organizations thereof. The employment of experts and consultants shall be subject to section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code and the engagement of such experts and consultants shall be subject to section 3109 of that title.

(2) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, one or more advisory committees composed of such private citizens and officials of the Federal, State, and local governments as he deems desirable to advise him with respect to the functions under this Act; and members of such committees, other than those regularly employed by the Federal Government, while attending meetings of such committees, or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation and travel expenses as provided in paragraph (1) with respect to experts and consultants.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 502. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

THE 10-PERCENT SURCHARGE ON INCOME TAXES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am not alone in receiving a great deal of mail from constituents concerning the proposed tax increase. Some of these letters show little or no understanding of the need for increased revenue in face of the mounting costs in Vietnam and the domestic problems that require, as part of their solution, Federal expenditures.

But many of these letters raise one very pertinent point again and again. They ask, why should all of us pay a 10-percent surcharge on our income taxes, when special interests use tax loopholes to avoid paying billions of dollars in taxes every year. This same question occurs to me as well. I do not think there is any answer.

As we examine the various means available to us to reduce the predicted deficit, I think we should consider that question seriously and carefully.

Last Friday I received a letter from Mrs. Lucille Bailey, of Bothell, Wash. She enclosed a poster she had prepared and asked that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues. I think the point she makes is as reasonable as it is direct.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of her poster:

ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Please stop the 27½% depletion allowance to oil millionaires before you vote 10% tax surcharge.

The people should rise up in righteous wrath for tax equality!

JEWISH WAR VETERANS GIVE STRONG SUPPORT TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, on August 18 the Jewish War Veterans overwhelmingly endorsed President Johnson's military and economic policies in Vietnam.

In a resolution adopted by the national membership, the Jewish War Veterans said:

We endorse our Government's position in meeting the military requirements of a continually changing situation, while searching every possible channel for the peaceful settlement that must be negotiated to end the conflict.

I take this as having great significance because the Jewish War Veterans have traditionally associated themselves with the fight against tyranny—from left or right.

The Jewish War Veterans support President Johnson in Vietnam because they—like so many other Americans—believe the President is right in what he is trying to achieve—"help a small new country retain its integrity as a free nation."

They believe President Johnson is right in pressing forward on the military side in order to obtain peace negotiations. They believe he is right—and they want an expansion of efforts aimed at economic development, land reform, pacification, and greater citizen participation in the affairs of the Vietnamese Government.

They know that a stable political system must be built on a popular and prosperous economic base. And they know President Johnson has worked every day toward those ends.

They made clear in their resolution that they fully understand—as only veterans can—the suffering this war has brought to Vietnamese on both sides, and to Americans.

Yet, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States—along with so many other Americans—believe there are times when sacrifices must be made for freedom.

There are times when force must be used to repel aggression and subversion; when strong nations must stand up for smaller ones; when a threat to one country becomes a threat to a whole area, and to the world.

We learned those terrible lessons with Japan and Nazi Germany in the 1930's and with Soviet Russia in the 1950's. Let us not make the same mistakes in the 1960's.

President Johnson has carried out a commitment made by three Presidents in Vietnam—by Eisenhower, by Kennedy and by himself.

The Jewish War Veterans recognize what he is doing, and are supporting him even though it means sacrifice. But that is the meaning of being free, independent, and unafraid of those who would tyrannize the world—if we let them. And we are not going to let them.

I insert in the RECORD the text of a draft resolution on Vietnam recommended by the resolutions committee of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States and passed on August 18, 1967.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Basic to our country's national self-interest and commitment to aid South Vietnam is the desire to help a small new country retain its integrity as a free nation. The Vietcong, encouraged and supported by Hanoi, Moscow and Peking have accelerated the murder and arson so characteristic of guerrilla warfare. The cold-blooded slaughter of local officials, and in other instances, of women and children is part of the planned terror used to brutalize and subdue the farmers and villagers of South Vietnam. Unfortunately, the necessary military response to these terrifying situations has, on both sides, brought suffering and death to Vietnamese.

Immediately prior to the changed military situation in South Vietnam resulting from increased United States commitment in materiel and personnel, the same methods of terror and subversion had taken place in other Southeast Asian countries. The Communists were advancing in Laos, Cambodia had lost its ability to act independently, and guerrilla warfare was launched in Thailand. In an attempt to seize control, Communist arms were poured into Indonesia during 1965.

The Jewish War Veterans in the 6,000 year old Jewish tradition of compassion and succor for the oppressed, consistent with the American heritage of helping those who long for freedom, supports our country's commitment to the independence and freedom of South Vietnam as an integral link in the free world's security system.

To that end, we endorse our government's position in meeting the military requirements of a continually changing situation while searching every possible channel for the peaceful settlement that must be negotiated to end the conflict in Vietnam.

Recognizing that military success is necessary, but alone is insufficient, we urge continuation and expansion of our government's efforts to improve and enlarge the pacification program and land reform in the Vietnamese countryside and for the creation of conditions promoting and enhancing the stability and viability of the South Vietnamese Government. In this regard, we look to increased South Vietnamese participation on the battlefield, lowering of the South Vietnamese draft age to 18, and a broadening of the Saigon Government to encourage greater citizen participation in its affairs to assure a free election and establishment of a free government.

COMMENDATION FOR ALABAMA EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION COMMISSION ON ITS OUTSTANDING ETV SYSTEM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, the seventh educational television station in Alabama's statewide ETV development was dedicated in Franklin County, Ala. This new station reflects the continuing growth and success of educational television in a State whose system is the pioneer of educational television in this country.

Without question or qualification, the State of Alabama is recognized as having the finest and largest interconnected, simulcasting ETV network in the Nation.

Alabama's system has been continually studied by individuals and groups from all over this country and the world, and has been a pattern and example for many since-established similar systems.

Existing facilities in Alabama will now serve approximately 92 percent of the State, and two additional stations are proposed which, when completed, will provide total coverage to the State of Alabama. The growth and success of educational TV in Alabama has come about to a marked degree as a result of the superior and unique leadership of persons such as Mr. Raymond Hurlbert. Mr. Hurlbert was the first president of the Alabama Educational Television Commission, serving from 1953 to 1955, and has been the general manager of the commission since that time.

In his dedicatory address of Alabama's newest facility, Lt. Gov. Albert Brewer recognized that ETV "is far more than entertainment. Its great service is for a broad, continuing education." Explaining that ETV has proven almost providential in its ability to provide the finest education to everyone, Lieutenant Governor Brewer said the "cultural and educational" opportunities are "as encouraging as they are fantastic."

It is a privilege to salute and commend the Alabama Educational Television Commission on its outstanding ETV system, which is a pacesetter for the entire Nation.

LET US GIVE SOUTH VIETNAM A CHANCE TO HOLD A FREE ELECTION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal concerns of journalists and students of the political science is the forthcoming presidential election in South Vietnam. This is a proper concern, for it is to help the people of South Vietnam to preserve their right of self-determination that we are involved in that seemingly endless war.

It is charged by, no doubt, sincere and well-meaning critics that the elections cannot be fair because several candidates have already been disqualified and there is not a wide enough choice for voters.

Mr. Speaker, there are 11 candidates for the presidency of South Vietnam. Ten are opposition candidates. In our own country, our voters usually are given only two choices.

It is further charged that the elections cannot be fair because one of the tickets is composed of military men.

Mr. Speaker, the critics might well remember that we Americans have elected at least six professional military men as President of our own country. I have never heard it proposed, however, that military men be prohibited from running for office in the United States.

It is charged that the elections cannot be fair because one of the tickets includes the present chief of state and the Prime Minister. According to this charge, they should resign; otherwise the election is not fair.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of this body would accept the suggestion that they resign before they run for reelection? When did any American President resign in order to insure that he would have no advantage over his opposition?

It is charged that the elections cannot be fair because some of the opposition candidates claim that the Government is trying to rig the elections.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the critics can remember any American election in which charges and countercharges of unfair tactics were not freely hurled about. The fact that such charges are made does not in itself prove the elections are unfair. In fact it may be a strong indication that candidates are trying hard to win. Specific charges deserve to be and should be investigated; but general and sweeping charges of unfair election tactics should in all fairness be treated with restraint.

Mr. Speaker, lest we become overly critical of the pending elections in South Vietnam, let us remember that its present Government was formed as recently as June 19, 1965, under the leadership of Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, the Chief of State, and Air Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the Prime Minister. While it is true that the present Government did not assume office through the electoral process, virtually all major non-Communist political, regional, religious, and social groups are represented to some degree within the governing process.

It is to the credit of the present Government that it recognized the importance of leading the country to a constitutional, elected government, and that on January 15, 1966, it announced its intention to carry through a program which would provide Vietnam with a new Constitution, the provisions under which elections would be held.

It is to the credit of the present South Vietnamese Government, too, that nationwide elections for the Constituent Assembly were held on September 11, 1966; that local village and hamlet elections have been completed this year; and that elections for the President, Vice President, and the National Assembly are scheduled for this fall.

It is to the credit of the present Government that it extended invitations to foreign observers to witness the conduct of the elections of 1966, and that in response thereto the usual press corps of 350 correspondents swelled to over 500 by election day; that foreign diplomats residing in Saigon were also invited to witness the voting and along with the news correspondents were provided with transportation and other assistance to facilitate their travel throughout the country; and that parliamentary delegations from Japan and Korea were also permitted to observe the elections; and that Italian Ambassador d'Orlandi, dean of the diplomatic corps in Saigon, in expressing appreciation to the Vietnamese Foreign Minister in behalf of the corps,

other observers, and journalists for the Government's courtesies, pointed out that—

Due to the efficient arrangements made by the Government of Vietnam, it was possible for the diplomatic corps in Saigon to see the orderly way in which this nation-wide vote was cast and the fact that the voter was perfectly free and protected from violence.

It is to the credit of Prime Minister Ky, the principal target of the critics, that he recently announced that he hoped that thousands of representatives of the world press and international organizations would be in Vietnam for the campaign and the elections on September 3, 1967, to satisfy themselves of the honesty of the voting and of the fairness of the elections.

It is to the credit of our own President, Lyndon B. Johnson, that he has issued a stern warning to the Vietnamese Government that the people of the United States will not tolerate any interference in the exercise of the right of self determination by the people of South Vietnam.

So, let us give credit where credit is due, and before yielding to those who would have us condemn the developments in South Vietnam, remember that although its present Government is not itself based on popular elections, it is moving fast toward replacing itself with that kind of government, and that by the end of this year South Vietnam is due to have elected national and local officials throughout the governing structure.

We must remember, too, that this process, difficult enough in peacetime, is being created in the midst of and despite a bitter war in which the South Vietnamese Government is now engaged. Above all, let us not be led to apply such severe standards, as have been set up by some critics, that even our own elections in some of our own States may be deemed unfair.

Let us give the South Vietnamese leaders a chance to prove that even in the face of adversities they can hold free elections.

UNITY ATTAINED

Mr. PRYOR. 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Members appreciate how difficult it is to arrive at unanimity on any problem affecting the vital social and economic interests of many nations.

Yet unanimity has been achieved within the Alliance for Progress under the heading of economic integration.

The American chiefs of state at the April summit meeting gave the highest priority to the consolidation of isolated and fragmented economies into a unified continental common market embracing all the Latin American States.

The United States supports this plan as a "friend of the family." We are concerned in the ultimate success of this

venture, and we have agreed to lend technical and financial assistance to our sister Alliance republics—all committed to economic integration as a means of accelerating their individual and collective progress.

The hemisphere's leaders have recognized the advantages of joint action to achieve within a reasonable time the main goals of a Latin American Common Market. At Punta del Este they gave emphatic approval to an action program under which Latin America will create and sponsor a common market, multinational projects will lay the physical foundations for economic integration; and the United States will join in efforts to increase Latin America's foreign trade earnings.

Even prior to Punta del Este, a number of developments had advanced the prospects for a continental market. The Central American Republics organized a regional common market and attained new high levels of production, trade, and gross national income. Inspired by the successes of the European Common Market and Central America, the South American Republics and Mexico formed the Latin American Free Trade Association—LAFTA—whose progress has been hindered by its vast geographical area and the difficulties of reducing or abolishing tariffs between countries whose economies vary widely.

At this point the extent of our commitment to this undertaking is contained in President Johnson's remarks at the summit conference. He said:

If Latin America decides to create a common market, I shall recommend a substantial contribution to a fund that will help ease the transition into an integrated economy.

Our stake in integration is clear: If the Latin American States resolve their national differences and fuse their energies and resources, they may realize unparalleled social and economic development, accomplishing in relatively few years what centuries of disjointed effort have failed to do. We in the United States will be indirect beneficiaries of this program. However, we must also help share the burden of developing economic integration.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that "integration" per se, is not a panacea for all the social and economic ills afflicting Latin America. But it is difficult to conceive of a democratically minded and progressive Latin America without physical and economic integration.

Latin Americans are determined to make integration succeed, notwithstanding the tedious journey and many sacrifices which lie ahead.

Sacrifices are necessary for the compromises and adjustments that must be worked out between the southern republics. To create a market extending from the Rio Grande of Mexico to the tip of Cape Horn, some countries will be obliged to make painful concessions. Ultimately, it is expected, all the participants will benefit from a free flow of trade, with obvious advantages in economy and efficiency over splintered markets in local communities.

In helping to set a pattern for a Latin American Common Market, President Johnson told the conferees at Punta del Este:

You will be expanding your industrial base, increasing your participation in world trade and broadening economic opportunities for your people.

Second—

The President said:

you will design and join together to build great multi-national projects that will open up the inner frontiers of Latin America. These will provide . . . the physical basis for Simon Bolivar's vision of continental unity. I shall ask my country—

Went on the President—

to provide, over a three-year period, substantial additional funds as our part of this special effort.

We are ready to explore with other industrialized countries . . . the possibility of temporary preferential tariff advantages for all developing countries in the markets of all the industrialized countries.

Experience indicates U.S. foreign trade will be favorably affected by the integration movement. U.S. trade with the newly integrated Central American Common Market, for example, has grown steadily. Between 1961 and 1966 our exports to this market rose from \$207 million to \$362 million—better than a 50-percent increase.

The growing volume of production and trade in and between the Central American States affords a case study for the other republics in the LAFTA market area.

We in the United States can sympathize with these efforts because our own enviable stability and prosperity are built upon a free market between the 50 States. In this blessed land we have developed a specialized technology whose products find ready markets in free-trading areas. Our overall trade with the Latin American Republics will grow as integration expands their buying power.

To show the progress in integration it is pertinent to outline what the Latin Americans have done to further the common market concept:

First, it is worth noting that trade within Central America has, since 1960, increased from \$32 million to \$140 million per year. There is a slower, although definite, increase among the LAFTA countries, where integration involves numerous complex problems.

Even before Punta del Este, the leaders of five neighboring republics attended a "little summit" and signed the Declaration of Bogota to strengthen their economic relations. This since has become the basis for a subregional common market, which will be useful in preparing for Latin American integration.

Under this stimulus Colombia and Ecuador have established a Border Integration Council. Their Declaration of Rumichaca provides for economic, cultural, and technical collaboration. Colombia and Venezuela also have concluded a border integration agreement. They are considering pooling their merchant marine fleets and forming binational companies for handling telecommunications, electric power, and fuel transmission lines.

The Latin Republics are pressing forward with various multinational projects that hold great promise. To fulfill the intent of Punta del Este they are working to establish an inter-American telecommunications network. They will step up the timetable for completing the Pan American Highway and push the construction of the Bolivarian Highway on the eastern slopes of the Andes as a landmark of progress under the Alliance.

Five neighbors—Argentina, Paraguay, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Brazil—are co-sponsors of a comprehensive study for the integrated development of the River Plate Basin. The prospects are promising for this and numerous other multinational projects in various stages of planning.

President Johnson has already said that the U.S. contribution to this program of continental integration can only be a minor share of the investment which the other Alliance countries will make. Some of this assistance would be provided at such times as the LAFTA countries adopt a programed elimination of duties and take other effective measures necessary to economic integration.

We can expect a consolidation of the Central American and LAFTA markets into a single continental common market and the United States has agreed to assist such consolidation.

Much of what is underway or contemplated will be assisted by an increase in our 3-year contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank. This "bank of the Alliance" has been a spearhead in furthering integration through multinational projects.

Latin America has clearly demonstrated its dedication to economic integration and social reforms. We can and should stimulate and support these endeavors.

THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD, I include the following editorial on the Teacher Corps. I agree wholeheartedly that the Teacher Corps is one of the most promising programs passed in the last few years.

It should be substantially expanded at the earliest possible date.

[From the *Newsday*, Long Island, N.Y., Aug. 14, 1967]

THE TEACHER CORPS

In 1965, President Johnson proposed an experimental program to upgrade the caliber of teaching in slums and in depressed rural areas. It was to be called the National Teacher Corps. Last year, after a long struggle with Congress for money to underwrite the program, Teacher Corps members began teaching in schools throughout the nation.

The program worked so well that Mayor Lindsay described it as "a much needed infusion of genuine commitment and imagi-

native talent to the schools of New York City." The mayor also said that if the Teacher Corps were not continued and expanded, he would "count it as a serious setback to the cause of quality education."

Good notices also came in from many of the 252 school districts in which 1,227 members of the Teacher Corps worked last year. The budget for the corps was \$11,300,000. President Johnson, encouraged by the good reports, wanted to increase that figure this year to \$33,000,000. He did not get the money.

Instead, the program was given an \$18,000,000 budget authorized by the Congress. Thus, Richard A. Graham, director of the corps, foresees only a small expansion of the program this year, and that is too bad. For this year, of all years, schools in tense urban areas may well have difficulty attracting good teachers. Last year, the Teacher Corps demonstrated its ability to bring teachers of quality and enthusiasm into such schools.

The corps last year was composed of 262 veteran "master" teachers and 965 teacher-interns. The teacher-interns are liberal arts graduates who sign up for two years during which they combine academic instruction in a university with on-the-job experience in a nearby public school. At the conclusion of the two years, teacher-interns who have performed successfully are awarded a master's degree. They are assigned only to schools in poverty areas that are short of teachers and ask for the aid.

One of the most interesting effects of the Teacher Corps is the dual impact of these teacher-interns. They have brought fresh ideas into the schools in which they work, and they have placed fresh, new demands on the universities in which they train. The House Education and Labor Committee's report on the Teacher Corps noted these "desirable side effects." In its report, the committee said: "The Teacher Corps program is generating new insights into what constitutes an effective teacher-preparation program. University training centers have developed special programs, courses and curriculums geared to the needs of neglected schools in their areas."

As U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II has noted, specialized training of teachers for service in schools in slum areas is an aspect of professional education that has been badly neglected. "The general run of teacher education has not really addressed itself to preparing teachers to teach kids who come from poor homes," Howe said. Thus, this small program could, merely by its impact on teacher-training methods, have a major influence on the quality of instruction in schools in poverty areas.

This year at least, there does not appear to be much hope that the Congress will add to the money authorized for the Teacher Corps. Hopefully by next year more members of Congress will understand what the corps is doing and what it could do were it given the chance. The success of the corps deserves recognition. It should be expanded.

VIETNAM ELECTIONS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG] 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 Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, a number of stories have appeared here charging rigging of the elections in Vietnam, intimidation of candidates, willful government sabotage of the campaign, casual refusal of the Vietnamese Government

to approve the candidacy of politicians who supposedly were a serious threat at the ballot box.

There were few specifics. Key facts were left out of the accounts. And when the facts were examined, the situation looked very different from the original reports.

One incident—in which a plane load of presidential candidates were set down at the wrong airport and then found no cars to take them to the election rally—is a case in point.

There was a strong crosswind at the airport where they were scheduled to land. Should the pilot have taken a chance on setting down there and wiping out most of the opposition presidential candidates? We can imagine what the charges would have been then.

The fact is that 1 hour after the candidates had landed, transportation was available to take them to the rally. But by then they had taken off back to Saigon. This important fact was missing from all news accounts of the incident. Of course, the truth never caught up with the first impression.

The election-rigging charge made the rounds, amplified in each rebroadcast with more adjectives and adverbs but unallied by a few key facts that would have put the whole tempest back in the teapot where it belonged.

Vietnamese politicians have learned that rumors are not only easier to start than to stop, but they can have great political impact. The trouble is that exaggerated reports get in the way of the facts. And at a distance of 10,000 miles, it is hard to get a picture of what is really going on in the campaign. We should realize that everything said by a candidate for public office—whether he is running in Vietnam or in the United States or elsewhere—may not be the Gospel.

American reporters send thousands of words each day from Vietnam. Facts and rumors, or half facts and half rumors, are well mixed in the process. American readers need an extra dose of our usual suspicion and an added measure of our normal sophistication.

Mr. Speaker, as I see it, the real obstacle to free election in South Vietnam continues to be the bombs and bullets of the Vietcong terrorists who are trying to prevent having any election at all, and who would, indeed, prevent elections, free or otherwise, for all time, just as the Communists have done in North Vietnam.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, for the period from August 22, 1967, through August 24, 1967, on account of illness.

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, August 21, 1967, an account of official business (National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders).

Mr. SATTERFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARSH), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. McCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. AREND), for today, 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. Gross, for 30 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 1 hour, on August 24, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. PETTIS), for 1 hour, on August 28, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. PRYOR), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. EILBERG to include extraneous matter in his remarks.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ZION.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRYOR) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. DONOHUE.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. DORN.

Mr. BROOKS.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 292. An act to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, in order to exempt from the provisions of such section certain transportation of merchandise which is in part over Canadian highways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 294. An act for the relief of Eloy C. Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1165. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds now on deposit to the credit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians on behalf of the Mississippi Bands and the Pillager and Lake Winnibigoshish Bands of Chippewa Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2162. An act to amend the act of January 17, 1936 (49 Stat. 1094), reserving certain public domain lands in Nevada and Oregon as a grazing reserve for Indians of Fort McDermitt, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLISON, 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. 1282. An act to provide for the withdrawal of wine from bonded wine cellars without payment of tax when rendered unfit for beverage use, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the free entry of certain scientific instruments and apparatus for the use of Tufts University, Mount Holyoke College, and the Massachusetts Division of the American Cancer Society;

H.R. 6056. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide rules relating to the deduction for personal exemptions for children of parents who are divorced or separated.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 22, 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:

1006. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a joint resolution regarding the status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (H. Doc. 159); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1007. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of compensation payments under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1008. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of administrative expenses for the safety program under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1009. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the second annual report on the minerals exploration assistance program, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(5) of the act of November 8, 1965; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1010. A letter from the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, transmitting the audit report of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-504; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1011. 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of August 15, 1967, the following bill was reported on August 18, 1967:

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 12474. A bill making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted August 21, 1967]

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. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 506. Resolution providing for the distribution of the United States Code Annotated or the Federal Code Annotated to Members of the House of Representatives with amendment (Rept. No. 570). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 842. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 124; with amendment (Rept. No. 571). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 6736. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9085. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of August 15, 1967, the following bill was introduced on August 18, 1967:

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 12474. A bill making appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

[Submitted August 21, 1967]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 12475. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive and legislative branches of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.R. 12476. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 12477. A bill to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE (for himself and Mr. MIZE):

H.R. 12478. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural

products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 12479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 12480. A bill to provide for uniform annual observances of certain national holidays on Mondays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12481. A bill to provide incentives for the creation by private industry of additional employment opportunities for residents of urban poverty areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12482. A bill to encourage and assist private enterprise to provide adequate housing in urban poverty areas for low-income and lower middle income persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLÉNBERG:

H.R. 12493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 12484. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 12485. A bill to guarantee productive employment opportunities for those who are unemployed or underemployed; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 12486. A bill to facilitate the entry into the United States of aliens who are brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12487. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to exempt certain securities sold, given, or otherwise transferred to certain employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 12488. 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. PELLY:

H.R. 12489. 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.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 12490. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the manner of determining annual income for pension purposes of certain persons who are entitled to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 12491. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 12492. A bill to expand the definition of deductible moving expenses incurred by an employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 12493. A bill to amend chapter 73, title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the obstruction of criminal investigations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 12494. A bill to establish a National Commission on Urban Living; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 12495. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of \$125 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a \$2,400 and \$3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 12496. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 12497. A bill to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H.J. Res. 797. 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. COLLIER (for himself and Mr. Brown of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 798. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.J. Res. 799. Joint resolution providing that the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation that the first week of October 1967 is an appropriate time to commemorate the 50 years of service to the Nation by the Langley Research Center; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.J. Res. 800. Joint resolution to provide funds on behalf of a grateful nation in honor of Dwight D. Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States, to be used in support of construction and endowment of Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y., as a distinguished and permanent memorial to his life and deeds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

278. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to return to the States for the purposes of public education a certain portion of Federal personal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

279. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to legislation affecting interstate taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

280. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, relative to the reinstatement of funds deleted from the appropriation for the lamprey control program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

281. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, relative to the recent plebiscite on Commonwealth status; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 12496. A bill for the relief of Marjorie

Eileen Skeene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 12499. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Passaris (Jimmy) Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOW:

H.R. 12500. A bill for the relief of Miss Giovanna Lagana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 12501. A bill for the relief of Elgie L. Tabor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 12502. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Schofield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 12503. A bill for the relief of Dr. Choong Oi Reddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

146. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to the creation of a Committee on Subsidies, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1967

The Senate met at 11:30 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia.

Rev. Collier S. Harvey, Jr., pastor, Tinkling Spring Presbyterian Church, Fishersville, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, as Thou didst guide Thy people of old with fire and cloud, make us sensitive to the evidences of Thy guidance in this our day. May we be able to discern Thy will amid the conflicting purposes and differing ambitions of this present hour. Remind us, O God, that Thou art the Creator and that we have been entrusted with the stewardship of that which Thou didst pronounce good.

We pray for wisdom and discernment for these elected to high office and grave responsibility. We pray for loyalty and concern on the part of those who have elected them. We pray also for that measure of justice for the good of all and of compassion for the needs of many which shall make the deliberations of this day a blessing to our land.

Lead us, O God, as Thy children and as citizens of this Nation to a deeper trust in the dimensions of Thy love for us and a richer faith in the fact that all things are possible unto Thee. We pray in the name of Christ, the way, the truth, and the author of abundant life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, JR., a Senator from the State of Virginia, to per-