

"We're not much worried about the money. If that runs out, we'll make out somehow."

And you talk to the Arlington police and ask them if their investigation of the beating has progressed.

"We have nothing new on it. We haven't had anything new to go on.

"It's still an open case."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF THE APOLLO TRAGEDY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Friday evening we had a tragic accident at Cape Kennedy in which three astronauts lost their lives. This is the first fatal accident involving Apollo hardware, although three astronauts had been killed previously in jet aircraft while assigned to the program.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has established a formal board of inquiry to review this accident in accordance with its established procedures. This investigation is now under way under the direction of Dr. Floyd Thompson, Director of the NASA Langley Research Center. Dr. Thompson is supported by technical experts from NASA headquarters and field installations as well as by experts from other Government agencies, the industrial community, and the President's Science Advisory Committee.

In view of the nature of this tragedy and its potential impact on the national space program, as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and with complete agreement with the ranking minority member, the senior Senator from Maine, we have decided it is essential that the committee undertake a full review of this accident.

Our purpose will be to examine the facts surrounding the accident. We will, of course, be especially interested in the recommendations and action taken to prevent a recurrence. The committee will review other related aspects of NASA's stewardship of the Apollo program as may be necessary to accomplish the above objectives. Mr. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, has been advised of the committee's intentions in this area.

I have directed the committee staff to undertake such background study as may be appropriate at this time and to keep currently informed on the progress of the NASA inquiry, with the full understanding that these actions will not in any way impede the NASA formal inquiry. It is our judgment at this time that committee hearings and other subsequent action by the committee on this matter will be dependent on the findings

of the NASA Board of Inquiry and committee staff studies that I mentioned.

It is our purpose in undertaking this course of action that all aspects of this tragedy be assessed in an objective framework both with respect to its cause and to how it relates to the national space program and our effort to establish the preeminence of this Nation in space.

In taking these actions, the committee will fulfill its responsibilities to the U.S. Senate and to the American people.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Everett Hutchinson, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of the Department of Transportation.

John E. Robson, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the Department of Transportation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 31, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.—Proverbs 3: 5.

Dear Lord and Father of mankind, our spirit's unseen friend, make Thy way known to us as we bow in Thy presence. May this moment of prayer be an open door to the reality of Thy spirit and as we look up to Thee may we find our strength renewed, our souls restored and be given courage and wisdom for the living of these days.

Endow us with one mind to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee, and in so doing to promote the welfare of all our people. Give to us and to all our citizens a love for truth, a passion for doing our duty, and a dedication to Thee which will hold us steady amid difficult times. In the name of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution continuing the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title 6, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonesential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. KING of California; Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. MAHON, of Texas; Mr. KIRWAN, of Ohio; Mr. Bow, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF U.S. GROUP OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 689, 84th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. group of the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HAYS, of Ohio, chairman; Mr. RODINO, of New Jersey; Mr. RIVERS, of South Carolina; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BROOKS, of Texas; Mr. ARENS, of Illinois; Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan; Mr. BATES, of Massachusetts; Mr. FINDLEY, of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, as amended, the Chair appoints as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey; Mr. MURPHY of New York; Mr. HALPERN, of New York; Mr. KUPFERMAN, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 88-606, the Chair appoints as members of the Public Land Law Review Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. BARING, of Nevada; Mr. TAYLOR, of North Carolina; Mr. UDALL, of Arizona; Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania; Mr. BURTON of Utah; Mr. KYL, of Iowa.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS EX OFFICIO OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85-874, as amended, the Chair appoints as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts the following members on the part of the House: Mr. **WRIGHT**, of Texas; Mr. **THOMPSON** of New Jersey; Mr. **FRELINGHUYSEN**, of New Jersey.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF U.S. TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The **SPEAKER**. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following members on the part of the House: Mr. **KARSTEN**, of Missouri; Mr. **HAYS**, of Ohio; Mr. **CUNNINGHAM**, of Nebraska.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES J. HEFFERNAN

Mrs. **KELLY**. 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 gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a former Member of the House of Representatives, James J. Heffernan.

Mr. Speaker, to Mrs. Adrian Driggs—Patricia Heffernan—the daughter of a great gentleman, I extend my sympathy on the death of her dear father, James J. Heffernan.

James J. Heffernan served as a Member of Congress for 12 years. He was an able Member of this august body and one who was held in great respect and esteem by his colleagues. He was a reserved, quiet man, possessing great dignity. This dignity was carried into every phase of his life. It was a reflection of his rearing, of which there was none better. It reflected his loyalty to all men. It reflected his kindness, his love of his neighbors and friends.

James Heffernan, for many reasons, possessed keen insight into the needs of the people and was always sought for his views on problems, projects, and issues of the day. His judgment was sound and his actions just. This body and his constituents lost a noble Representative when he retired.

I was proud to know him. I was happy to have him for a friend—not only of mine but for a long time of the Kelly family.

One can truly say of Jim Heffernan, "You devoted your life to the good."

Mr. **ROONEY** of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of my longtime friend and colleague the Honorable James J. Heffer-

nan. For 12 years Jim Heffernan represented the people of the old 11th Congressional District in Brooklyn and they were indeed well represented. He was a quiet, highly intelligent and gentle man who brought to this body a vast store of knowledge. Jim Heffernan was no newcomer to Brooklyn when he was elected to the House of Representatives. His family settled in Brooklyn before the War of 1812 and he himself had been a district leader in the Park Slope area of Brooklyn for 17 years before coming to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago on the sad occasion of his departure from the House of Representatives, I said of Jim Heffernan:

Jim has always been a quiet, unassuming, kindly, capable gentleman, respected here in the House by all of his colleagues and in the Borough of Brooklyn by all its citizens.

This was true to the end of his days. To his daughter, Patricia, and her family, I extend my deepest sympathy and prayers.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mrs. **KELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and public service of James J. Heffernan.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S AIR POLLUTION MESSAGE

Mr. **ADAMS**. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ADAMS**. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to a subject which has become a plague on our land—the pollution of our atmosphere.

Air pollution is of major concern to all Americans. We in the great Northwest who cherish our fertile fields and forests are becoming more and more aware of the grime and filth of polluted air.

Air pollution is partially a natural phenomenon, but today its true danger is caused by man—by people driving automobiles—by factories and powerplants burning sulfur-bearing fuels—yes, even by our good neighbors burning their trash or leaves.

Part of the pollution in the atmosphere is contributed by industry. One of the industries at which the finger is often pointed is the pulp and paper business, and my State, Washington, is one of the many States which manufacture pulp and paper. Many of these industries are now spending substantial amounts of money to correct this situation. Much more needs to be done, and because of this I welcome and support the President's recommendations for methods of improving the quality of our air.

There has been considerable resistance by some segments of industry to the installation of air pollution control equipment. The resistance that I am talking about is based on reasonable economic grounds. Why, says the industrialist, should my State require that I install expensive air pollution control equipment when my competitor in the next State is not required to? The piecemeal institutions of such controls could not only sadly affect one company's business, it could tip the scales in a corporation's decision about which State it chooses to build a new plant in. Under the provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967, minimum emission control levels would be established for the entire country, and the necessary burden of the expense of controlling air pollution would put no industrialist at an economic disadvantage with his competitor.

I also welcome the financial support which the act gives to research in the field of air pollution. While it is true that we could control the pollution from, say, our pulp and paper mills, it is also true that our control techniques are in their infancy and that a great deal of research and development is needed before they reach the level of efficiency and economy we hope for.

In Washington we recently passed a Seattle-King County air pollution control resolution which was reported on November 10, 1966, and I applaud the enabling legislation which was passed in the last legislature authorizing this, but it must go further. It does not cover automobiles, yet we know and national studies confirm that of the approximately 133 million tons of material being dumped into the U.S. atmosphere each year, transportation—basically the auto—accounts for 85 million tons, manufacturing, 22 million tons; electric, coal, and power generation, 15 million tons; space heating, 8 million tons; and burning of refuse, 3 million tons.

Industrial air and water pollution must be controlled, but the basic megalopolis air and water pollution must be also. As we found with controlling our pollution of Lake Washington, this takes areawide jurisdiction and execution. Seattle receives approximately 33 to 35 tons of dustfall per square mile per month. On 50 to 100 days per year, atmospheric stagnation occurs in the Puget Sound region. In our State we should have new legislation such as suggested by Professor Rossano to deal with the problems of the whole "airshed."

Nationally we have some areas such as New York where the problem is multi-State. In those areas we will have to have either State compacts or national legislation. Earlier this month several of us introduced legislation to accomplish this, and we support the President's position as outlined in his message.

Let no one imagine, however, that we can afford to wait until we know everything before we do anything. The menace is real, and it must be countered with our best effort now. We must see that the Air Quality Act of 1967 is made an effective tool, if we are to avoid disaster.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION SHOULD BE INCREASED

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would increase the personal income tax exemption for each member of a family from the present \$600 to \$1,000. It has been 20 years since the \$600 individual exemption was set by Congress. I believe it is time that we take steps to liberalize the exemption to keep pace with the cost-of-living increases which have occurred since 1947.

In my judgment, the \$600 exemption should be increased before Congress considers the 6-percent surtax which the administration has proposed. I believe a \$400 increase would provide equitable relief for middle- and low-income families. Following is a detailed analysis of this proposal in an editorial from *The Machinist* written by one of our Nation's most able union leaders Ray Siemiller, the President of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers:

IN ALL FAIRNESS

Washington, D.C. is buzzing about an increase in income taxes. The President called for a six percent surtax—meaning an increase of six percent of the tax you now pay. Business editors and conservative economists are talking about a five percent across-the-board increase in the tax rates.

They say a tax increase will kill two birds at once: it will drain off purchasing power and prevent prices from rising still higher; and, it will help to finance the war in Southeast Asia.

Trade union members know that every citizen should pay his fair share of the tax burden. We support the effort to stop Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. Also, we would rather pay taxes than suffer a depression or a runaway inflation.

But the tax law should be fair. For the past 30 years, the burden of taxation has been steadily shifted from the rich to the middle and lower income families.

Shifting of the tax burden has been accomplished by clever loopholes written into the law. Loopholes enable millionaires to cut their average tax payments to 24 percent of their gross income, instead of the 90 percent which they claim.

The shift of the tax burden has been accomplished by freezing the individual exemption at \$600 per person. That exemption means practically nothing to wealthy families. As the cost of living climbs—and your wages rise to meet it—the frozen exemption means higher and higher taxes to wage earning families.

CAN YOU RAISE A CHILD ON \$600 A YEAR?

Back in 1947, twenty years ago, Congress set the personal exemption at \$600 for each member of the family. In theory, this was the minimum amount needed for a decent standard of living and should not be taxed.

In 1947, this \$600 exemption gave a tax free income of \$2,400 to the average family of four.

At that time, the trade union movement protested that the \$600 exemption was too low. But, if it was right in 1947 it is outrageously outmoded today. The cost of liv-

ing has risen nearly 50 percent in the past 20 years.

The IAM believes that in the field of taxation, the first order of business for Congress should be to increase personal income tax exemption from \$600 to \$1,000. This simple act would provide a tax-free base of \$4,000 for a family of four.

In 1939, before World War II, the personal exemption for income tax purposes was \$2,500 for a man and wife and \$400 for each child. This gave the average wage-earning family \$3,300 in tax free income—in 1939 dollars. To equal that level at today's cost of living the exemption would have to be raised to \$2,000 per person or a total of \$8,000 in 1967 dollars.

If the exemption were \$1,000 now, a family of four making \$8,000 per year would pay \$500 instead of \$866. You could pay a surtax and still give a break to a family with young children.

INCOME TAXES FOR THE WEALTHY HAVE BEEN REDUCED

The tax law is now riddled with loopholes through which the wealthy have reduced their tax burden, while yours was going up. For example:

1. Before World War II, the "community property" privilege which allowed income to be divided between husband and wife was restricted to a few states. Since 1947 it has been made universal. It saves a working man only a few dollars. But, it gives thousands of dollars in tax reduction to someone with a \$100,000 income.

2. Many corporations give stock in their company to executives instead of cash bonuses. If the executive holds the stock for six months he can sell it and pay only a capital gains tax of 25 percent instead of his normal income tax rate of two or three times that.

3. Corporations also supplement the salaries of executives by providing many non-taxable fringes including expense accounts, company-paid cruises, free daily luncheons, use of company cars, etc.

4. Oil millionaires for years have been able to salt away 27½ percent of their income tax free, before they begin to calculate their tax liability. Other industries have secured "depletion allowances" since 1947.

5. Family trusts enable the very wealthy to evade legally the progressive features of the income tax law. They put stocks and bonds in their children's names enabling the children to get the dividends or interest and thus dividing the family income five or six ways so the income tax rate is only a fraction of what it should be.

When the wealthy do not pay their share, the working people are stuck with the bill. You can't hide wages. They take your taxes out of your pay before you see your money.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

In simple justice, the long frozen personal exemption should be brought up to date before wage earners are asked for additional taxes. We have been patient and patriotic for 20 long years. We have seen the wealthy win concession after concession while they shift the burden onto working people. A young man today with two or three children is already carrying more of the load than he should. We are asking Congress to raise that personal exemption to \$1,000 for each person in the family before they add any surtax.

Let your Congressmen know that you want the personal exemption raised to \$1,000 before any tax increase is levied.

NO STATEMENT

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, critics outraged by civilian casualties caused by U.S. bombing in North Vietnam have little to say of similar events in South Vietnam.

The *Baltimore News American* wonders why. It quotes South Vietnamese Premier Ky:

"What," he asked, "of the 7,277 South Vietnamese civilians that have been murdered and the 35,218 persons who have been kidnaped by the Communist Vietcong there during the past 5 years?"

The *Hearst* newspaper asks when the war critics, in America and abroad, will protest these atrocities.

So do I.

I offer the entire editorial for the *RECORD*:

[From the *News American*, Jan. 23, 1967]

TELL-TALE SILENCE

During his trip to Australia, South Vietnam's Premier Nguyen Cao Ky indignantly replied to those who have been criticizing the U.S. Vietnam war effort because some civilians have been unavoidably killed in our bombing of North Vietnam military targets.

"What," he asked, "of the 7,277 South Vietnamese civilians that have been murdered and the 35,218 persons who have been kidnaped by the Communist Vietcong there during the past five years?"

"Doctors, priests, monks, welfare workers and nurses are slaughtered in cold blood. Bus loads of small children going to school and housewives going to market are blown up. Village elders are mutilated, farmers knifed to death."

Premier Ky asked a good question. What about it indeed? We are still waiting for our vociferous war critics—both at home and abroad—to make some statement or protest on the unspeakable atrocities being committed daily by the Vietcong on their own people.

Our bet is we will have a long, long wait.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to present this statement in support of the President's proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

Not long ago I toured the New York area by helicopter, approaching the city from the east, from Suffolk County where the air is comparatively clean and clear. On the western horizon hangs a strip of dirty brown haze made up of industrial smoke, gases, chemicals, auto exhausts, dust and soot. That is what we are breathing and have been breathing for years.

Must we wait for another national disaster before action is taken? A short journey back in time recalls the poisonous and deadly stench that settled over Donora, Pa., in 1948.

As a Congressman from Staten Island and Brooklyn, which is affected by air pollution traveling on the prevailing winds from industrialized New Jersey, I have been in the forefront of the fight for clean air for 4 years. During this time I have introduced and supported the Clean Air Act of 1963 as well as the amendments of 1965 and 1966.

Because air pollution is free to cross State and other political boundaries, we must develop the machinery to control air pollution as it really exists today. Regional air quality commissions to regulate and control air quality must be established. These commissions would have the responsibility of establishing and enforcing regional air quality levels no less stringent than the minimum levels published by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The development of such levels will enable industry to know to what extent they must control their sources of pollution. Experience has shown that it is not realistic to expect industry and the public to support strong State and local emission levels without assurance that similar action be enforced elsewhere.

Passage of President Johnson's air quality legislation will provide the necessary assurance. With it, we can get on with the job of clearing the air in every region of the country.

COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT OF GREECE FOR ACTION AGAINST CAPTAINS AND OWNERS OF SHIPS TRADING WITH COMMUNIST CUBA

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to commend the Government of Greece for action against captains and owners of ships trading with Communist Cuba.

Last week the Greek Government initiated legal action against captains and owners of 12 Greek vessels who have continued to trade with Cuba despite the directives of their Government.

I am sure that the American people are gratified that we have such an ally as Greece. At the same time I would like to commend the Greek Government for their action in backing our request that no free world nation trade with North Vietnam. There has not been a single ship under Greek registry enter a North Vietnam port since June of 1966.

I only wish that England, who is supposedly our closest ally, would take similar action in barring her ships from the ports of Cuba and North Vietnam.

Greece is equally dependent upon trading as is England. But the Government of Greece has put the moral issue of communism versus democracy above the dollar.

It would appear that England listens to the talk of the dollar, rather than the

call of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Again, I commend the Government of Greece in cooperating with the United States and the Organization of American States in enforcing the policy of economic isolation against Communist Cuba.

BIRTHDAY OF ROBERT E. LEE QUIETLY PASSED IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH NO RECOGNITION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in open session of the House on January 19, 1967, that the routine business was carried on but that no remarks were made from this Chamber on the birthday of a great American. Yes, the birthday of Robert E. Lee quietly passed in the Congress of the United States with no recognition. Some historians have written that Robert E. Lee was the greatest American that had ever lived. Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama, stated there is no doubt Robert E. Lee had more feeling, more qualities than any other American.

One other outstanding Confederate general has a birthday in the month of January. I speak of Gen. Stonewall Jackson, whose birthday was on January 21. I mention these Confederate generals, Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson, not to reopen the wounds of the War Between the States but to pay tribute to these men who had a cause and stood for their cause.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following commemoration of the birthday of Robert E. Lee on January 19, 1967, with excerpts from Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama, and Mr. Benjamin H. Hill:

ADDRESS OF DR. FRANK ROSE, KAPPA ALPHA-TRANSYLVANIA, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, AT THE KAPPA ALPHA CONVENTION IN MEMPHIS

Robert E. Lee was born the son of one of America's most distinguished Revolutionary heroes. "Light-Horse Harry" Lee, a gentleman of impeccable manners and flashing conversation, often mentioned as Washington's successor and as a member of the Continental Congress was the one who eulogized George Washington as "First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen." His first wife had died early and he had married the lovely Ann Hill Carter, age twenty, and the daughter of one of the richest men in Virginia. This lovely lady was to become the mother of our spiritual founder, Robert E. Lee.

Henry Lee did not have the capacity to retire to the quiet and prosperous life, and soon after his marriage to Ann Hill Carter, he became involved in highly speculative land deals that lost all of the family resources and brought embarrassment to many of his old friends, among them Washington, Monroe and Jefferson. In the summer of 1813, he left his young wife and young son to take a

chosen exile in the Barbados, never to see his family again.

Young Robert gave his every attention to his mother and the Episcopal Church and grew into a fine young man. By the end of 1823, he had completed the course at Alexander Academy and enrolled at West Point. He was an outstanding cadet, without demerits and with outstanding marks in all subjects taken. His service in peacetime was excellent and on September 1, 1852, he returned to West Point to become the ninth superintendent of the United States Military Academy. He rebuilt the Academy and inaugurated new courses and instituted new disciplines. In 1855, Lee was ordered to Texas, and it was six years later that he had to declare his faith to the Union or to Virginia. On April 18, 1861, Colonel Robert E. Lee was summoned to Washington and offered the Command of the Northern Army which he declined with a fervent appeal that all differences between North and South be settled without troops. General Scott asked for his immediate resignation, and a few days later, Lee reluctantly assumed command of the Northern Virginia troops.

The War took its heavy toll of Lee's men and his vitality, and following his surrender, he was offered many opportunities to reclaim fortune, but chose instead to become president of Washington College. He was so respected by both faculty and students that they would pause outside his home in the morning in the hope of speaking to him or to see him on his way to his office. Life was not to be kind in the aftermath, as extremists on both sides were to attack him until his death. He accepted his punishment with courage and won many strong friends and the praise of outstanding men on both sides. The New York Herald, in an editorial, submitted Robert E. Lee's name as the Democratic nominee for presidency of the United States on July 1, 1868.

What was it our founders saw in Robert E. Lee? One cannot read the volumes that have been written on his life without being greatly moved.

He was a man of great discipline. This is seen in his life even at an early age—in his care for the wishes of his parents, his attendance and attention to his Episcopal Church, his excellent mastery of subjects taken in school and at West Point, his devotion to duty as a soldier in the Mexican War and later as Superintendent of the Academy. He fought successfully for four years, outnumbered four to one, and with few of the instruments of war. He accepted defeat in honor, and refused great financial fortune to return to his native Virginia to begin rebuilding the lives of those who would become the leaders of tomorrow. His sorrows, he would not allow to become rancor; his defeat, not bitterness; his losses, not helplessness. For Robert E. Lee and his native South there were no Marshall Plans or Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There was no Point Four Program.

He returned home to teach his boys the manhood out of which reason prevails and intelligence conquers. With courage and wisdom and perseverance, he started rebuilding. The South was the frontier and he led the way. This is what our founders saw in Robert E. Lee and this is why they gave us our heritage.

He was a man of great character. Embarrassed by the conduct of his father in early life, poor in the midst of relatives that were rich, left with the care of a mother ill in health, and tempted by the frivolous ridicule of those his own age, he set his mind on higher goals and achieved most of them. He did not want to be a party to those who would destroy the Union, neither would he be made a party to those who would destroy the South. But he would defend his State of Virginia. He surrendered his slaves before the War. Grant did not free his until after

the War. Our founders saw justice, goodness and Godliness in Robert E. Lee, and this is our heritage.

Further comments were made by Benjamin H. Hill commemorating the birthday of Robert E. Lee:

"He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guilt. He was a Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward."

WILSONS CREEK NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill whereby the authorized funds for development of the Wilsons Creek National Battlefield Park, near Springfield, Mo., would be increased. Identical bills to increase this authorization to \$3 million are being introduced in the Senate by my two Missouri colleagues, Senators SYMINGTON and LONG.

These funds would be "earmarked" for further development of the park. This development would help establish facilities to accommodate the increasing number of park visitors, and would supplement the land acquisition policies of the State of Missouri which has been its part of this joint Federal-State project.

The second section of this bill would change the name of the park from Wilsons Creek Battlefield National Park, to Wilsons Creek National Battlefield. The purpose of this change is to conform with uniform nomenclature for all national parks, and it is requested by the Department of Interior.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as one of the major engagements west of the Mississippi during the so-called Civil War, Wilsons Creek merits the fullest development. However, I think we are all aware of the budget problems this year. It is important to recognize that this bill is an "authorization," and that the appropriation for any single year will of course depend on the capabilities of the National Park Service, and their master development plan. With this in mind, I sincerely hope we can have hearings in both the House and Senate at an early date.

AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES UNDER THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, there is some confusion among farmers relative to the coverage of agricultural employees in the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act adopted by Congress last year. The effective date of the amendments is February 1, 1967.

Whether a farm will be covered is generally determined by the test of whether 500 man-days of agricultural labor was employed in any calendar quarter during the previous calendar year. There are certain employees exempted from the man-day count as noted in the explanation I will place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The definition of employee as applied to sharecroppers or tenants has created misunderstanding. Generally, sharecroppers and tenants are covered under the law if their activities are closely guided by the landowner; and they are not covered if the landowner in no way guides, directs, or aids in management of the farming operation. The latter are independent-contractor sharecroppers. However, there is no single rule or test for making such a determination.

Mr. Speaker, many of us were fearful that the inclusion of agriculture in minimum wage legislation would be unduly burdensome by subjecting farmers to unnecessary regulation. I, therefore, voted against the bill in the House. Nevertheless, the majority of the House and Senate favored the principle of covering farmworkers and such is now the law. Because this is a total new experience to farmers, I would hope the Department of Labor would be sympathetic and understanding in administering this provision.

I include at this point excerpts from House Report 1366, 89th Congress, which explains the intent of Congress in regard to agricultural employees in the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966:

The bill amends section 13(a)(6) of the Act so as to extend minimum wage protection to 485,000 agricultural workers. They will remain exempt from the overtime provisions of the law. The minimum wage for covered agricultural workers will be \$1 an hour beginning February 1, 1967; \$1.15 an hour beginning February 1, 1968; and \$1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969. Room, board, and other facilities customarily furnished employees by employers are "wages" according to their fair value or reasonable cost as provided for in section 3(m) of the Act.

The committee is fully cognizant of its action in entering the area of agricultural employment. Opponents of this coverage constantly assert that agriculture is an area to which the minimum wage cannot be applied. By limiting the wage increase to \$1.30 an hour, the committee is affirming its intention to follow closely the effect of minimum wages in agriculture. It is not, however, subordinating its belief in a minimum wage as a wage below which no employee should be paid. Likewise it is in no way implying that the wage floor for agricultural employees should lag permanently behind that of other protected employees.

Of the agricultural workers to be covered, some 213,000 (44 percent), presently earn less than \$1 an hour. Given the initial coverage of such workers at \$1 an hour, the wage bill increase for agriculture will be \$52 million.

The method of covering agricultural workers received considerable attention. A dollar-volume test, such as that applied to enterprises, is inapplicable in an industry so subject to seasonal variation. The committee decided an equitable and administrable formula would be a test considering the quantity of labor used by an individual farm. This accounting procedure would reflect the variations of farm activity.

Generally, only the employees of large farms will be covered. To be covered, an employee must be employed by an employer who used more than 500 man-days of agricultural labor in any calendar quarter of the preceding year. "Man-day" means any day during any portion of which an employee performs any agricultural labor. If the employer used more than 500 man-days of agricultural labor as specified, all of the employees on that farm are covered by the minimum wage. This is intended to provide protection to the employees of large agri-business enterprises. Five-hundred man-days is approximately the equivalent of seven employees full time in a calendar quarter. Therefore, it would generally require that a farm have seven or more full-time employees, a considerable enterprise in farming, before the employees receive minimum wage protection. The parent, spouse, child, or other member of an agricultural employer's immediate family are not covered.

The calculation of man-days is not a simple count of all workers on a farm. The bill provides that certain agricultural employees not be included in the general count; that is, the labor of certain employees will not be recognized as increasing the man-day count. The employees who will not be included in determining whether or not an individual farm exceeds the 500 man-day criteria are—

(1) the parent, spouse, child, or other member of an agricultural employer's immediate family; or

(2) an employee who (a) is employed as a hand harvest laborer and is paid on a piece-rate basis in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece-rate basis in the region of employment, (b) commutes daily from his permanent residence to the farm on which he is so employed, and (c) has been employed in agriculture less than 13 weeks during the preceding calendar year.

The latter category generally defines local, temporary employees, who work during a crop harvest. The committee did not intend to have the limited labor of these employees raise the man-day count above 500. The committee further believes that an individual employed in agriculture for fewer than 13 weeks should not be considered as an agricultural employee. The effect of including these employees in the man-day count would be to cover the employees of small farms which may utilize extensive local and temporary labor during a harvest season.

It is intended that the minimum wage provisions of the Act be extended to certain sharecroppers and tenant farmers. The test of coverage for these persons will be the same test that is applied to determine whether any other person is an employee or not. Employer, employee, and employ, are all defined terms in the Act. Coverage is intended in the case of certain so-called sharecroppers or tenants whose work activities are closely guided by the landowner or his agent. These individuals, called sharecroppers and tenants, are employees by another name. Their work is closely directed; discretion is nonexistent. True independent-contractor sharecroppers or tenant farmers will not be covered; they are not employees.

The Supreme Court (in *Rutherford Food Corp. v. McComb*, 331 U.S. 722 (1947)) has made it clear that there is no single rule or test for determining whether an individual

is an employee or an independent contractor, but that the "total situation controls." In general an employee, as distinguished from a person who is engaged in a business of his own, is one who "follows the usual path of an employee" and is dependent on the business which he serves. As an aid in assessing the total situation, the Court mentioned some of the characteristics of the two classifications which should be considered. Among those are:

- (1) The extent to which the services rendered are an integral part of the principal's business;
- (2) The permanency of the relationship;
- (3) The opportunities for profit or loss;
- (4) The initiative, judgment, or foresight exercised by the one who performs the services;
- (5) The amount of investments; and
- (6) The degree of control which the principal has in the situation.

The committee fully subscribes to these criteria.

Testimony indicates that there are large numbers of so-called sharecroppers who are not allowed to make a single economic decision regarding the land upon which they live and work. For example, they do not decide what to plant, when to plant, when to harvest, where to purchase seed, or where to sell the product of their labor. For these people, the term "sharecropping" only denotes a means of compensation; it conveys no connotation of independence, individualism, or self-determination. On the other hand, there are true tenant farmers, who make basic economic decisions upon which rest the productivity of the farm and consequently the amount of their compensation. Generally these tenants operate farms owned by absentee landlords. They are unsupervised, make day-to-day decisions necessary to the running of the farm, and share in the profits related to the productivity, for which they are greatly responsible. Such persons are not intended to be covered by the Act.

Average hourly earnings in agriculture were 90 cents in 1964 in the United States. In some States the average falls below 60 cents an hour, and there are reports of wages of 30 cents an hour. Migrant agricultural workers had average annual earnings of only \$868 in 1963, and this includes \$211 earned during an average of 17 days of nonfarm work. In 1961, in households with three or more farm wage workers, the total year's farm and non-farm earnings of these family members together averaged only \$1,432. This is less than half of the \$3,000 income level below which families are considered to be living in poverty.

The two top classes of farms (class I equals \$40,000-plus and class II equals \$20,000 to \$39,999, total value of farm products sold commercially) include only 9 percent of all farms, but they produce 50 percent of all farm output. These two top classes of farms pay out more than 70 percent of the total annual farm wage bill. In fact, class I farms alone pay out more than half of the annual commercial farm wage bill. Very recent sample studies indicate that this concentration of agricultural production and hired labor on large farms has been increasing. Such cost increases, focused primarily upon the largest agri-business enterprises who tend to be the price leaders, would tend to create a more favorable competitive situation for family farm operators. The imputed wage for the family farm operator and his family would no longer be so drastically undermined by the tragic wages of workers on the largest farms. There were 2.6 million households in the United States that contained at least one person who did farmwork for wages in 1962. The total population of these households is 11.2 million persons. Forty percent of these households had an annual income of less than \$2,000 and 56 percent of such households had annual income below \$3,000.

Between 1950 and 1960 output per agricultural man-hour increased 69 percent compared with 23 percent in nonagricultural employment. From 1960 to 1964, the output per man-hour in agriculture increased 23 percent compared with 13 percent in non-agricultural industries. The labor of 1 farmworker supplied the farm products needs of 11 persons in 1940, 15 persons in 1950, 26 persons in 1960, and 33 persons in 1964. This has been accomplished through the use of improving farming techniques. Mechanical harvesting has made enormous strides and use of fertilizers and other chemical agents has grown rapidly. Despite this gain in productivity, wages of farmworkers have lagged far behind those of workers in non-agricultural industries. Not only have farm labor wages lagged behind those of other workers, but a widening of the gap between agricultural and nonagricultural wages has, in fact, occurred despite the fact that output per man-hour in agriculture was 2.7 times as great in 1964 as in 1947, while in non-agricultural industries it was 1.6 times as great.

The policy of the Fair Labor Standards Act is to provide a wage which will enable a worker to maintain a decent standard of living. If prices were to rise equally or faster than the rise in wages, the real earnings of workers would remain stable or decline. If the price of farm products were to rise more than wages as a result of the coverage of farmworkers, the intent of the legislation would be negated. Thus, the committee looked at the relation of the cost of field labor to the price of farm products to the consumer. The conclusion is clear. Field labor is a very small percentage of costs to the consumer. The cost of bringing seasonal agricultural wages up to the level of about \$1.25 an hour is approximately equal to 1 cent per unit for most vegetables and fruits—per pound or per dozen or per head or whatever the ordinary unit may be. If retail prices go up more than that and if the increase is blamed on rising labor costs in the field, the American housewife should demand a complete and immediate congressional inquiry.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO OPPOSES RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN THE SOVIET UNION

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing in the new Congress the resolution which I proposed last year to express the intent of Congress in support of freedom of religion for all people and particularly calling upon the Soviet Union to fully permit the free exercise of religion by Jews and all others within its borders.

The compelling need for introduction and enactment of this resolution is obvious. We need only to review the many harassments of the Jewish people which have occurred, the impediments that have been placed in the way of their religious observances, the opposition to the religious education of their children, and the restrictions which have been placed on the training of candidates for the rabbinate, to become aware of the oppressive religious persecution which exists in the Soviet Union.

The closing of places of worship, the

prevention of religious education of children, and the severe restrictions on activities of rabbis and clergymen, together constitute a serious impairment of religious freedom which has always been regarded as a natural and inalienable right of man. Denial of freedom to worship, wherever and whenever it occurs, is a crime against our common humanity and a violation of the noblest aspirations of the spirit of man.

Last year the House of Representatives passed legislation similar to my own bill and referred it to the other body. Unfortunately, the Congress adjourned before further action could be taken. It is my hope that this year prompt consideration can be given to my resolution in order that its early enactment may be insured.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join together in their support of this resolution in order that we may reaffirm to the Soviets and to all nations our belief that mankind the world over has the inherent and inalienable right to be free from oppression and religious persecution.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON OUR ENVIRONMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in today's special message on our environment, the President spoke of new steps to explore the oceans and develop their resources. I commend the President for his emphasis on the oceans, and I look forward to receiving his further recommendations for new directions in our marine sciences activities. For 7 years, the Congress wrestled with the problems of intensifying our oceanographic activities in harmony with our national goals and of mobilizing the efforts of some 11 Federal agencies with different but related missions in the seas.

Last year the Congress and the President agreed on a new statutory base of policy and purpose, on ways and means to develop a comprehensive and cohesive program of marine sciences. Of special importance was the establishment of a Cabinet-level Council to advise and assist the President in translating the many recommendations of the past for strengthening our ocean activities into action programs. Having introduced the original bill in 1960 to establish such a body, I am particularly pleased with the initiatives of the President and Vice President in imparting momentum and unity to our programs.

Our efforts in the oceans have unusual promise for international cooperation—cooperation that contributes to world order, to economic growth here and abroad, and to social benefit. We are well on our way to exploring space and the stars, and we have established an international framework for promoting the peaceful and cooperative exploration

of space. Now as we unravel the secrets of the ocean depths, I am pleased to see that the President is taking the lead in similarly developing an international framework for promoting cooperation in the seas.

SUPREME COURT NULLIFIES LOYALTY OATH

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court, like the Communist Party, is increasingly involving itself in the use of subtleties to prepare the unsuspecting citizen for the coup de grace. It would appear that on some occasions the High Court and the Communist Party are running a parallel course toward the eventual death of this Nation by a slow and deliberate process. Only Monday of last week a decisive boost along this fatal path was made possible by the Court in a 5-to-4 decision nullifying State laws designed to curtail subversives in the teaching profession.

The irony of the Court's decision is that it failed to go all the way in voiding individual State loyalty oaths and procedures. This is comparable to the avowed current American Communist Party line; that is, to make a foothold through gradual infiltration. Neither the Court's decision regarding loyalty oaths nor the Communist Party's infiltration is overt, but this bathos is more dangerous to our security than a full-scale revolution, because it goes on without a great deal of fanfare.

As incredible as it may seem the Court based its decision this week on the great misnomer, "academic freedom."

Mr. Speaker, I would ask just whose academic freedom the Court is speaking of? The Communist Party recognizes no such theoretical concept as "academic freedom." Communist dogma, by its very nature, is opposed to academic freedom. Such a term in Communist states has been relegated to oblivion, along with such concepts as freedom of belief and freedom of the press. Of course, the Court has to write a majority opinion, but it does seem that some reason other than "academic freedom" should have been used. The Court, in striking down these loyalty oaths on the basis of academic freedom, is sowing the seeds for the eventual destruction of all freedom, including that of academic freedom.

I do not profess to be a clairvoyant, but I do feel that unless the Warren Court is restricted in its legislative activity by judicial interpretation, this Nation will lose its ability to protect itself from internal subversion. After all, it was best expressed by a member of the Court himself, Justice Clark, who said in the minority opinion that:

The majority has by its broadside, swept away one of our most precious rights; namely, the right of self-preservation.

Mr. Speaker, only this past week the largest newspaper in South Carolina had

a very excellent editorial regarding the Supreme Court's decision. At this point I would like to include this editorial as a part of my remarks.

[From The State, Columbia, S.C., Jan. 25, 1967]

ACADEMIC LICENSE

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled (another 5-4 decision!) that New York state may not fire or refuse to hire public school teachers—or any other civil servants—solely because they are members of the Communist Party.

Thus, New York's entire teacher-loyalty program and the state's 1939 civil service law provision which made membership in the Communist Party sufficient grounds to fire or not to hire public employes goes out the window.

"Our nation is deeply committed to safeguarding academic freedom," said Justice William J. Brennan, Jr., for the majority. "That freedom is therefore a special concern of the First Amendment, which does not tolerate laws that cast a pall of orthodoxy over the classroom."

Evidently, Justice Brennan hasn't had much chance, lately, to read up on Communism, academic freedom, or the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Well-meaning liberals long have argued that Communists have an abstract right to teach, on the theory that patriotic American boys and girls will rise to refute untruths uttered in the classroom.

But Communist teachers rarely are professors of political science (as one might expect); more often, they are English instructors, teachers of physics, mathematics, and so on. They seldom shout or preach, but row with muffled oars. The eddies they stir are beneath the surface.

Because Communist professors work to destroy academic freedom for everyone else, they are not entitled to academic freedom's prerogatives. We are not morally obliged to tolerate those who would not tolerate us, if they had power. And if academic freedom becomes academic license, it cannot long endure.

Truly, we seem headed into an era of what William L. Roper has called judicial oligarchy. When one justice can cast a decisive vote that will change the law of the land, it is time to devise some tougher checks.

Now, more than ever, the suggestion made last year by Samuel L. Devine (R-Ohio) to the effect that whenever the court is called upon to rule on Constitutional questions, "it should be required that at least two-thirds, or six of the nine justices must agree," appears both reasonable and necessary.

We urge that the proposal be given serious and immediate consideration.

LIBERALIZED TAX TREATMENT FOR WATER AND AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reintroduce today a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to liberalize the tax treatment accorded facilities for water and air pollution abatement.

While there was not sufficient time for consideration of this legislation in the House Ways and Means Committee before adjournment last year, it did get rather significant bipartisan support

from 56 Senators and Representatives who introduced the same or similar bills.

Other bills similar in approach but slightly different in specific details were also introduced by other Members of the House and Senate during the 89th Congress.

Twenty Members of the House join me today in introducing this measure. They are ROGER H. ZION, of Indiana; J. IRVING WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, of Pennsylvania; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania; MARK ANDREWS, of North Dakota; WILLIAM A. STEIGER, of Wisconsin; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Michigan; THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, of New York; HASTINGS KEITH, of Massachusetts; DURWARD G. HALL, of Missouri; CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota; CHESTER L. MIZE, of Kansas; THOMAS J. MESKILL, of Connecticut; HENRY SMITH, of New York; CHARLES TEAGUE, of California; JACK McDONALD, of Michigan; JOHN BUCHANAN, of Alabama; EDWARD BIESTER, of Pennsylvania; ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio.

In addition, several other Members of the House have indicated to me their intention of introducing similar legislation, and a few have already thrown the same bill or similar bills in the hopper. I also understand the same bill is being introduced in the Senate.

My measure provides an incentive tax credit for the taxpayer who undertakes a construction program for air and water pollution treatment facilities in cooperating with the Federal and State Governments on pollution control programs.

The 20-percent incentive tax credit is applied to all costs of the facility—buildings, improvements, machinery, equipment, and includes total costs of land. Under this legislation the 7-percent investment tax credit, which was not suspended last year in the case of pollution control facilities, would not be allowed in respect to these facilities.

In addition, the taxpayer is permitted at his election to amortize these expenditures during the tax year or over the next 4 years after the year in which the expenditures were made.

For the taxpayer to qualify for the benefits of the incentive tax credit and the rapid tax amortization provisions of this proposal, he must obtain approval from the appropriate State agency that the facility is to be constructed in accordance with the State's program for abatement of air or water pollution.

The provisions of the legislation are relatively simple, but they are essential to accelerate pollution control construction on the part of business. Industry must have these incentives to undertake programs of the scope necessary to solve the Nation's pollution problems today.

The money expended by private enterprise for the construction of these costly facilities is an investment in nonproductive facilities, primarily in the public interest, requiring high, nonproductive operating costs which will be continuing charges against future earnings. The most efficient way to encourage this kind of investment is by means of tax credit, rather than Federal grant.

The necessary legislation to require pollution abatement facilities to meet

local, State, and Federal standards is already on the books, and many industries have indicated their eagerness to tackle this problem. A tax credit arrangement would enable them to do so promptly without having to wait for the availability of funds from Government grants. Such an arrangement would also eliminate costly administrative redtape, implicit in any Federal grant program.

Pollution of our air and water resources is continuing at an alarming rate. Through cooperation of Federal, State, and local government bodies with private business and industrial enterprises, air and water pollution control facilities can be constructed to prevent further pollution of these resources.

The President sent us a sobering message on this subject yesterday. In it, he proposed the tightening of punitive restrictions against those in private industry who offend the public by polluting the environment.

But we have had restrictive and punitive legislation on the books for some time, and progress has remained painfully slow. This is due to the fact that Government itself has been reluctant to put an industry out of business or force it into costly revisions of plant facilities which might raise prices of consumer goods even higher.

My bill provides the "carrot" to go with the "stick" already available to Government—the stick which the President hopes to make stronger.

My bill does not speak to municipal pollution and is not intended to; but it will encourage action to control industrial pollution. It provides for a partnership between Government and industry to resolve a problem which both Government and industry have let get out of hand in the past.

It is designed to encourage action in the field of pollution control, rather than more laws and more talk; for action is what the problem of air and water pollution in this country needs.

The Congress has already accepted the basic principle embodied in this bill. It did so during the last session when it allowed the 7-percent investment tax credit to continue for air and water pollution control facilities when the 7-percent tax credit was being suspended for all other kinds of manufacturing investments.

It is my hope that hearings can be held on this bill in the near future, and I urge my fellow colleagues to examine this bill carefully.

BILL BAGGS—PART VIII AND IX

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the final articles in the exclusive series written in North Vietnam by Bill Baggs, editor, Miami News. I have had the pleasure of inserting each

of the preceding articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In today's articles Mr. Baggs discusses first the relationship between the North Vietnam Government of Ho Chi Minh and the "portable" government of the Vietcong, in the south. Is there a formal relationship between these two organizations, or is it merely a variable factor of influence? The critical factor is—as Mr. Baggs defines it—would an agreement between the Ho government and the United States to initiate talks be equally binding on the Vietcong?

And finally, Mr. Baggs analyzes the false morale of the North Vietnam population, based on assumptions that the balance of world opinion rests with North Vietnam's position, and that the dissension in the United States is substantially greater than, in reality, it is.

In the following articles, as in each of the previous, Mr. Baggs exhibits his ability to extract salient factors concerning the war, and formerly unemphasized:

[From the Miami News, Jan. 25, 1967]

TWO FOES IN VIET—THE NORTH, THE CONG (By Bill Baggs)

HANOI.—There are two Vietnam "governments" shooting and shooting back at the Americans.

One is the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the country here in the North, whose leader is Ho Chi Minh.

The other, of course, is the National Liberation Front, whose soldiers, known as the Viet Cong, are in the steady and violent engagements in the fighting down South.

The Viet Cong is not a government recognized by the United States.

What very few persons know, for a certainty, is whether the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the government here in the North country, actually rules the rather portable government down South.

A visiting reporter is inclined to doubt that Hanoi governs the National Liberation Front, or the Viet Cong.

Surely, Ho Chi Minh, because of his immense prestige, and other leaders of the North have long influences with the National Liberation Front down South. Indeed, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, respected in American military circles as a most accomplished commander probably has as much to do with strategy of the troops in the South as anyone, and he is formerly of the government here in the North.

American charges that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, or the Ho government, are shipping men and supplies south to the Viet Cong, are dismissed here by the Asian equivalent of shrugging the shoulders.

The persons you converse with here are strong in expressing sympathy and admiration for the Vietnamese who are fighting the Americans and the Ky troops down South.

One minister of the government here told this reporter that the National Liberation Front, or Viet Cong, consulted the Ho government on important decisions. Otherwise, the sentiments you hear are that North Vietnam cannot make decisions for the South.

The difference could be critical. If, for instance, the United States and the Ho government decide to initiate peace talks one day, what about the Viet Cong . . . if it is independent? Indeed, if it is independent, the only solution might be the personal influence of Ho Chi Minh to urge the Viet Cong to end fighting.

Often, there is a peek visible to an American newspaperman suggesting a growing mood of independence in the National Liberation Front, or Viet Cong. Not long ago, the National Liberation Front suggested, in a paper here, that in time, after the war, the

National Liberation Front will establish a government in the South, and it will begin talks with the Ho government on reunification of the entire country. The National Liberation Front statement emphasized that reunification would take a long, long time.

Of course, the National Liberation Front statement is made on the presumption the National Liberation Front is going to win the war down South, and victory for either side down South, the Ky government or the Viet Cong, is not in the sight of this reporter based on the conversations and reports from both sides.

[From the Miami News, Jan. 26, 1967]

HOW THE NORTH VIETS VIEW UNITED STATES AND THE WAR (By Bill Baggs)

HANOI.—From Ho Chi Minh, in the worn elegance of the old governor's palace, to a shy farmer, standing on the edge of a rice field, a visiting American is told time and again that the world is on the side of North Vietnam in this war.

The opinion, obviously, nourishes the determination of these people.

Just as obviously, their hopes are raised by the belief that millions of Americans disagree with the presence of American troops in Vietnam, and that the ranks of the protesters grow all the while.

The belief is understandable. The few Americans who have visited Hanoi have been, almost without exception, persons in harsh disagreement with American policy in southeast Asia. And you gather, from conversations, that these Americans have indicated a mushrooming sentiment against the war back in the United States.

The people here are courteous but unconvinced when you suggest that such a sentiment has been exaggerated, and that while many Americans do protest the war, they are most frequently persons with not much influence to change American policy.

You do not find anywhere a lack of respect for America's economy and military competence. However, persons of rank in the Hanoi government, and military people, point out that America's great technology cannot be used with much efficiency in such a war as this.

The point is fairly clear. North Vietnam is not a country of cities. It is a country of more than 400 villages, and hamlets which "belong" to the villages. Most of the people do not live in the cities. In the air war over Europe during World War II, the German factories were rather easy to locate and bomb. Not so here. And a reporter acquires the conviction you could bomb out all the cities, and force a surrender, because these people do not depend very much on their cities.

Of the American bombing, there is no question that it has hurt North Vietnam, and you can easily believe the flow of materials to the south, to the Viet Cong, has been slowed. The roads have taken a beating, you can observe that, although the North Vietnamese are quick on repairs.

However, the bombings at the present level, damaging as they are, do not appear sufficient to encourage the leaders of the government to suggest peace talks. A great escalation of the bombings would be necessary to even raise such a prospect, and, as other observers have said, such a greater bombing program might bomb the U.S. into a war with China.

One of the questions which accompanies an American reporter to Hanoi is why haven't the North Viets accepted volunteers from other countries. The answer you get is prompt. They do not need volunteers yet. In conversation with a visitor from France, printed in a government paper here a couple of months ago, Ho Chi Minh said:

"Hundreds of thousands of volunteers from the socialist countries and other countries

have declared their readiness to fight the U.S. imperialists by our side. . . . When necessary we shall ask them."

Almost completely absent here is any sense of Chinese presence. The leaders do not mention China, or the Soviet Union, in talking . . . they mention "socialist countries" instead. In the art museum and in the historical museum, the exhibits and the lectures you hear are strongly laced with nationalism, and even a steady but gentle insistence that the culture of Vietnam is distinct and different from the culture of China, and has been for centuries. It seems fair to say that nationalism is the strongest political sentiment you find in North Viet Nam.

Indeed, for a country squatting in the enormous shadow of China, you are most surprised by such sights as you find in a bookstore. The pictures of Lenin are large, and so are the pictures of Ho Chi Minh. But the face of Mao Tse-tung is quite small. And the writings of Mao are not at all prominent in the bookstore.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION AGAINST CIVIL DISORDER

Mr. FASCELL. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to establish Federal penalties for traveling interstate or for using any facilities in interstate commerce with intent to incite people to riot, or with intent to commit any kind of violence or to damage property by arson or bombing in furtherance of violent civil disorder.

I introduced this legislation in the second session of the 89th Congress, on September 22, 1966. I spoke on the floor in justification of the bill at that time, and again before Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee on October 6.

Mr. Speaker, the need for Federal antiriot legislation is urgent. At no time in our history have the rights of person and property—the most essential of all civil rights—been so endangered by civil disorder as they are today. At no time in our history has civil violence reached such a degree as it has today.

The States and their subdivisions have primary responsibility for guarding persons and property by suppressing civil disorder. And in this connection I should like to point out that section 3 of the bill I am introducing provides that nothing in the act shall be interpreted by the courts as preempting the field of legislation to the exclusion of State laws against rioting and mob violence.

But several factors compel us to recognize the need for Federal antiriot legislation.

First, rioting mobs have comprised such great numbers of people, and have exercised such destructive force, that in city after city the police alone could not restore order, and the National Guard had to be called in.

Second, rioting has swept the entire country, from coast to coast. Let me cite some of our major cities that have been rocked by incredible violence—Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Cleve-

land, Dayton, New York, Philadelphia, Omaha, St. Louis, Atlanta.

Third, the weapons and tactics utilized by rioters in different cities have been markedly similar and suggest similarity in guerrilla training. Rioters have thrown the same kind of bombs—bottles filled with gasoline and fitted with a wick—in Los Angeles and Chicago and Atlanta, to name three cities far distant from each other. And snipers in different, riot-torn cities have hidden in buildings and shot at firemen trying to put out fires ignited by gasoline bombs.

These three factors—the proportions of violence, the nationwide extent of violence, and the similarity of weapons and tactics—give us reason to believe that there are leaders and agitators whose operations extend from State to State.

We know that there are leaders calling for racial unity as the basis for exercising racial power, and for the exercise of racial power as an alternative to seeking equality of opportunity in American society and as an alternative to preparing for new opportunities in our productive system.

And we should be well aware of the strong appeal to great numbers of people in our urban ghettos of racial unity for mass action to make government and society responsive to themselves.

This appeal is intensified when the individual feels that he can alienate moral responsibility to the mob for violent, mass action, and when he is relieved of fear of legal penalties by becoming part of the mob.

And the drawing power of the appeal to racial unity and violent, mass action must encourage agitators and demagogues who seek their own glory instead of the advancement of their race.

The antiriot legislation which I am introducing today will give the Federal Government authority to apprehend and prosecute those who move from State to State in order to foment civil violence. Effective guarantee of the rights of person and property requires nothing less today than the intervention of the United States.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House in the 90th Congress.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this request?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. This is the usual request that we get from the Committee on Ways and Means at the beginning of all sessions of the Congress.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. CURTIS. Let me reemphasize

what the majority leader has said. Indeed, this is so and perhaps this ought to be made a part of the permanent rules because it is done every year. And there is a reason for it. I might say that many times I have said that we ought not to sit while we have an important bill being considered and we have never had any problem in our committee and we do not sit at the request of Members who have to be on the floor. So I am in accord with this and would simply say that this is routine and it is a request from the Committee on Ways and Means as a full committee.

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

There was no objection.

CONTINUING JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 51, Rept. No. 3) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. CON. RES. 51

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by S. Con. Res. 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby continued through June 30, 1967.

Sec. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1967, through June 30, 1967, not to exceed \$60,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

TO CONDUCT A STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 53, Rept. No. 2) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 53

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1967, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of fifteen Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) the factors which have impeded or may impede the normal operations, growth, and development of small business; (2) the administration of Federal laws relating specifically to small business to determine whether such laws and their administration adequately serve the needs of small business; (3) whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business; and (4) to study and investigate problems of small business enterprises generally, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided, That the*

committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

SEC. 3. The committee may from time to time submit to the House such reports as it deems advisable and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed or adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as the committee deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 5. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking of evidence including sworn testimony.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754(b) of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 9]

Abbutt	Fuqua	Pike
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Quie
Ashmore	Gibbons	Rallsback
Ayres	Gurney	Resnick
Baring	Halleck	Rivers
Battin	Hansen, Wash.	Ronan
Bow	Harvey	Rostenkowski
Brademas	Hawkins	Rumsfeld
Bray	Henderson	Scheuer
Brinkley	Holland	Schneebell
Burton, Utah	Horton	Sisk
Cabell	Jacobs	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Jarman	Springer
Celler	Jones, N.C.	Steiger, Ariz.
Clancy	Kornegay	Talcott
Clark	Landrum	Taylor
Conyers	Lennon	Thompson, Ga.
Corman	Maillard	Thompson, N.J.
Derwinski	Martin	Tunney
Diggs	Mathias, Md.	Udall
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Vigorito
Donohue	Nix	Watkins
Eckhardt	O'Hara, Mich.	Whalen
Edwards, Calif.	O'Konski	Whalley
Esch	Ottinger	Whitener
Flood	Pepper	Willis
Fraser	Philbin	Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollecall 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

WHAT THE "NEW LEFT" DID TO ME

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from the current issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "What the 'New Left' Did to Me." The author of this article is Phillip Abbott Luce, a former leader of the most left of all the so-called "new left" organizations now operating in this country—the Progressive Labor Party, an ultraradical and revolutionary Communist organization which aligns itself with Peking.

The article carries an important message for all Americans, young and old. It is a warning and eye opener to the youth of our country, telling them bluntly, realistically, and dramatically what communism really stands for, its role in the "new left" and how involvement with it leads to "wasted years" in their lives.

It also makes it clear to us of the older generation that by no means all of those in the "new left" are Communists. Many are merely what Luce was when he started out—youth in rebellion against authority. We will not effectively handle the problem they create by erroneously branding them all as "Reds," but only by taking steps to cure the evil which, Luce believes, goes to the root of their problem—their ignorance of communism. He himself finds it incredible that he was able to acquire a graduate degree in political science without ever having been encouraged to read any of the outstanding books on communism that have been published in the last few decades.

Many Members will recall that 3 years ago this young man was a hostile witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities. They will also recall that last summer he again appeared before the committee in a completely different role to give the Congress and the American people the benefit of the knowledge about the aims of revolutionary Communist groups in the United States which he had obtained from firsthand experience.

The committee has since placed this young man under contract to write a study of ultrarevolutionary Communist organizations. Questions have been raised about its doing so simply because Luce has been a witness before the committee. Based on the excellence of his Reader's Digest article and the general quality of the studies released by the committee over the years, I want to take this opportunity to express the view that the committee made a wise move in employing Luce for the project and that his study, when it is released, will be of great benefit to Congress and the country.

The Reader's Digest article follows:

WHAT THE "NEW LEFT" DID TO ME

(An angry young man discloses the full cycle of his thinking—from rebellion against all authority, to communist "activism," to disillusionment with communist demands, to defection. And he sees a way to avoid such "wasted years".)

(By Phillip Abbott Luce)

A Communist must be prepared to act upon command. Once he begins to develop scruples, he's on his way out. How and when the break comes depends on the man and the circumstances.

I began dabbling in "revolution" in 1958, when I was 20. I became a free-wheeling "activist" of the New Left in 1960 and a secret member of the Chinese-oriented Progressive Labor Party in 1963. By the winter of 1964 I was trusted enough to be selected to join a special group to go underground.

The plan was discussed for weeks in quiet restaurants and coffee-houses in New York City. We would be trained in the techniques of disguise, forgery, wiretapping, karate, evasion of surveillance. Later, this education would be rounded out abroad, in Cuba or China. Then we would change our names and trades, drop all open contacts with communists and blend into the submerged world of secret operatives.

As a start, I was instructed to give up my friends, my relatives, my girl, my job, my apartment. Since I was at the time awaiting trial under federal indictments for my connection with trips to Cuba, I would become a fugitive from justice. There would be no turning back.

I chose not to go underground. A few months later, I decided to break away. It was not a sudden thing. The underground project was only the climax. For months I had been worried by scruples, but I was kept too busy with meetings, picketings, sit-ins and editorial writing to think things through. Now I was forced to reappraise communism and my own relationship to it—not the abstract ideas, but the grim facts.

I defected because, when the chips were down, I couldn't accept total obedience. Sucked into the movement by hunger for absolute freedom and rebellion against all authority, I finally recognized that there were no margins for personal freedom among hard-core communist revolutionary organizations.

I defected because I saw young people being deceived and possibly destroyed by lies which we, as leaders, were telling them; by actions in which they were just expendable pawns. Some were my friends, drawn into the movement in part by my example.

I defected not because I was reconciled to the injustices of American society as I saw them, but because I realized that communism would bring more and infinitely worse injustice.

The Inner Frustrations. My story is not unique. Thousands of young people through nearly half a century have believed that revolutionary radicalism held the answers to their own grievances and the world's problems. Few joined the movement for bad reasons. Mostly we were naive, romantic, misinformed—above all, angry and impatient.

I was born in Ohio of middle-class, Republican parents. I graduated from Mississippi State University in 1958, then earned a master's degree in political science from Ohio State University in 1960. By the time I got to Ohio State, I had begun to flirt with communism. My inner frustrations led me to the illogical conclusion that only the overthrow of the whole political and economic structure of the country could cure its ills.

These inner frustrations are difficult to explain, being more emotional than reasoned. I was in rebellion against parents, school, society—any authority. I wanted things changed and changed now. The normal

democratic tempos seemed to me too slow, the "establishment" too entrenched to yield to anything but violent pressures.

My rebellion was fed by the reading of communist hate propaganda and sustained by the itch to "do something." The civil-rights struggle seemed made-to-order for my mood—not only a thrilling cause in itself, but an outlet for protest generally. I was expelled from the staff of the Mississippi State newspaper for my attacks on the state legislature and the White Citizens Councils. I found the experience of "struggle" with "reaction" intensely intoxicating. As a graduate student, I joined picket groups, sit-ins, boycotts. I was becoming an "activist," quite sure what I was *against*, but pretty hazy about what I was *for*.

Upon finishing at Ohio State, I went to New York. I wrote for the communist *Worker* under several pseudonyms, and I fellow-traveled with a variety of communist organizations, coming to know the whole spectrum of ultra-left groupings, some of them communist creations, some infiltrated, some independently radical. I was searching for a "home" in the frenzied world of revolution. It was not until the summer of 1963, however, that I became fully involved.

Action, Color, Power. By then the so-called New Left was in loud and violent eruption, an outgrowth of the stage of romantic anarchy called the Beat Generation. The movement was "new"—or so we told ourselves—because it rejected the conventional Marxist jargon and working-class mystique. We had only contempt for the Old Left, with its patience and restraints. We relished stirring up trouble for trouble's sake. We were for police bating, riots, undergrounds. *Ours was an attitude rather than an ideology.*

Ironically, today only a few New Left groups remain financially and ideologically out of communist clutches. Some of these, such as the Students for a Democratic Society and Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), are being rapidly penetrated.

Consider the noise it makes, the New Left is surprisingly small—perhaps 5000, with another 5000 at the fringes. Most are social anarchists, with no more than 2000 communists of all stripe in their midst. These self-willed utopians and most other Americans find it virtually impossible to believe that a tiny handful of communist professionals, using glittering slogans like "peace," "freedom now," "equal rights," or "academic freedom," can manipulate thousands of innocent young rebels into violent street demonstrations and explosive confrontations with police. On the surface, it is incredible. But having studied the arts of mass manipulation and hate propaganda, and having practiced them myself, I know the power of a few expert hidden persuaders.

In the late spring of 1963, I was approached by a leader of the Maoist Progressive Labor Party to join an expedition to Cuba. No one can overstate the influence of Red Cuba upon immature, alienated minds. Fidel Castro and Che Guevara were to us what Lenin and Trotsky had been to others in their time. Here was action, color, our own kind in power—and all of it only 90 miles from the mighty Yankees. Here was David defying Goliath. I jumped at the chance to go. The fact that it might be in violation of federal law added spice to the adventure.

When I returned, I plunged into Progressive Labor activities. I helped organize, in 1964, a second trip to Cuba. I was arrested while trying to kindle a riot in Times Square—forcing a "confrontation with the cops," we called it grandly. I helped secrete guns in New York City for future "self-defense." I drafted the original declaration calling on young men to refuse to fight in Vietnam, took part in a violent fracas before the House Committee on Un-American Ac-

tivities, marched and sat and shouted slogans as directed.

"True Truth." It was a frenetic life I led, as thoroughly "involved" as any of the communist string-pullers could wish. The change in me was evidenced in a new willingness to lie and deceive others in pursuit of our goals. Looking back, I recognize how utterly self-righteous and intolerant we were, not only of the "enemy"—meaning everyone from conservatives to "bourgeois radicals"—but of all other elements in the New Left. *It was the totalitarian mentality in action.* We were toddling totalitarians, and uncarded communists demanding instant idealism and "Millennium Now!" We alone had the "true truth" from which dissent was heresy.

By August 1964 I had begun editing the magazine *Progressive Labor*, but without being "identified." This deception was based on the hope that a secret party member would be more successful in recruiting. Not until December, only three months before I defected, was my name listed as editor.

Meanwhile, the riots broke out in New York's Harlem. We were not the immediate spark, but we did everything possible to provoke them and to harvest the credit. For weeks we had been preparing the requisite explosive climate, calling for a "long, hot summer" in Harlem.

One hour before the rioting actually began, Bill Epton, a vice-chairman of Progressive Labor, told a street rally: "In the process of smashing this state, we're going to have to kill a lot of cops, a lot of these judges, and we'll have to go up against their army. We'll organize our own militia and our own army." (Epton was in due time arrested and convicted of criminal anarchy.)

The 25-year-old editor of our party's newspaper, *Challenge*, proclaimed: "I advocate precisely that the people disturb the peace. There is no lawful government in this country today. Only a revolution will establish one." We prepared the infamous posters, "Wanted for Murder—Gilligan the Cop," which helped to spark the mobs.

By dint of sheer activity I was becoming more and more entrapped within the narrow communist world. If you are a good communist, your time—including evenings and weekends—is not your own. You sell party literature, do volunteer mailings and office work, paint signs, picket, demonstrate, attend endless meetings.

Yet some part of my mind was uneasy, questioning. The caches of arms left a bitter taste. It bothered me to see our individual members time and again become patsies in plans and plots outside their knowledge or consent, so that they often were jailed or injured for reasons beyond their control.

The Break. Finally, all my doubts and grievances seemed to crystallize when the scheme for going underground was sprung on us. Making the conscious decision to join the communists had taken a certain kind of guts. Now, defection proved even more difficult. The temptation is to sink away in silence; if you decide to break away publicly and try to save others from the morass, you have to be prepared for slander, harassment, even physical attack.

I chose the latter alternative. Then I walked into the FBI office in New York to clinch it. At this, the wrath of my former "comrades" knew no bounds. They accused me of every crime in the book, contended that I was always a "police agent." I was in the outside world but not yet part of it. It took some time before I discovered not only that I was indeed free but that others had gone through the same ordeal of disenchantment and that, like them, I could ultimately readjust myself to a rational society.

The Wasted Years. I've thought a lot about my involvement, and its meaning. It is not enough to condemn impatient, rebellious youth as communists or dupes. The

public must distinguish between young communists and young rebels. Youth has always been rebellious. The problem is to understand and channel their zeal for a more just world, and to keep them out of the clutches of communists and other messianic extremists.

I think often that I might have been spared the wasted years if my schooling had included the study of communism—not as a beguiling doctrine through its sacred texts, but as living history on view in Soviet Russia and Red China and in the story of its many mass deceptions and manipulations in the Free World. It seems incredible that I could have acquired a graduate degree in political science without having been encouraged to read *Witness* by Whittaker Chambers, *The God That Failed* by Arthur Koestler and others, *Child of the Revolution* by Wolfgang Leonhard, *The Red Decade* by Eugene Lyons. There is a rich literature on communism. Surely our colleges have an obligation to use it effectively.

Most of the young rebels in and around the New Left are not, in their hearts, communists. In most cases, their actions are more dangerous to themselves than to the country. But we must win them over to the side of democracy before they get themselves and others into serious trouble.

FOR VALIANT AND NEEDED SERVICE

Mr. SIKES. 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed by the Secretary of Defense that six Air National Guard units and eight Air Force Reserve units be deactivated by the end of fiscal year 1967. All of these units are actively engaged in the support of the Vietnamese war. Needless to say, that war is not over, nor is there any indication that it will be over at the end of fiscal year 1967. This is not the time to reduce our air lift capability and to dismiss highly trained pilots and crews. America has farflung involvements which require their support.

It is significant that the eight Air Force Reserve units each have 16 C-119 aircraft. The Air National Guard groups each have eight C-121 or C-97 aircraft. Approximately 100 officers and 600 enlisted personnel are assigned to each group. The Air Force Reserve groups to be affected comprise 20 percent of the Air Force Reserve airlift forces. The Air National Guard groups which are included in the deactivation list have almost 25 percent of the current Air National Guard force. These are major forces indeed.

A recent statement by the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, says:

I am greatly concerned about the planned phase-out of an extremely valuable military capability at a time when we are engaged in a war in Southeast Asia. The report of the Special Subcommittee on Military Airlift took note of the significant contribution to our Defense Posture which has been and is still being made by the airlift

units of the Guard and Reserve through their augmentation of the Military Airlift Command. It states, "In view of present world tension, the military and political crisis in Southeast Asia, and increasing requirements for airlift, plans to deactivate Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve units should be deferred until the Southeast Asia conflict is successfully resolved and until a thorough study of tactical airlift requirements for limited war is completed and approved by the Air Force and the Department of Defense." To my knowledge, such a study has not been completed within the Air Force or within the Department of Defense. In view of the lack of a detailed study to support the deactivation, I am at a loss to understand the reasoning of the Secretary of Defense in the action he proposes.

I think it highly important that we carefully consider the actual workload carried by these units which the Department of Defense now wishes to deactivate.

The six Air National Guard units scheduled for inactivation accomplished during calendar year 1966, 616 productive overseas missions for the Military Airlift Command. Included were 202 missions flown in direct support of southeast Asia. Flying hours generated totaled over 28,000 hours in providing this support. The payload accomplishments reflected over 5,800 tons of cargo moved and more than 6,600 passengers transported. Ton-miles flown was an impressive 25 million.

The eight Air Force Reserve units scheduled for inactivation performed, during calendar year 1966, over 4,900 productive missions, generating some 17,900 flying hours. The payload accomplishments totaled over 4,100 tons of cargo hauled and more than 23,800 passengers transported. Miles flown amounted to over 3,300,000. In addition, these units airdropped over 87 tons of equipment and 53,183 airborne troops in support of field exercises.

It is most important to remember that we have in these units over 9,800 highly skilled and motivated personnel whose collective experience represents a national asset that would take years to replace and cost millions of dollars. This is a personnel asset which when properly equipped will equal any productivity standards in the Air Force under wartime conditions.

It would be most unfortunate if these units were deactivated; yet let me remind my colleagues that if they are to be retained in service, immediate steps are required. It should be noted that they are scheduled for inactivation by the end of fiscal year 1967, which is June 30. Simply to provide for the continuation of these units in fiscal year 1968, would be to lock the barn after the horse has been stolen. Action must be taken now to express the will of the Congress that these units be continued in full force throughout the remainder of fiscal year 1967 and continued in fiscal year 1968. Last year the proposal was made that three Air National Guard units be dropped. The Congress interceded to assure that existing resources were maintained through fiscal year 1967 by retention of these three organizations. This has proven to be a wise step.

I submit that the determination of the national defense posture is the preroga-

tive of Congress and that our Reserve Forces are considered in our total requirements. Further, that this determination is not based upon any element of productivity of our Reserve Forces during peacetime although this is an important byproduct. Our investment in training and equipment must preclude any reduction in our total force requirements. The Congress should not willingly permit any action to depreciate our national defense posture. In view of our ever-expanding worldwide commitments I strongly urge that Congress act immediately to insure the longevity of our Reserve Forces posture.

Units affected and their home stations are:

Air National Guard units: 195th Airlift Group, Van Nuys, Calif.; 171st Airlift Group, Pittsburgh, Pa.; 105th Airlift Group, White Plains, N.Y.; 16th Airlift Group, Olmstead, Pa.; 109th Airlift Group, Schenectady, N.Y.; 167th Airlift Group, Martinsburg, W. Va.

Air Force Reserve units: 403d Wing, Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich.; 927th Group, Selfridge Air Force Base, Mich.; 434th Wing, Bakalar Air Force Base, Ind.; 930th Group, Bakalar Air Force Base, Ind.; 931st Group, Bakalar Air Force Base, Ind.; 446th Wing, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex.; 924th Group, Ellington Air Force Base, Tex.; 910th Group, Youngstown MAP, Ohio; 906th Group, Clinton City Air Force Base, Ohio; 944th Group, March Air Force Base, Calif.

EDGAR G. CROSSMAN

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday New York City lost a prominent attorney, Edgar G. Crossman, who was a senior partner in Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Kiendl, one of our city's leading law firms.

A veteran of both World War I and World War II, Edgar G. Crossman had also served as legal adviser to Henry L. Stimson when he was Governor General of the Philippines. During World War II he served as a colonel on the staff of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. He received the Legion of Merit and the Philippine Distinguished Service Star.

In 1947, President Truman appointed him as Minister to the Philippines and U.S. Chairman of the Joint American-Philippines Finance Commission.

Mr. Crossman was active in civic affairs in New York City and had served as a member of the executive committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the passing of this distinguished citizen and extend my deepest sympathy to his family. It has been my privilege to be a neighbor of his son, Patrick, who is a distinguished attorney and community leader in his own right.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the obituary which appeared in the New York Times on January 30:

EDGAR CROSSMAN, A LAWYER, WAS 71—DAVIS POLK PARTNER DIES—SERVED U.S. IN PHILIPPINES

Edgar Crossman, a senior partner in Davis Polk Wardwell Sunderland & Kiendl, lawyers at 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, died Saturday in St. Luke's Hospital. He was 71 years old and lived at 1088 Park Avenue.

Mr. Crossman, a veteran of both World Wars, also served the Government twice as a civilian in the Philippines.

He was born in Lisbon, N.H., attended the Phillips Academy in Andover, Mass., and was graduated from Yale College in 1917 and from the Harvard Law School in 1922.

He joined the law firm in 1925 and became a partner in 1934, specializing in corporate financing and reorganization and railroad law.

After the outbreak of World War I, he entered the Army and became a lieutenant and later a captain and battery commander in the Fourth Field Artillery.

In World War II, he was commissioned a lieutenant colonel in 1944 and later served as a colonel on the staff of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

During the war, he held military government assignments in Australia, New Guinea and the Philippines. He was at the landing at Leyte and did civil-affairs work in the liberation of the Philippines. He received the Legion of Merit and the Philippine Distinguished Service Star.

REPRESENTED TRUMAN

Mr. Crossman's first experience in the Philippines was in 1928-29, when he served as legal adviser to Henry L. Stimson, Governor General of the Philippines, in whose office Mr. Crossman had his first law training.

In 1947, he went back to Manila as personal representative for President Harry S. Truman, with the rank of minister and as American chairman of the Joint American-Philippines Finance Commission.

Mr. Crossman had represented the Guaranty Trust Company of New York and bondholders committees of the Paramount Public Corporation and the United Cigar Stores Company of America.

He had served as chairman of the membership committee and as a member of the executive committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. He had also been president of the board of trustees of St. Bernard's School.

His clubs included the Century, Knickerbocker, Yale and Anglers in New York.

Surviving are his widow, the former Helen Farrell; three sons, Edgar, Patrick and John, and nine grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Wednesday at 10 A.M. in the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, at 73d Street. Burial will be in Arlington Cemetery.

SOME SOUND COMMENTS ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY BY THE NEW CHANCELLOR OF EISENHOWER COLLEGE, DR. EARL J. McGRATH

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I know we are all concerned with education, and with the desirability of making

a good education available to all of our children capable of absorbing it—higher education as well as elementary and secondary education.

In that connection I believe Members may be interested in reading a thoughtful book review which appeared in the Saturday Review for December 17, 1966. It is a review of a new book by a recognized educational expert, Dr. Earl J. McGrath, former U.S. Commissioner of Education and now chancellor of the new Eisenhower College which is emerging in my district of upstate New York at Seneca Falls.

Dr. McGrath's book deals primarily with a subject which I am sure has been of concern to all of us; namely, the tendency for college education to be limited to a comparatively few young men and women and denied, for academic no less than financial reasons, to thousands of others who could well profit from it. He is disturbed about what he feels may be a trend toward an "elitocracy" in America, and his views along these lines have had an important bearing on the operating philosophy of Eisenhower College.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose the article from the Saturday Review:

THE EDITOR'S BOOKSHELF
(By Paul Woodring)

"*The Liberal Arts College and the Emergent Caste System*," by Earl J. McGrath (Institute for Higher Education, Teachers College Press, Columbia University), is a reprint of three speeches delivered at Hendrix College. Mr. McGrath, who is chancellor of the new Eisenhower College, expresses alarm over a trend in higher education that should be of deep concern to all Americans and especially to the governing boards of colleges—the effort to strengthen a few prestigious institutions at the expense of all the others. McGrath observes that until recently, although our colleges educated many of the leaders of our society, they did not produce a dominant social class because educational quality was not highly concentrated. The nation's leaders emerged from a wide variety of institutions. Today, however, a few prestigious colleges and universities, aided and abetted by the federal government, are making a vigorous effort to monopolize the research grants and the funds for buildings and laboratory equipment and are then using these facilities to attract the best faculties and the most academically talented students.

And they are succeeding. The top ten institutions of higher learning (one-half of 1 per cent of the total number) are said to get nearly 40 per cent of the federal research and development funds while the top 100 get about 90 per cent of the available money. "The vast majority of institutions," says McGrath, "including even the old and reputable independent liberal arts colleges, receive only a trifling share of these grants. Yet this aid to institutions, and the fellowships and scholarships provided to students through government funds, come from taxes resting broadly on the people, and, if the general public knew the facts, they would doubtless consider it a matter of utmost national significance that many respectable colleges outside the gigantic centers of learning become more equitable beneficiaries of the grants-in-aid of the United States Government."

The concentration of both facilities and research talent in a few institutions is producing what McGrath calls "The Rising Academic Elitocracy"—a social club made up of those who make high grades in school and

college and who score high on college entrance examinations. "Some of our élitists do not seem to realize," says McGrath, "that high grades at one level of education guarantee little other than high grades at succeeding levels. The fact is . . . that those who have made the most careful and objective investigations of the relationship between academic success and any other aspect of personal, professional, or social achievement find that test scores and grades at present bear little relation to any measures of adult accomplishment. Consequently, some informed and thoughtful observers are questioning whether a broader 'mix' of students in terms of ability, attitudes, values, and life goals might not be better than a more homogeneous academic community."

The big state universities and some of the stronger state colleges are answering the challenge by competing for federal research funds—with the result that they are sacrificing undergraduate liberal education to research in their expanding graduate schools. The real victims of the current trend are the 800 private or church-related liberal arts colleges which now enroll only about 800,000 of the 6,000,000 students now in college. These colleges cannot hope to flourish if all their best student and faculty talent is drained away into a few prestigious larger institutions. And status-seeking students seem unable to discriminate between the two kinds of institutional prestige. Many freshmen select an institution famous for the research scholars on its graduate faculty and then complain about the faculty's indifference to undergraduate teaching.

McGrath believes that the best chance for survival of the smaller independent and church-related colleges lies in doing what they can do best: providing a common core of intellectual experiences. "But, if they attempt to substitute advanced specialized instruction for genuine liberal learning, they will not only fail in the consequent competition with the universities, but they will fail in their performance of an indispensable public service. With proper planning they can offer liberal education at high levels of quality and at a cost their students can afford to pay." But he warns, "The bloated college curriculum is, I believe, the major impediment to increased effectiveness of most American colleges. One need not deprecate the hundreds of specialized courses of professional or graduate schools to point out that the liberal arts college ought not to offer such instruction. Able undergraduates who have had sound teaching in a selected but limited number of courses in their major fields rarely encounter academic difficulties in their advanced education, and if they do not have the ability and the desire to learn, no amount of premature and specialized forced feeding will give them any lasting advantage over their classmates who seize the opportunity to get a broader liberal education."

Although he fears a decline in quality in the independent colleges, McGrath does not predict that such institutions will disappear from the academic scene. "Contrary to the prophets of doom," he says, "most independent colleges are not about to sink into oblivion or disesteem . . . the liberal arts colleges are neither dead nor dying." It seems clear, however, that if small private colleges are to compete with other institutions for faculty members—as they must because all professors come from the same graduate schools—it will be necessary for them to raise faculty salaries substantially.

Where the money will come from is not at all clear. Perhaps if all congressmen will read McGrath's book, the federal government will decide that good undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts college is no less important than research in the graduate school and is, indeed, an essential prelude to it. But if the decline of the small independent

colleges is to be stopped the decision must be made soon.

JOHN E. FOGARTY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my shock and sorrow at the sudden and untimely passing of our colleague and friend John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

John Fogarty was one of the giants of this House, yet he was always a modest, friendly, kindly, and unassuming man. In his quiet but very effective way he helped to build a pattern of legislation in the field of health that cannot be matched in any other period of our history.

His friends and his family can be proud of the fantastic legislative achievements which he brought about. Children not yet born will owe John Fogarty more than they will ever realize. No man could have done more in his term of service in this House.

We salute him as a legislative leader. We shall long mourn him as a friend and companion.

CONTINUING THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, and concur in the resolution.

S. CON. RES. 2

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, established by Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, Eighty-ninth Congress, agreed to March 11, 1965, is hereby continued through June 30, 1967.

Sec. 2. The joint committee is hereby authorized to make expenditures from February 1, 1967, through June 30, 1967, not to exceed \$60,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was going to reserve the right to object, and I shall not object, for that very purpose. I was going to reserve the right to object, I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, to propound some questions mainly for the purpose of making legislative history. Permit me to do that if I may, and then to ask some questions.

Mr. Speaker, to lay a foundation for the questions I wish to propound to the gentleman from Indiana, I insert at this point in the RECORD the chronological history of House consideration of S. 2177

in the 79th Congress, the bill which eventually became the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946:

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF HOUSE CONSIDERATION OF S. 2177 IN THE 79TH CONGRESS

June 10, 1946: Senate passes S. 2177, with amendments.

June 11, 1946: House receives S. 2177, held on Speaker's table.

July 19, 1946: Committee print on agreed changes in Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, page 9496, Congressional Record.

July 20, 1946: House Rules Committee reports H. Res. 717 for consideration of S. 2177 (Report No. 2614).

July 22, 1946: Committee Print, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 Statement and Explanation of the House Substitute for S. 2177 (45 pp.).

July 25, 1946: House considers and passes S. 2177, with amendments.

July 26, 1946: Senate accepts House amendments.

August 2, 1946: President Truman signs S. 2177 into law (P. L. 601, 79th 2nd Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946).

Mr. Speaker, I have furnished a copy of this chronological summary to the gentleman from Indiana and desire to call his attention to the fact that the bill was messaged over to the House after passing the Senate on June 10, 1946; that upon its receipt by the House of Representatives, it was held on the Speaker's table and not referred to any standing committee of the House of Representatives. It is my further understanding that informal discussions were held between the House members of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and the leadership, as a result of which certain changes in the Senate bill were agreed upon. These changes were incorporated in a committee print, and this draft was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1946, on page 9496.

July 20, 1946, the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives reported House Resolution 717—Report No. 2614—which provided for taking S. 2177 from the Speaker's table, referring it to the Committee of the Whole, and making in order the offering of the so-called committee print, printed on page 9496 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the previous day, as a substitute, subject to debate and amendment as an original bill. The rule also provided 2 hours of general debate, with the time divided equally between the vice chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, Mr. MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and the ranking Republican House member of the joint committee, Mr. Michener, of Michigan. July 22, 1946, the committee print of the legislative reorganization bill and a statement of explanation of the House substitute for S. 2177 were available to Members and July 25, 1946, the House debated and amended S. 2177 in the Committee of the Whole and passed S. 2177 as amended. July 26, 1946, the Senate accepted the House amendments and August 2, 1946, President Truman signed S. 2177 which became Public Law 601 of the 79th Congress, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Fully realizing that the procedure for considering the Senate-passed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1967 cannot

be determined with finality at this time and, of course, that such procedure is within the discretion of the Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he has any knowledge of the probable procedure for considering any Senate-passed bill on legislative reorganization when it reaches the House of Representatives in this Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will state that the gentleman has correctly outlined the procedure of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress of 20 years ago.

It is my desire and my intention with the consent of the Members of the Congress to ask that the same procedure be followed as was followed 20 years ago when the bill was passed by the Senate, to be referred by the Speaker to the Committee on Rules and that the Committee on Rules act upon it and then it will be considered on the floor of the House as an open rule and open to any amendment that the House may see fit to adopt.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. I want to assure the gentleman of my support and urge that the procedures as outlined here be followed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw any reservations that I might have had.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there were only 2 hours of general debate 20 years ago when the reorganization bill was considered, and I would hope that the rule when it is submitted to the House would provide for considerably more than 2 hours because of the scope of this omnibus bill.

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to the gentleman's request, as far as the gentleman now speaking is concerned, he will recommend to the Rules Committee that the time for debate be extended.

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

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

Mr. CURTIS. I would concur in that. I certainly feel that this is so. I would emphasize that the committee has been trying to make its recommendations available to Members of both the House and the Senate as it has gone along, and most of the material that will be up for debate should be within the knowledge of the membership at this time. But I certainly concur that possibly longer than 2 hours would be desirable, and that certainly if any Members felt that way, I would urge that we do provide more time to meet their requests.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree, in accordance with the request of the gentleman from Iowa, that the time should be extended.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is saying that the rule would be a completely open rule, and all provisions of the proposed legislation would be open to amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. That is my intention. Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. So that we can better understand with what we shall be

faced, I should like to ask a question of the gentleman from Indiana. Am I to understand that our concurrence in the resolution would embody an agreement which would allow or require the House of Representatives to consider the reorganization bill which is finally passed by the Senate, and that when that bill does come from the Senate to the House, it will go to the Rules Committee; that it will come from the Rules Committee under a completely open rule, and the gentleman will make every effort to see that an extended period of time over and above the 2 hours granted during the 1946 Reorganization Act debate will be provided under the rule for considering this legislation?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

There was no objection.

The resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) was laid on the table.

VIETNAM CONFLICT SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS ACT OF 1967—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 48)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On July 28, 1943, in a fireside chat on the progress of the war and plans for peace, President Franklin D. Roosevelt told the Nation:

The members of the armed forces have been compelled to make greater sacrifices than the rest of us . . . they are entitled to definite action to take care of their special problems.

America has taken that "definite action." It has responded to the needs of the men and women who have carried the banner of liberty in time of danger.

We have not forgotten the veterans of past wars. At Belleau Wood and Chateau Thierry, at Normandy and Midway and at Heartbreak Ridge, these brave men earned an honored place in history. Their sacrifices have brought greater justice and decency to the world.

Today, the members of our Armed Forces are again fighting and giving their lives in the defense of freedom. It is essential that we convey to them—and to all Americans—our full recognition and gratitude for their services in Vietnam and in other troubled areas of the world.

Never have we had more cause to be proud of our Armed Forces. When I visited Camranh Bay last October, I

could see that the morale of our men was high for they are determined to succeed. Gen. William Westmoreland, their commander, told me that our troops were the finest the United States had ever placed in the field. We must take "definite action" for them.

Many civilian employees of the Federal Government are also working in the villages of South Vietnam, providing the help that a young nation must have to grow and become strong. These employees are exposed to the hazards and dangers of a war which has no front-line. We must also extend special benefits to them.

I. SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

In the past 2 years, you in the Congress have enacted and I have signed a series of measures to help honor our commitment to Americans now serving or recently separated from the Armed Forces:

Two military pay raises since August 1965, an average increase of 13.6 percent.

A new cold war "GI bill" to speed the readjustment of returning servicemen through new education, training, medical and home loan benefits.

An increase in hostile fire pay.

A comprehensive "military medicare" program.

A \$10,000 servicemen's group life insurance program.

A 10-percent average increase in disability compensation and enlarged benefits for surviving children and dependent parents of those who died as a result of a service-connected injury.

We must now take additional steps to fulfill our obligations to those who have borne the cost of conflict in the cause of liberty.

I propose the Vietnam Conflict Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967. This important legislation has six major objectives:

First, to remove the inequities in the treatment of veterans of the present conflict in Vietnam.

Second, to enlarge the opportunities for educationally disadvantaged veterans.

Third, to expand educational allowances under the GI bill.

Fourth, to increase the amount of servicemen's group life insurance.

Fifth, to increase the pensions now received by 1.4 million disabled veterans, widows and dependents.

Sixth, to make certain that no veteran's pension will be reduced as a result of increases in Federal retirement benefits, such as social security.

EQUAL BENEFITS FOR VIETNAM VETERANS

Veterans of the Vietnam conflict should receive benefits comparable to those granted to their comrades of World War I, II, and Korea. Prior legislation has equalized many of the benefits. But, because of certain gaps in the law, today's veteran, his family and his children are ineligible for a number of benefits other war veterans receive.

It is only right that these loopholes be closed. It is a matter of simple fairness that the veteran of the Mekong Delta and Chu Lai be placed on a par with

the veteran of Pork Chop Hill and Iwo Jima. The Senate passed—and my administration supported—such a measure last year.

I recommend that the following benefits be extended to veterans who have served on or after August 5, 1964:

Disability compensation at full war-time rates for all veterans.

Disability pensions for veterans and death pensions for widows and children.

Special medical care benefits, including medicines and drugs for severely disabled veterans on the pension rolls.

One thousand six hundred dollars toward the purchase of an automobile by veterans with special disabilities.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE VETERAN

Since last June, when the new GI bill went into effect, more than 500,000 veterans have applied for education and training benefits. Thousands more are signing up each week. Today, over one-quarter of a million returning service men and women are preparing for the future and learning new skills in universities, colleges, and technical and vocational schools across the Nation. By the end of fiscal 1968, this number will increase to more than 500,000.

While the new GI bill is less than a year old—and an outstanding success—we can still work to extend and improve it.

Even today, some 20 percent of those separated from the Armed Forces each year—about 100,000 young men—have not completed high school. Many of these young veterans have the ability and desire to better themselves. All too often, they lack the financial means to complete their high school education and enter college.

As a nation, we cannot afford to neglect this valuable manpower resource.

The present GI bill makes no special provision for a returning serviceman who needs to finish high school or take a "refresher course" before he can enter college. In fact, it works in just the opposite way. For each month the veteran pursues a high school education under the GI bill, he loses a month of eligibility for college benefits under the law.

This situation must be changed. I recommend legislation to provide full GI bill payments to educationally disadvantaged veterans so that they can complete high school without losing their eligibility for follow-on college benefits.

We are taking a further step. In recent months, thousands of men who would have been rejected for military service because of insufficient educational achievement are being accepted. Forty thousand men will enter the service in the first year of this new program, and 100,000 each year thereafter. Its purpose is to provide the intensive training needed to make these young men good soldiers. Upon the completion of their military service, they will be better educated and equipped to play productive and useful roles as citizens.

I am directing the Secretary of Defense to find new ways to improve this program.

The time has also come to increase the educational assistance allowance under the GI bill. A single veteran pursuing a full-time course receives \$100 a month to help him finance his education. This amount is less than the \$130 a month paid to the child of a deceased or disabled veteran who may be taking the same courses at the same school.

The veteran going to school is usually older and many bear heavier responsibilities. I recommend an increase in the monthly educational assistance allowance under the GI bill from \$100 monthly to \$130 for a veteran.

In accord with the present scale of benefits, a married veteran with children receives \$150 monthly under the GI bill, regardless of the number of children he has. To help veterans with families who wish to continue a full-time educational program, I recommend that the monthly payment be increased by \$10 a month for the second child and \$10 a month for each additional child.

These increases in the educational assistance allowance will benefit the more than 250,000 veterans now enrolled in schools under the GI bill.

LIFE INSURANCE

There can never be adequate compensation for those who suffer the loss of a loved one on the field of battle. We can, however, help ease their financial burden in time of sorrow. Through a combination of social security, dependency and indemnity compensation, and other benefits they are being relieved of much of the economic hardship.

In addition, the 89th Congress enacted a group life insurance program for servicemen. Under this law, a member of the Armed Forces may purchase up to \$10,000 in life insurance. The Government pays a large part of the cost.

With the outstanding cooperation of the Nation's insurance firms, this program has worked smoothly and effectively.

We should now raise the limits of coverage. This will provide a further career incentive for the men and women of the Armed Forces as well as added protection for their loved ones.

I recommend an increase in the amount of available serviceman's group life insurance, from a maximum of \$10,000 to a minimum of \$12,000—with higher amounts scaled to the pay of the serviceman—up to a maximum of \$30,000.

This proposal would carry out a recommendation of the Cabinet Committee on Federal Retirement Systems. It is in line with the general principle that the amount of group life insurance should be geared to the amount of salary earned. It will provide a substantial amount of insurance for all members of the Armed Forces. And it will permit servicemen returning to civilian life to continue the insurance at prevailing commercial rates, without regard to their physical condition.

VETERANS OF PAST WARS

The legislation I have proposed above primarily reflects the public concern for the welfare of veterans of the Vietnam conflict. But this administration has not

forgotten the veterans, dependents, and survivors of earlier wars.

Today, there are about 94 million Americans who fall into this category—almost one out of every two persons in the Nation.

The last several years have witnessed dramatic improvements in the range and quality of services and benefits available to our veterans and their families.

I have asked for and Congress has approved veterans' appropriation increases of \$300 million each year for the past 3 years. Except for the 2 years immediately after World War II, my veterans budget for fiscal 1968 of \$6.7 billion is the highest in history.

Those programs for veterans and their families which have been expanded include a 10-percent increase in pensions; a 30-percent increase in subsistence allowance for veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation training.

We are also providing the best medical care a grateful and compassionate nation can offer.

Last year more than 740,000 sick and disabled veterans were patients at VA hospitals. Four new hospitals have been opened in the past 2 years. Five more are scheduled to be completed within the next 8 months. With the modernization of six additional hospitals, over 15,000 new beds will be added for disabled veterans during the coming year.

Special medical research is also being pursued in pioneering areas such as organ transplant, chronic lung disease and dramatically new methods of fitting artificial limbs. This year I have asked for over \$46 million to support this vital work.

Nor have we forgotten the veteran who because of disability and age may be in needy circumstances.

We are helping to meet their needs through wide-ranging improvements in the social security, senior citizens, education, health, and children's programs. I have already submitted a number of those recommendations to the 90th Congress. I will submit others shortly.

Although many of these new proposals will have an important relationship to programs for veterans and their survivors it is important that we do more.

To help meet today's cost of living, we should raise the standard of living for disabled veterans, and the widows and other dependents of deceased veterans receiving pensions.

I propose, effective July 1, 1967, a 5.4-percent increase in the pensions of 1.4 million veterans, widows and dependents.

Last week I proposed to Congress a 20-percent overall increase in social security payments—representing the greatest increase in benefits since the act was passed in 1935. Although these increases will benefit millions of older Americans, we must make certain they do not adversely affect the pensions paid to those veterans and dependents who are eligible for both benefits.

Accordingly, I propose that the Congress enact the necessary safeguards to assure that no veteran will have his pension reduced as a result of increases in Federal retirement benefits such as social security.

A COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF COMPENSATION, PENSION, AND OTHER VETERANS' BENEFITS

The proposals I have outlined will, I believe, strengthen our veterans' programs. But we must assure the continuing soundness of these programs.

I am directing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in consultation with leading veterans' groups, to conduct a comprehensive study of the pension, compensation and benefits system for veterans, their families and their survivors. I have asked them to recommend to me by January 1968 proposals to assure that our tax dollars are being utilized most wisely and that our Government is meeting fully its responsibilities to all those to whom we owe so much.

II. CIVILIANS SERVING IN VIETNAM

Among those engaged in the effort to preserve freedom in southeast Asia are civilian employees of agencies such as the Department of Defense, Department of State, Agency for International Development, and U.S. Information Agency.

There are no front lines in Vietnam. These employees are frequently exposed to hazardous conditions. They have suffered terrorist attacks in hamlets, villages, and even in the larger cities. Despite their status as civilians, many have been killed, seriously wounded, or reported missing.

The laws now governing Federal civilian employment in overseas areas have not kept pace with the times. Civilians who risk their lives in the service of their country are entitled to special benefits.

I recommend that the Congress enact legislation to—

Increase the salary differential for service at hazardous duty posts.

Allow medical benefits to continue beyond the date of his separation for an employee who has been injured, or became ill while serving in a hostile area.

Extend similar medical benefits to the employee's family after his separation or death.

Allow special travel expenses for employees after long service in hazardous areas, so they can be reunited with their families.

Authorize up to 1 year's absence without charge to leave as a result of injury or illness due to hostile action.

I have outlined a program shaped to meet the needs of America's servicemen and veterans.

No act of Government, and no legislative proposal can ever repay the Nation's debt to these brave men.

They are away from their families and loved ones, serving the cause of liberty. They serve us all silently and well. And this grateful Nation is in their hands. Whether in a patrol along the wall in Berlin, or walking the 38th parallel, or in the air on a SAC alert, or in a nuclear submarine beneath the seas, or on a sweep through a rice paddy in South Vietnam their mission is freedom and their cause is just.

The measures I propose in some small way serve notice to these Americans—in and out of uniform—that we will never let them down. The Congress, the executive branch, and the American people

have accepted that obligation of honor to those who have fought and continue to fight in the defense of freedom.

The Congress, I believe, will want to consider and promptly enact this legislation.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1967.

AMERICA'S SPACE AND AERONAUTICS PROGRAMS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 49)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

America's space and aeronautics programs made brilliant progress in 1966. We developed our equipment and refined our knowledge to bring travel and exploration beyond earth's atmosphere measurably closer. And we played a major part in preparing for the peaceful use of outer space.

In December the United Nations, following this country's lead, reached agreement on the Outer Space Treaty. At that time I said it had "historical significance for the new age of space exploration." It bars weapons of mass destruction from space. It restricts military activities on celestial bodies. It guarantees access to all areas by all nations.

Gemini manned missions were completed with a final record of constructive and dramatic achievement. Our astronauts spent more than 1,900 pilot hours in orbit. They performed pioneering rendezvous and docking experiments. They "walked" in space outside their vehicles for about 12 hours.

We orbited a total of 95 spacecraft around the earth and sent five others on escape flights, a record number of successful launches for the period. We launched weather satellites, communications satellites, and orbiting observatories. We performed solar experiments and took hundreds of pictures of the moon from lunar orbiters. Surveyor I landed gently on the moon and then returned over 11,000 pictures of its surroundings for scientific examination.

Major progress was made during the year on the Apollo-Saturn moon program and the manned orbiting laboratory.

These accomplishments—and the promise of more to come—are the fruits of the greatest concerted effort ever undertaken by any nation to advance human knowledge and activity. Space, so recently a mystery, now affects and benefits the lives of all Americans.

Our national investment in space has stimulated the invention and manufacture of a flood of new products. Our new knowledge has made us more secure as a nation and more effective as leaders in the search for peace. This knowledge is hastening the ultimate solution of social

and economic problems that combined to obstruct peace.

It is with pride and pleasure that I transmit this record of achievement to you the Members of Congress. Without your support, no achievement would be possible.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 31, 1967.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON VETERANS' BENEFITS

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

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message concerning veterans' benefits.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I met yesterday with President Johnson to discuss the President's proposals to Congress on veterans' matters. I have just concluded a meeting of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and on the basis of the response of its Members, I predict quick congressional approval of the President's proposals.

At the meeting Monday, the President expressed his strong feelings that those who are bearing the burden of battle in Vietnam, and those who have served this country in uniform, should receive fullest consideration of their Government. I could not agree with him more.

I take this time to commend the President. This is a very fine program. It is a program that I feel everybody on both sides of the floor can support. I believe this program will be referred to subcommittees soon. We expect to bring this legislation back to the floor quickly.

I believe this is the first time in the 20 years that I have been in Congress, and I believe the first time in history, that the President has sent a special message to Congress proposing extensive legislation on veterans' matters. The President's message embraces recommendations covering needed legislation in many areas. I commend him for this.

I think this emphasis by the President on this legislation reflects his great concern and compassion for the men carrying our burden in Vietnam. He has said in the past that we should do all possible to smooth the path of return to civilian life for our men serving there. He has already approved extensive veterans legislation in his administration—a GI bill, raises in compensation for disabled veterans, expansion of benefits for widows and orphans, and broad health benefits.

The President has proposed, in his

comprehensive Vietnam Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967, the following:

First. Removing the inequities in treatment of veterans of the present conflict in Vietnam, extending full wartime benefits to them.

Second. Enlarging the opportunities for educationally disadvantaged veterans of this conflict, and expanding educational allowances under the GI bill by increasing payments to veterans in school.

Third. A cost-of-living increase for aged veterans and their survivors who are receiving pensions, plus safeguards in the pension law to assure that no pensioner will receive less in combined Federal payments as a result of the social security increases.

Fourth. A study group to include leaders in the field of veterans activities, to conduct a comprehensive survey of the broad spectrum of veterans matters to make sure that those who most deserve them are beneficiaries of veterans programs, and to make sure our tax dollars spent in this field are utilized most effectively.

I want to say that I am in full agreement with these matters I have listed and which are being proposed by the President. I have scheduled immediate hearings on this legislation, and I think we are going to see all the major proposals in the President's recommendations approved by this committee and passed by this Congress.

I want to add that I am pleased, very pleased, with the President's position. I consider this action very timely, and very fair, and the benefits very deserved. We all know the continuing contributions to our society by veterans who are healthier, better educated, and who are better citizens as the result of earlier laws. The Veterans' Administration continues to provide deserving veterans the finest medical care in the world, and not so incidentally has been responsible for some of this country's most significant medical advances beneficial to all our citizens.

With the expansion of various benefits to Americans—social security, antipov-erty, education, and other programs—the veteran of this country who has served so faithfully should share in these benefits. I am particularly impressed by the President's evident compassion for the elderly veterans and widows, and his special concern to specifically propose the cost-of-living increase to those who need it so badly.

The veterans of this country can take great comfort in knowing that they have a real friend, a friend who understands their problems and needs, in President Johnson. I have been in this Congress for more than 20 years and never has there been as much sincere understanding, and as much concern for the veteran, as that shown in President Johnson's special message.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas that there are

certainly a great many worthwhile proposals here.

I must remark, however, that this certainly does represent a change in attitude on the part of the White House. Members will recall that most of the proposals contained in this message have been sought by Members of the Congress and of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in past years. A number of those proposals which we thought were necessary and not too costly, were looked upon with disfavor by the Bureau of the Budget.

For example, just last year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported and the House of Representatives passed H.R. 17488, a veterans pension bill designed to provide sorely needed increases in monthly payments for the Nation's aging veteran pensioner. The administration opposed this measure and the Senate failed to act upon it prior to adjournment. I am sure that had the administration supported this proposal last year, instead of waiting until the present time, needy veterans would now be enjoying this modest increase in monthly income.

Also, had the administration been willing to support a GI bill in the last Congress that truly reflected today's cost of living and the higher cost of tuition, the President's request today for an increase in the educational allowances authorized by the GI bill would have been unnecessary.

I believe a message of this sort is long past due as indicating a recognition on the part of the Executive that there are some changes necessary in veterans' laws. I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the White House will look with favor upon the proposals which we will bring out pursuant to this message today.

There is one matter which bothers me a little, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if any estimate of the costs involved in the proposals here have been transmitted to us?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes, there is an estimate of the major costs.

Probably the cost of the cost-of-living increase for pensions would be about \$100 million. The increase in the educational benefits under the GI bill would cost about \$75 million. And the equalization of benefits for men in Vietnam and our other wars would cost \$20 million to \$30 million.

Mr. ADAIR. So we are talking here of proposals in the range of \$200 million?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. I should like to ask the gentleman further, how much of that \$200 million was budgeted in the budget message which came up only a few days ago?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Unless I am mistaken the pension increase was not in the budget message.

Mr. ADAIR. So, as matters now stand, there is before us a group of proposals which may add as much as \$200 million to the budget which just came up.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would assume that the President will ask for a supplemental appropriation for the pension program.

In further answer to the gentleman from Indiana, all of us on the Veterans' Affairs Committee have for years felt that the Bureau of the Budget had too much influence on our veterans' programs. I met with the President yesterday, and I can say to the gentleman from Indiana that this, in my opinion, certainly shows a very commendable position, in the work and personal attention the President himself has given to this situation.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, this Hall has rung with the eloquence of hundreds of speeches proclaiming the patriotism and devotion of the men and women of this Nation who have put aside their civilian responsibilities to answer the call of their country to bear arms. There is no sacrifice that the members of our Armed Forces have not made in order that America could obtain its position as the greatest nation on earth. These men and women have asked nothing more in return than that their country be secure and that they be allowed to return to their homes, their families, and their jobs.

But a grateful nation has done more than to grant only this small request. For the people of this Nation have also asked that they be allowed to show their gratitude to their sons and daughters, husbands and wives who have protected and preserved freedom.

We of this 90th Congress have the opportunity again to express this Nation's gratitude by continuing to provide the benefits that a free and grateful people owe to its fighting men.

President Johnson has today proposed an encompassing piece of legislation—the Vietnam Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967. It is but a continuation of the firm belief of our country that to serve is deserving of recognition.

We have made some progress already in providing benefits to those men who are today protecting the free men of Vietnam from aggressors from the north—aggressors who would deprive an independent nation of its identity and enslave and murder the populace.

We have called upon the young men of America to bear arms—to lay down their lives if necessary, to thwart this enemy. For this is not the enemy of the South Vietnamese alone—it is the enemy of all free men. It is, indeed, our enemy—an encircling foe whose designs do not stop with Vietnam but view the whole world for conquest.

We remember the battles of World War I—and then the worldwide quest that ensued in World War II when Americans again bore the brunt of battle. The Korean conflict again called upon Americans to stand forth as champions of freedom—as champions of a cause that defeated aggression once more.

When these men returned to their homeland they found a grateful people, extending open arms, ready to proclaim

them not only victors but extending the bounty of this Nation.

We have only partially extended this same reception to our fighting men of today. Yet today, our fighting men have answered the same call to duty—they have risked their lives—and some have died, and still others will bear the scars of battle forever. We have an unfinished job—we must provide the means to a happy and fruitful life when they return from battle, just as we have in the past. We must provide for the widows and orphans of those men who are killed in battle—a battle which is no less yours and mine than any battle in which American fighting men have engaged.

The President has asked that we amend and extend our present laws in order that these men will be recognized as men sharing the same place in the hearts of their countrymen as all other veterans.

His recommendations in this legislation are fair, are just, are truly deserved, and certainly needed by those who will benefit therefrom. I do not believe we can hesitate to enact this legislation with haste. I urge speedy approval of this legislation.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE ON SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to my colleagues that I commend not only the President for this message but also our distinguished, able, and beloved chairman of our committee, who so persistently over the years not only has championed the cause of the veterans but also has advocated at the White House and on this floor some of the very measures the President has recommended to the Congress today.

I commend my distinguished chairman for his persistence and tenacity over the years in championing the cause of the veteran. I believe at this session of Congress a lot of his recommendations, which really have been embodied in the President's message today, will be enacted.

I commend my chairman and the committee and my distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR]. Our committee is a great, non-partisan committee. We have advocated this on both sides of the aisle in the committee for many years.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, several of the things which General Westmoreland and his staff and our men in Vietnam have recommended to our chairman and to some of the others of us who visited Vietnam last year—such as increased pay for men serving overseas, the GI bill, and so on—are measures which improve and help the morale of our fighting men all over the world. This Congress can stand up and be proud of what we are doing and what we have done for our servicemen deployed throughout the world.

I believe Congress will pass this pension bill so that it will become effective in July and provide for a 5.4-percent increase for 1.4 million veterans, widows, and dependents.

I believe that Congress will enact legislation which will prevent any veterans receiving a pension from having his pension reduced because of an increase in social security.

I believe the Veterans' Affairs Committee will soon act and Congress will pass legislation which will increase from \$100 to \$130 a month educational benefits for single veterans and also a similar increase for married veterans studying under the new GI bill of rights. This would benefit more than 250,000 veterans now enrolled under the GI educational program.

The Presidential message today urging the passage of this and other veterans' legislation will pave the way for final enactment this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see the President advocate legislation long proposed by our Veterans' Affairs Committee. This legislation, like the GI bill last year, will boost the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam and those standing guard on the ramparts of freedom throughout the world.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my support to the recommendation made by the President that the Congress enact the Vietnam Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967.

I would like to explain why I think such legislation is needed and urge quick passage of this most meritorious legislation.

It recognizes the achievements of our men fighting in the jungles of Vietnam.

It takes into account the need for remedial attention for veterans, dependents, and survivors of earlier wars.

It provides far-reaching benefits, programs, and services for veterans, even though budgets for veterans affairs have been the largest since the immediate post-World War II years of 1947 and 1948.

It expands the schooling opportunities for educationally disadvantaged veterans.

It fills the gaps in present measures for the Vietnam veterans.

The educational benefits provided in this Presidential recommendation will give strength to our democratic way of life. For an educated populace always makes for a stronger democracy than one which is uneducated.

Benefits that we may provide for our new veterans are really an investment in America. Expenditures for GI bill benefits should not be considered merely as an expenditure of Federal funds; instead, they should be seen in their true light—as an investment in human beings, our veterans—an investment that already has paid handsome dividends to all America.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased by the President's message recognizing the need for action on veterans pensions.

This action is certainly overdue, and there should be no further delay in legislation to correct the matter.

Our veterans and their widows and orphans should be the first to have adjustments in payments to recognize increases in the cost of living, and not among the last.

I congratulate the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, for his success in the fight to secure administration recognition of the need for action.

I congratulate the President on the message we have received to speed the day of action in the Congress.

Let us move quickly and generously to end the inequity now present.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, the call to duty has always been accepted by the highest quality of men this Nation could produce. Today, our finest young men have answered this call and are giving their full energy to winning a dirty and bloody war in Vietnam. These men are carrying on in the traditions set by our approximately 25 million other men who now carry the proud title of veteran. They are the finest—they are the best fighting men ever to bear arms in defense of freedom.

Therefore, it gives me great pleasure to add my name to the others of this body who endorse—without reservation—the proposals of President Johnson for the Vietnam Servicemen and Veterans Act of 1967.

It is also with pride that I notice that the provisions, those largely concerned with making the benefits available to the Vietnam veteran, have not forgotten the other veterans who have served this Nation in similar wars before.

We have made great strides in providing some of the benefits during the last session to these gallant young men; however, there is no question that there are still loopholes—and loopholes that will be filled by this new proposed legislation. The increase in educational benefits, the enlargement of opportunities for educationally disadvantaged veterans, plus putting our present servicemen in line for full compensation and pensions—definitely meet with my approval.

I urge the speedy passage of this group of legislation.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in commending the President for his message on behalf of America's servicemen and veterans.

It is my understanding that it is the first time—at least in recent history—that a Presidential message to Congress has concerned welfare legislation for servicemen and veterans.

The President, indeed, deserves praise for giving the interests of these groups such emphasis.

The proposals which he has recommended to the Congress deserve speedy consideration.

Among the proposals are many which deserve specific comment. Of those I shall single out only two:

First, the increase in the educational allowance is badly needed. A single veteran pursuing a full-time course of studies now receives \$100 per month to help him finance his education.

The President has requested that the amount be increased to \$130—a more realistic figure in these days of rising living costs.

Second, the President has suggested that legislation be enacted to provide full GI bill payments to educationally disadvantaged veterans so that they can complete high school without losing their eligibility for follow-on college benefits.

This, too, is a wise and practical improvement of the GI program. It will give a helping hand to those veterans with the maturity and energy to want to help themselves by getting an education.

In the process they will be helping our country by reducing the numbers of the potential unemployed and by contributing their skills to 20th century America.

Despite the many worthy recommendations in the President's message, Mr. Speaker, it contained one shortcoming.

No mention was made of correcting the serious inequity which exists with respect to training those young veterans who wish to engage in apprenticeship or on-the-job vocational training.

Although provisions were made for such training in the World War II and Korean war GI bills, they were omitted from the cold war GI bill passed in the 89th Congress.

As I said in a recent press statement, a Vietnam veteran who wants to be a welder or a sheet metal worker has just as much right to Federal training benefits as one who wants to be an accountant or an engineer.

Although the President's message makes no mention of restoring this form of training to the GI program, it is my hope that the very competent House Veterans' Affairs Committee, under the able leadership of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Chairman TEAGUE, will give full and favorable consideration to providing veterans' education benefits for apprenticeship training.

Pending before that committee at the present time, Mr. Speaker, is H.R. 2383, a bill which I introduced in order to give fair treatment to veterans who seek apprenticeship and on-the-job vocational training.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further with this proposal, I include at this point my recent press release on the bill, a fact sheet, and the text of the legislation:

ZABLOCKI SEEKS TO AID VIETNAM VETS WHO WISH VOCATIONAL TRAINING BY AMENDING "COLD WAR" GI BILL OF RIGHTS

A Vietnam veteran who wants to be a welder has just as much right to federal training aid as one who wants to be an accountant, Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (Dem., Wis.) firmly believes.

For that reason, Zablocki will introduce into the 90th Congress this week a bill providing benefits to returned veterans who participate in on-the-job or apprenticeship training programs.

His bill, the Veterans Apprenticeship Assistance Act, would amend the "Cold War" G.I. Bill of educational and other veterans' assistance passed early in the second session of the 89th Congress.

Unlike the World War II and Korean Conflict G.I. Bills, Zablocki pointed out, the "Cold War" G.I. Bill does not provide benefits to returned members of the armed forces who wish vocational rather than academic training. The deletion was caused by past abuses of that aspect of the program, he added.

"I am convinced that abuses can be kept to a minimum through legislative safeguards," Zablocki said. "More than that, I am convinced that our Nation must provide

equitable treatment to those who seek vocational training outside a college or university.

"In the world of tomorrow, we will have great need for these men and their skills."

The congressman noted that in his home state of Wisconsin more than 43,000 veterans had obtained apprenticeship training under the two initial G.I. Bills. "Those men today are an essential part of our trained work force," he asserted.

"According to the Wisconsin State Apprenticeship Council, about 20 young state men a month are entering the armed forces, either through enlistment or the draft, from their registered apprenticeship programs. If, when they return, they choose to take up vocational training once again, not one nickel of veterans' educational assistance will be available to them as things now stand," Zablocki said.

The congressman's bill, first introduced last year, would provide the trainee a monthly federal allowance up to a maximum of \$105 for a man with more than one dependent. In addition, the veteran could take wages from the firm to which he was apprenticed as long as the total did not exceed \$410 monthly.

Zablocki said he was hopeful that the House Veterans Affairs Committee would schedule hearings early in the 90th Congress on his proposal. He said that business, labor and educational groups throughout the nation are supporting remedial legislation.

FACT SHEET ON H.R. 2383, VETERANS' APPRENTICESHIP ASSISTANCE ACT

HISTORY OF THE BILL

As a co-sponsor of the "Cold War" G.I. Bill of educational and other benefits, Rep. Zablocki believed that similar aid should be given to Vietnam veterans as had been extended to World War II and Korean Conflict vets. The bill which was finally enacted by the 89th Congress, however, excluded those veterans who wished to obtain on-the-job or vocational training. The reason given by the House Veterans Affairs Committee was that abuses had occurred in those programs in the past.

Believing that a boy who wants to be a welder deserves federal help as much as one who aspires to be an accountant, Congressman Zablocki introduced remedial legislation in July, 1966. He then distributed the bill to vocational specialists throughout the United States, asking for comments. As the result of several suggestions, he has introduced a slightly revised version in the 90th Congress.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

The bill would allow returned veterans to undertake on-the-job or apprenticeship training in a craft or skill while receiving a modest federal allowance, in addition to any salary which might be paid him by the firm training him, up to a maximum of \$410 per month. The measure spells out safeguards against abuses, including these: The training content of the course must be adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained, there must be a reasonable certainty that a job will be available to the veteran in the skill field, the training establishment must be adequately equipped, and it must keep detailed records on the progress in training.

THE EFFECT OF THE BILL

The bill would remedy a deficiency in the present Cold War G.I. Bill which, if left unchanged, might result in a tragic shortage of trained workers at some future time. Under the World War II G.I. Bill and Korean Conflict G.I. Bill more than 43,000 veterans were trained in the State of Wisconsin alone. Those veterans now make up the backbone of the State's skilled work force.

The bill would also make clear that boys who seek vocational training have just as

much right to aid as boys who wish to attend college. Their skills will be just as needed in the world of tomorrow as those of the academically trained.

RELATED MATTERS

According to the Wisconsin State Apprenticeship Council about 300 young men in the state left their apprenticeship programs to enter military service in 1966 either by enlistment or through the draft. Believing that these young men deserve some help if they choose to return to their apprenticeships, labor, business and educational leaders in Wisconsin have contacted Rep. Zablocki, supporting his proposal.

For further information see Rep. Clement J. Zablocki, "The Veterans' Apprenticeship Assistance Act of 1966" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 12, pages 16310-16313.

H.R. 2883

A bill to authorize on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs under the veterans' educational assistance program embodied in title 38 of the United States Code

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 "Veterans' Apprenticeship Assistance Act".

Sec. 2. Section 1673 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out in subsection (c) "any course of apprenticeship or other training on the job."

Sec. 3. Section 1682 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) Any eligible veteran may receive the benefits of this chapter while pursuing a full-time program of apprenticeship or other training on the job approved under the provisions of section 1777 of this title. The training assistance allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing such an approved program shall be computed at the rate of (1) \$70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) \$85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) \$105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his training assistance allowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic training assistance allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay a training assistance allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of \$410 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive a training assistance allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four. The terms 'program of apprenticeship' and 'training assistance allowance' used in this subsection and section 1777 shall, for the purposes of the other provisions of this chapter and chapter 36, have the same meaning as 'program of education' and 'educational assistance allowance', respectively."

Sec. 4. (a) Subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by redesignating sections 1777 and 1778 as sections 1778 and 1779, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 1776 thereof the following new section:

"§ 1777. APPRENTICESHIP OR OTHER TRAINING ON THE JOB

"(a) Any recognized state apprenticeship agency, or where such state agency does not exist, the Secretary of Labor may approve a course of apprenticeship or other training on

the job if the training establishment offering such training is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turnover.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than three months and not more than two years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily requested by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him, and his training period shortened accordingly, and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with chapter 4C of title 29, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 36 is amended by striking out "1777" and all that follows down through "courses," and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"1777. Apprenticeship or other training on the job.

"1778. Notice of approval of courses.

"1779. Disapproval of courses."

Sec. 5. Subsection (c) of section 1682 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of any eligible veteran who was discharged or released from active duty before the date of enactment of the Veterans' Educational Assistance Program Amendments of 1966 and who pursues a course of apprentice or other training on the job, within the provisions of section 1682(f) of this chapter, the eight-year delimiting period shall run from the date of enactment of such amendments, if it is later than the date which would otherwise be applicable."

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the President's endorsement today of the benefits we sought to give last year to the veterans of the Vietnam conflict, as well as to veterans of past wars and their dependents, will insure that we are providing those men who have risked their lives in strange lands with an opportunity to carve a better place for themselves in civilian life.

The President went even further in proposing an increase in the amount of servicemen's group life insurance and recommending that no veteran have his pension reduced as a result of increases in social security benefits.

I was particularly pleased by the concern which the President showed for the need for expanded educational benefits. I have already introduced a bill that is designed to provide many of the same benefits. This is a proposal to place Vietnam era veterans on an equal footing with other veterans and to increase allowances under the GI education bill.

The President's recommendations, and my own bill, would give these veterans of the Vietnam conflict the right to disability compensation at full wartime rates, disability pensions and death pensions for widows and children, special medical care benefits, and a \$1,600 allowance toward the purchase of an automobile for veterans with special disabilities such as paraplegics.

It would also raise the monthly stipend for veterans attending school under the GI bill from \$100 to \$130 a month. Students with dependents would receive correspondingly larger amounts.

A new proposal, which I wholeheartedly approve of, is one that would allow a veteran who needs to complete high school to do so, and to receive full benefits during this period without losing any of his eligibility for college benefits afterward.

Equally important, of course, was the President's endorsement of the increase of 5.4 percent for disabled veterans' pensions, as well as increased benefits for widows and dependents of deceased veterans. We passed a similar proposal near the end of the 89th Congress in the House of Representatives that was not acted on by the Senate because of the rush of legislation during the closing days. I was gratified, as well, by his re-

assurance on a position I have been taking in my contact with veterans for some time—that no veteran should have his pension reduced as a result of increases in social security benefits.

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House of action taken by the Committee on Rules. House Resolution 53 was ordered reported. It is a resolution to create a Select Committee on Small Business. It will be programmed for tomorrow.

H.R. 4082—TAX-SHARING PROPOSAL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, despite massive Federal programs over the years, our State and local governments remain pockets of fiscal poverty.

The Federal Government has given them urban renewal programs that too often are wasteful, cause needless human suffering, and succeed sometimes in hiding rather than eliminating urban blight.

It has given them cash to erect Government buildings, then required local and State governments to build more and spend more than was needed.

It has established programs to curb water and air pollution. But while local government waits for us to provide the funds to implement those programs, their rivers get dirtier, their air more difficult to breathe.

And we are spending billions for the war on poverty—more, according to the President, than we are spending on the other war in Vietnam—to duplicate many of the programs the States and local communities already offer.

All of these examples, and there are more, illustrate the need for a new approach.

That new approach must be aimed at strengthening local government's ability to work out solutions to local problems and to pay for those solutions without compromising principle.

To do this, the Federal Government must offer something other than competition for the taxpayer's dollar.

Most State and local governments already are using traditional revenue-producing taxes, such as property, income, and sales taxes, to the maximum and are searching desperately for new sources of revenue.

Many city governments and school districts are asking voter approval to increase the limits on those traditional

taxes or to authorize new taxes in addition to those imposed by the States.

Local governments must compete with each other for the taxpayer's dollar and with the prospect of a Federal income tax increase.

While voters have no direct control over Federal taxes, they can in most cases display their general dissatisfaction by voting down local tax increases.

They are doing so all over the country. So, the Federal Government often does very little directly to assist the fiscal problems of State and local government and indirectly compounds those problems with its own free-spending policies.

Federal spending policy can hurt local government in another way.

Large-scale Federal spending tends to encourage inflation and inflation means the taxpayer pays more Federal income tax because Federal taxes, tied to a sliding income scale, rise in proportion with the inflationary spiral.

But the taxpayer, faced with a dollar that is worth less and a higher Federal income tax bill over which he has no direct control, will be less inclined to vote for new local taxes.

Local government is caught in the pinch. On the one hand, its income is proportionately less as inflation soars; on the other, its chances of getting voter approval for additional funds diminishes.

I believe the Federal Government must indicate it recognizes these problems and then do something to help.

That is why I am joining with several other Republicans in introducing H.R. 4082 to return 3 percent of the Federal personal income tax collection to the States beginning in 1968.

Half of the money would be for use by the States as they see fit. The remainder would be redistributed by the States to local units of government without Federal controls.

This proposal, I believe, will be a first step toward returning perspective to State and Federal Government relationships.

FIRST LIEUTENANT FRANK S. REASONER, U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McCLURE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I am constantly reminded of the sacrifices being made by citizens of my State in the Vietnam war. Two weeks ago, one of my constituents, Maj. Bernard F. Fisher, U.S. Air Force, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

This morning I was a guest at the Pentagon to watch the presentation of the Congressional Medal of Honor to another resident of the First District of Idaho. Regrettably, this time the award was made posthumously.

First Lieutenant Frank S. Reasoner, U.S. Marine Corps was born in Spokane, Wash. The family moved to Kellogg,

Idaho, when Reasoner was 11. After graduating from Kellogg High School, he enlisted in the Marine Corps. Three years later our late, revered Senator Henry C. Dworshak appointed young Reasoner to West Point. Following his graduation from the Academy, he returned to the Marine Corps as a second lieutenant and embarked on a 3-year tour of duty in the Pacific area from which he was not to return. During his entire time overseas, he served as a reconnaissance platoon leader with the 3d Reconnaissance Battalion.

On the day he died, Lieutenant Reasoner was leading an advance patrol of his company deep in Vietcong territory. Spotting an enemy rifleman, he signaled for his men to open fire. Vietcong snipers and an enemy machinegun then pinned down the patrol. In the ensuing battle Lieutenant Reasoner killed two of the enemy.

Seeing that his radioman was wounded and unable to move, the lieutenant raced toward the wounded man to effect a rescue. As he ran, Reasoner was hit with a fatal burst of machinegun fire.

A Marine Corps installation in Vietnam was subsequently named "Camp Reasoner" and dedicated to his memory. They tell me that a hand-scrawled sign near the gates of the camp reads:

First Lieutenant Reasoner sacrificed his life to save one of his wounded Marines. "Greater Love Hath No Man."

Gallantry such as Lieutenant Reasoner's is irreplaceable, for in this one act of natural courage, he has joined the ranks of 3,181 other Congressional Medal of Honor holders—men whose devotion to their fellow man and whose love of country was greater than life itself.

I would not want to sound partisan on an occasion such as this, but Lieutenant Reasoner's story reminds me again of the sacrifices young Idaho men are making in a strange, far-off land. Sometime soon we must have the assurance that their valor has not been in vain, that victory is in sight, and that when the struggle in Vietnam is over, we will find ourselves in a world at peace.

The citizens of Idaho join me in extending to Lieutenant Reasoner's family—his wife, Sally, and his son, Michael Lawrence, of Kingston, Idaho; and his parents, Mr. and Mrs. James C. Curry, of Kellogg, Idaho—our deep gratitude for his service and our sorrow at his death. We also share their pride knowing that the Nation has paid him its highest tribute.

In order that generations to come will remember the full story of 1st Lt. Frank Reasoner, I include as part of my remarks the text of the official citation:

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as Commanding Officer, Company A, 3d Reconnaissance Battalion, 3d Marine Division in action against hostile Viet Cong forces near Danang, Vietnam on 12 July 1965. The reconnaissance patrol led by Lieutenant Reasoner had deeply penetrated heavily controlled enemy territory when it came under extremely heavy fire from an estimated 50 to 100 Viet Cong insurgents. Accompanying the advance party and the point that consisted of five men, he immediately deployed his men for an assault

after the Viet Cong had opened fire from numerous concealed positions. Boldly shouting encouragement, and virtually isolated from the main body, he organized a base of fire for an assault on the enemy positions. The slashing fury of the Viet Cong machine gun and automatic weapons fire made it impossible for the main body to move forward. Repeatedly exposing himself to the devastating attack he skillfully provided covering fire, killing at least two Viet Cong and effectively silencing an automatic weapons position in a valiant attempt to effect evacuation of a wounded man. As casualties began to mount his radio operator was wounded and Lieutenant Reasoner immediately moved to his side and tended his wounds. When the radio operator was hit a second time while attempting to reach a covered position, Lieutenant Reasoner courageously running to his aid through the grazing machine gun fire fell mortally wounded. His indomitable fighting spirit, valiant leadership and unflinching devotion to duty provided the inspiration that was to enable the patrol to complete its mission without further casualties. In the face of almost certain death he gallantly gave his life in the service of his country. His actions upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and the United States Naval Service.

FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. DICKINSON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced legislation today to provide for humane treatment of laboratory animals.

This bill, which as H.R. 5647 in the 89th Congress had extended public hearings before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Health, sets standards of humane care for animals used in federally supported scientific research.

As I told my colleagues on March 2, 1965, prior to my introduction of this bill, I studied many proposals and am convinced my bill will provide standards of humane treatment without impairing legitimate research.

It follows closely the guidelines established in England in 1876. That law is still in force today and has the approval of the overwhelming majority of responsible British scientists.

The bill creates standards for the handling of animals and bars all Federal grants for research to institutions or persons not having a certificate from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare showing that they meet these standards.

Fair treatment of animals should be the mark of every civilized society. My bill will provide for decent care of experimental animals which can be provided without impairing the progress of scientific research. It would eliminate much duplication of painful experiments which are run in areas where the answers sought have already been discovered.

I was heartened by the passage in the 89th Congress of one piece of legislation to provide for humane treatment of animals, H.R. 13881, which I supported.

But that new law, Public Law 89-554, while a step in the right direction, does not go far enough. It deals only with animal dealers and the handling of animals being procured for laboratory use. But it stops short of the laboratory door.

My bill would take the next step and provide proper care for animals in the laboratory itself. Every year, since this measure has been before the public, support for it has grown.

I hope this is the year in which it will finally be enacted into law.

SECOND- AND THIRD-CLASS MAIL FOR FIRE COMPANIES

Mr. DICKINSON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which would extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings which are now applicable to certain nonprofit associations and organizations.

In much of rural and suburban America, our volunteer fire companies are not only the only protective agency in the town, but they form the backbone of much of the charitable and organizational work performed.

The history of volunteer fire departments and companies is long and illustrious.

Our Nation's first President, George Washington, was a volunteer. As a matter of fact, in 1764, he purchased a fire engine in Philadelphia for 80 pounds, 10 shillings—about \$400—and gave it to the Alexandria, Va., Volunteer Fire Company.

The first "mutual fire society" was started in 1718. Its main job was to save furniture and personal property while the paid fire department was fighting the fire. Similar societies began to flourish. Then a gentleman we have all heard of, suggested that the companies do more—that they do both salvage work and firefighting. His name was Benjamin Franklin and the volunteer company he organized in Philadelphia set the pattern for the Nation. From that time on, the development of a volunteer fire company was often the first real community action taken, as the rest of our continent was settled and the boundaries pushed westward.

Today, many of these volunteer fire companies still exist and perform their vital duties in an age of rapidly advancing technology. Very often they must reach their membership for drills concerning improvement in modern firefighting technique; to call them together for meetings; or, in areas where they also serve charitable needs, for meetings for those purposes.

Figures for recent years show that nearly 12,000 men, women, and children lose their lives annually as a result of the Nation's fires. Property damage alone comes to more than \$1½ billion a year. In much of the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire and other rural areas, the only force standing between these ravages of fire and the people are the volunteer fire companies and departments.

If these volunteer companies, which have done such a remarkable job in New Hampshire, are to be able to continue their fine work, the least we can do is allow them the same postal privileges we now allow other similarly oriented charitable and nonprofit organizations and associations.

LET'S CLEAN UP OUR AIR AND WATERS

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join many of my colleagues today in introducing legislation which would provide a tax credit against the cost of constructing air and water pollution control facilities.

This 20-percent credit would apply to the taxpayer's cost for necessary land, buildings, and equipment provided for pollution treatment facilities in cooperating with Federal and State Governments on their pollution programs.

Recent articles appearing in national magazines have vividly documented, through alarming color photographs, the unbelievable poisoning of two of our most important natural resources—our air and water. The people who live in our crowded urban areas know all too well that their air is unfit to breathe. They know all too well that nearby waterways are clogged with waste of all kinds.

Even what may, by comparison, be thought of as rural areas have not escaped the effects of such pollution. Air currents move discharged gases and solids many miles from the cities before depositing them in open areas. Streams and rivers flow many miles before purifying themselves.

The pollution of our air and water has continued at an alarming rate, and it is essential that Federal, State, and local governments work in close cooperation with private business to prevent the further poisoning of these resources.

The legislation necessary to require pollution control facilities to meet local, State, and Federal standards has already been enacted. What is needed now is a means of enabling them to proceed as rapidly as possible, without having to wait for the availability of Government grants.

The longer we delay in attacking and solving these problems, the more danger there is to our health and that of future

generations. The problems cannot be solved by one company, or one county, or one State, or even by the Federal Government alone.

It will require the greatest coordination and cooperation at all business and governmental levels if the citizens of this country are to enjoy the benefits of clean air and fresh water. This legislation would provide one of the steps to insure those benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and my other colleagues in urging this legislation's prompt consideration by the committee and early passage by this body.

CRIME ON CAPITOL HILL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the crime wave on Capitol Hill is beginning to look like a page from a police blotter.

According to FBI figures, nationwide crime rose by 10 percent during the first 9 months of 1966 compared to the same period in 1965.

Crime in the District of Columbia increased by approximately 9 percent during that time.

But the U.S. Capitol set the record.

Crime on Capitol Hill—and that includes only the Capitol Building, the five office buildings, and the grounds—hit 51 percent last year over 1965.

Half again as many crimes were committed on Capitol premises in 1966 as in the year previous.

We view with alarm the national crime crisis and enact such legislation as we can to combat it, but we scarcely can point with pride at the sloppy and dangerous lack of security we permit on the Hill.

Early in January 1965 I took this floor to warn the House that the security situation here is serious and demands immediate attention. The House had just had the shattering experience of an invasion by a member of the American Nazi Party, in blackface and minstrel costume, during a session. That same day, just before the President delivered his state of the Union message, a known crackpot gained admission to the floor and was removed by police only when pointed out by a colleague of ours.

This prompted me to introduce a resolution calling for a special House committee to investigate the Capitol's security measures. My resolution languished and died in the 89th Congress. I reintroduced it on the opening day of the session, House Resolution 74, now before the Committee on Rules.

Since I first introduced this legislation more than 2 years ago, we have had a total of 131 serious crimes of all types, 52 of them occurring during 1965 and 79 of them last year.

Several of these were so outrageous as to encourage my hope that the House would surely adopt my resolution and correct a situation which not only jeopardizes the safety of every one of the 7,000 employees who work on Capitol Hill but the millions of constituents who visit us yearly.

Let me call to mind the brutal attack on our colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND], in the spring of 1965, while he was working one evening in his office in the Longworth Building. He might well have been killed by his knife-wielding assailant.

Many of us shared the concern of another colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], when her automobile was stolen from its parking space in the Cannon Building garage shortly before Congress adjourned last fall.

The House beauty shop was robbed in broad daylight on December 19, 1966, the holdup man taking hundreds of dollars in cash, despite the fact that the police guardhouse is only a few doors away. I am told that employees in the shop have had to rearrange their working schedules so that they can leave before dark.

Inestimable damage was done late last fall to the paintings which hang in the House side of the Capitol.

And, just before Christmas, while working alone in the office of our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] a young secretary tried by herself to capture a thief who had calmly walked in and stolen her wallet. Ironically, the young lady's husband is a Capitol policeman stationed on the Senate side.

These are only a very few of the cases which come to mind.

I think, if we are not to improve our security enforcement, we would do well to warn our visiting constituents to be prepared for any contingency when they wander through the historic corridors of their Capitol and through the labyrinths of the subways and office buildings. They are not now safe from assault or robbery.

I am reliably informed that the Chief of the Capitol Police, James M. Powell, testified last year in closed hearings before the House Administration Committee that he was fearful that we might have a murder in the Rayburn Building and the body not be found for days under the present security system.

Let me pause to express my unreserved admiration for Chief Powell, who comes to us from the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police with an outstanding record, and to our great Sergeant at Arms, Zeake Johnson. They are doing a splendid job under terrific handicaps and with a minimum of cooperation from Members of Congress. If tragedy should strike, if the crime wave on Capitol Hill continues to rise, it will not be the fault of these two dedicated gentlemen. It will be the fault of those of us who have consistently ignored the urgent need for a modern, well-trained, well-equipped, professional police force. I understand that the present problem is not a numerical lack of policemen, but, rather, a deficiency of

trained men with solid police backgrounds. It calls for a long, hard look at our present system of making police appointments and our methods of training the men to do their jobs.

It is no secret that the Capitol lies under a constant threat of violence. With the crime situation what it is throughout the District of Columbia, it is not always possible to summon hundreds of metropolitan police to Capitol Hill in a moment's notice in time of emergency. And when we hear tales of Capitol Police rookies leaving their posts because they want to "go get a soft drink," we are given pause for thought.

Chief Powell has provided me with a breakdown of crime on Capitol premises for the years 1965 and 1966 which I shall include at the conclusion of my remarks. Not listed, of course, are the many incidents which never reached the police desk but of which we all have heard: the cases of peeping toms, the traceless vandalism which has marked the walls of the new elevators in the Rayburn Building, the escapades of teenage youngsters who roam the halls and ride the escalators hours on end.

It has been suggested that after a certain hour each evening, those entering and leaving the buildings be required to sign a register and identify themselves. The Rayburn Building alone poses a massive security problem with its many entrances and virtually unguarded access to the Capitol Building and other office buildings.

I urge the Rules Committee to give its earliest consideration to my resolution and the House to act promptly thereafter. We have a situation here which cannot be ignored and which augurs real tragedy if not corrected.

The breakdown referred to follows:

Crime breakdown for the U.S. Capitol for the period from Jan. 1, 1965, through Dec. 31, 1965

	Cases
Robbery (includes attempts)-----	2
Stolen autos-----	3
Miscellaneous larcenies-----	32
Larceny from autos-----	9
Indecent exposure-----	1
Vandalism-----	3
Assaults-----	2
Grand total (all types)-----	52

Crime breakdown for the U.S. Capitol for the period from Jan. 1, 1966, through Dec. 31, 1966

	Cases
Robbery (includes attempts)-----	4
Stolen autos-----	11
Miscellaneous larcenies-----	41
Larceny from autos-----	11
Indecent exposure-----	1
Vandalism-----	5
Assaults-----	6
Grand total (all types)-----	79

TAX SHARING TO STATES FOR HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that would return a fixed portion of Federal tax revenues to the States to health, education, and welfare purposes. This particular bill has the support of the distinguished Senator JAVITS, from New York, and of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

While there are a number of so-called tax-sharing proposals now under consideration, I am convinced that the legislation I introduce today strikes the best balance between needed flexibility at the State and local level and essential Federal accounting for the moneys returned to the States.

Under the bill 1 percent of the aggregate taxable income reported would be returned in the first year, 1½ percent in the second year, and 2 percent each year thereafter. Eighty-five percent of the fund, estimated at \$3 billion in the first year, would go to the States on the basis of population and tax effort; the remaining 15 percent would be distributed among the States with the lowest per capita figures for the country as a whole.

The trust fund, composed of this fixed percentage of revenue income, would be administered by the Treasury Department. No State could receive more than 12 percent of the fund in any one year.

Wide flexibility would be accorded to the States. The areas of health, education, and welfare are purposely broad and the restrictions are few. States could not use the fund for administrative expenses, highway programs, State payments in lieu of property taxes, debt service or disaster relief.

To insure that the States are using the funds wisely within these broad guidelines, each Governor would be required to develop a distribution plan for sharing the returned revenues with local communities. Frequent reports to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General, and the appropriate committees of the Congress would provide a further estimate of the degree to which the operation of the program was in accord with the congressional intent.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that legislation to improve the financial situation in our States is critical. We are all familiar with the problem faced by so many of our States which necessarily are restricted to a property or sales tax base. Exceptionally high property taxes only weaken a State's competitive position in attracting new industry and new residents; while high sales taxes have a regressive impact on those elements in the economy least able to afford them. Certainly the burden on State and local programs in my own State of Massachusetts would be much eased by the return of \$63.5 million as contemplated in my bill.

Tax sharing would also help us break our present dependence to the grant-in-aid approach. There are serious questions as to whether this method is efficient, and to what extent Federal restrictions impose unnecessary limitations

on the decisionmaking process at the State and local level.

The tax-sharing concept has gained such wide support and interest that I think it deserves our careful consideration during this Congress.

LEGISLATION TO ENCOURAGE EXPENDITURES FOR MUNICIPAL BONDS, PURE RESEARCH, CHARITIES, IN SEARCH OF INVESTMENT, AND FOR POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Mr. DICKINSON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today several bills designed to remove the tax deterrents to the expenditure of funds held by individuals and organizations in our society for purposes we have long agreed to be beneficial. Indeed, we have held these purposes to be so beneficial and important that great sums have been expended directly by our Federal Government in pursuance of these same goals. My objective today is to encourage private initiative by removing barriers imposed by our tax laws and bring them into conformity with our social and economic objectives.

The basic theory behind these proposals is that of the "tax neutralists" who hold that the economic impact of taxation should be as minimal as possible, thus, correspondingly, tax policy should be in accord, not in discord, with governmental expenditure policies. Put another way, we should not tax expenditures by the private sector, which, if not made by the private sector, would have to be made by the public sector.

One of the bills which I am introducing today clears away some of the remaining tax barriers to investment in local and municipal bonds used to finance schools, sewers, and hundreds of other local needs. Another removes the tax barriers to contributions in foreign charities, attempting to do much the same job as our massive foreign aid program. A third bill is designed to stimulate investment in new business ventures to keep us at the forefront of technological advances. A fourth bill encourages basic research by allowing a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science. A fifth bill, which I am cosponsoring today, was originally introduced in the last Congress by my very able colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and is being reintroduced today by him and several other Members on both sides of the aisle. I am very pleased to join them in introducing this measure, which provides a tax credit to encourage expenditures for a construction program for air and water pollution treatment facilities in accord with the Federal and State Government's pollution control programs.

A discussion of each bill follows:

A BILL TO IMPROVE THE BOND MARKET FOR MUNICIPALS

Mr. Speaker, as a recognition of the importance of bond financing for State and local governmental bodies, our present Internal Revenue Code provides that interest on these obligations shall be free from Federal income taxation. This exemption from taxation is effective in making State and local government obligations attractive to investors and permits their sale at lower interest than would be possible otherwise.

The role of bond financing is not difficult to trace. School bond issues, sewer bond issues, and hundreds of others are commonplace in financial circles. The need for adequate debt financing capital to our State and local governmental bodies cannot be overemphasized, and the availability of this capital at advantageous interest rates, made possible by the tax-exempt nature of their interest, depends upon a ready market for these bonds.

I have today reintroduced a bill which would help expand and improve the market for municipals. While individual bondholders may receive the interest from municipals tax free, when this interest is channeled to them through a corporate investing mechanism the investors fail to get the full benefit of tax exemption. The interest comes to the investment corporation tax free, just as it does to individuals, but there is no carry-through provision. Thus, the entire income of the corporation, from tax-free and taxable sources, is merged and divided and the entire amount received by each shareholder in the investment corporation is fully taxed. What my bill suggests is that there be allowed exclusion on the part of the individual taxpayer of his pro rata share of the tax-exempt interest received by the corporation, thereby giving the taxpayer the direct benefit of the tax-exempt status of these securities.

By making municipal bonds more attractive to investment corporations, which control a very large amount of capital, a better market will be created for these securities and the problem of financing State and local government will be eased.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE TO PROVIDE THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO FOREIGN CHARITIES BE DEDUCTIBLE FROM GROSS INCOME

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 170(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a charitable contribution made to a foreign charity by a U.S. taxpayer to be deductible for income tax purposes.

The nondeductibility of such contributions was brought to my attention by a constituent and his wife who during the past several years have made contributions to Protestant religious groups in Japan. The constituent's father established a mission in Japan in 1895 and this mission today is known as the "Church of Christ in Japan." A college classmate of his wife built a settlement house in Japan and both of these worthwhile organizations have received financial and moral support over the years from these two Americans. These

Americans are quite interested in the progress and work of these Japanese organizations and have generated a great deal of good will and friendship for our people. Deductions of gifts to these two religious charities and similar organizations have been disallowed by the Internal Revenue Service for the reason that under the present law they do not qualify for such treatment.

Section 170(c) of the 1954 code provides in part that for the purposes of this section, the term "charitable contributions" means a contribution or gift to or for the use of:

2. A corporation, trust, or community chest, fund, or foundation—

(A) created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States.

After I looked into this matter I wrote Mortimer M. Caplin, then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and he replied stating that the legislative background of section 170(c) (2) of the 1954 code indicates the intent of Congress that only contributions made to "domestic" charities be deductible. He said this restriction which was first enacted into the law as section 23(c) of the Revenue Act of 1938 limits the deduction for contributions to those made to or for the use of a domestic charity. In his letter he quoted from the report of the House Ways and Means Committee on section 23(o) of the Revenue Act of 1938, H.R. 1860, 75th Congress, third session—1938—pages 19 and 20, as follows, to wit:

Under the 1936 act, the deductions of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions (sec. 23(q)). The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burden which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derives no such benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization, the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionary and educational purposes) will not affect the deductibility of the gift.

The policy reasons cited for limiting the deduction to domestic organizations might have had some validity in 1938, but it sounds almost strange in 1963, particularly when we think in terms of our mutual security programs, the purposes of point 4, Peace Corps, student exchanges, and so forth. It seems to me that the time has come for the Ways and Means Committee to again consider these basic policy reasons established back in 1938 to determine whether or not they are still valid or whether or not some changes should be made to more accurately reflect our present policies and attitudes.

When I introduced this bill during the last session, I received a report from Mr. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, giving me the Treasury's

views on this bill. I include that report in the RECORD at this point:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D.C., December 23, 1963.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for the views and recommendations of this Department on H.R. 8367 (88th Cong., 1st sess.), entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income."

The bill, if enacted, would make two changes in the present provisions dealing with income tax deductions for gifts to foreign charities. The first change would be to eliminate the present requirement contained in the last sentence of section 170(c) (2) of the Code which requires that contributions made by corporations to a "trust, chest, fund, or foundation" shall be deductible only if "the contribution is to be used within the United States or any of its possessions;" the so-called domestic use requirement. The second change would eliminate the present language contained in section 170(c) (2) (A) which requires that all deductible contributions must be made to a charitable organization "created or organized in the United States or in any possession thereof, or under the law of the United States, any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States;" the so-called domestic organization requirement.

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC USE REQUIREMENT

As noted above, a corporation, under present law, may only deduct a contribution to unincorporated donees if the gift is to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions. However, since the code does not specifically require gifts by a corporation to a charitable corporation to be used exclusively within the United States or any of its possessions, the Service has taken the position that a gift by a corporation to a domestically organized charitable corporation is not subject to the domestic use requirement. Because of the presence of a domestic organization through which the Internal Revenue Service can monitor the activities of the donee organization so as to determine whether such activities are in accord with the congressional grant of an income tax deduction to the donor, the absence of a domestic use requirement with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors has not led to any serious abuses or administrative problems. Therefore, we would have no objection to treating charitable contributions made by corporate donors in a manner similar to that presently accorded in the case of contributions by noncorporate donors. Accordingly, this Department would have no objection to the removal of the last sentence of section 170(c) (2) (the domestic use requirement).

ELIMINATION OF THE DOMESTIC ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENT

The second change which would be made by the bill would be to broaden the provisions allowing deductions for charitable contributions so as to permit the deduction of gifts made by both corporate and noncorporate donors without regard to whether the donee institution is a domestic or a foreign charity. Such was the scope of the law with respect to charitable contributions made by noncorporate donors prior to the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1938. The expressed intent of the present restriction upon income tax deductions for charitable contributions to domestic charities, which was enacted in that year with respect to gifts made by noncorporate donors, was to insure that the United States would obtain

an offsetting benefit for the revenue loss resulting from the deductibility of such contributions. At that time the Ways and Means Committee took the position that the United States derives no benefit from gifts to foreign institutions and that, therefore, only contributions to domestic organizations should be deductible under the income tax law. Thus, the report of the Ways and Means Committee states that: "Under the 1936 act the deduction of charitable contributions by corporations is limited to contributions made to domestic institutions. The bill provides that the deduction allowed to taxpayers other than corporations be also restricted to contributions made to domestic institutions. The exemption from taxation of money or property devoted to charitable and other purposes is based upon the theory that the Government is compensated for the loss of revenue by its relief from financial burdens which would otherwise have to be met by appropriations from public funds, and by the benefits resulting from the promotion of the general welfare. The United States derives no such benefit from gifts from foreign institutions, and the proposed limitation is consistent with the above theory. If the recipient, however, is a domestic organization the fact that some portion of its funds is used in other countries for charitable and other purposes (such as missionaries and educational purposes) will not affect the deductibility of the gift."

Irrespective of the validity at the present time of the reasoning which led Congress to limit the deduction to contributions made to domestic organizations in 1936 and 1938, the Treasury Department believes that the limitation should now be maintained for strong administrative reasons. We feel that the elimination of the domestic organization requirement, which would allow tax deductible gifts to be made directly to foreign charitable organizations without providing a domestic entity through which the Internal Revenue Service could insure that the provision of the income tax law allowing deductions for charitable organizations are followed, would prevent the effective supervision over charitable funds expended abroad. Such lack of an effective policing power to insure that the funds were in fact expended for religious, charitable, etc., purposes, that no part of the net earnings of the foreign entity inure to the benefit of any individual and that no substantial part of the recipient organization activities consisted of carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation would lead to widespread abuses in this area. Such action might, in effect, place foreign philanthropic activities, which could not be adequately policed, in a preferred position as compared with domestic activities.

In addition, the ability to make contributions directly to foreign organizations might permit payments with respect to which an income tax deduction has been granted to be used by Communist organizations and thus would circumvent the purpose of section 11 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 996; 50 U.S.C. 790) which denies an income tax deduction for contributions to domestic Communist-action or Communist-infiltrated organizations.

For the above reasons, this Department is opposed to the provisions of lines 6 through 9, inclusive, of H.R. 8367 which would, in effect, remove the domestic organization requirement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, in reading through this report it appears that Secretary Surrey's

primary objection for permitting deductions for charitable contributions to foreign charities is the difficulty of administering the program. I think Mr. Surrey is correct and I think he has put his finger on what appears to be the most difficult problem. It seems to me that we can put the burden of qualification upon the foreign country. It would certainly be in that country's best interest to see that its domestic charities qualify for private foreign aid. Why not by regulation determine what criteria must be satisfied before foreign charity can qualify and then have the foreign government process the applications of their domestic charities. This data could be submitted to the local embassy for checking in the doubtful cases and the foreign charity would be obliged to recertify its qualifications each year or from time to time as the Commissioner feels appropriate.

It is certainly possible that some of these contributions will be diverted to other than charitable purposes, but this probably happens in our own country; and if it does, then the recipient should be disqualified. If we err, it should be on the side of the open door as opposed to the closed door. If our original premise is valid then we should be thinking in terms of ways to implement it rather than limit it.

Another collateral aspect of this problem involves the tax exemption status of foreign charities. The Commissioner has outlined the procedures for establishing this tax-exempt status of foreign charities by various separate tax treaties. In fact, all organizations which enjoy a tax-exempt status must qualify under the Internal Revenue regulations and such organizations have been listed by the U.S. Treasury Department in IRS Publication No. 78. It does not seem to me to be an insuperable task to establish guidelines consistent with the policy behind the deduction.

There are a good many of us in Congress who believe that the people-to-people approach is extremely important if we are to achieve better understanding and closer friendships between our people and the peoples abroad. It is my feeling that such relationships should be encouraged rather than discouraged. We have written a great many tax incentives into our Internal Revenue Code to encourage the development of certain policies. This could well be an area where the Congress should take a long look to determine whether or not this impediment to contributions to foreign charities should be changed or eliminated. It may be time to replace the impediment by a policy of equality with other charitable gifts. I hope that my colleagues will give some thought to this suggestion and give the members of the Ways and Means Committee the benefit of their thinking on this matter.

**A BILL TO STIMULATE INVESTMENT INTO
NEW ENTERPRISE**

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, under section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code a loss is deductible for amounts spent in searching out and investigating a potential business or investment only where the taxpayer has entered into the transaction under contemplation and the loss has resulted from the abandonment of

the project. This interpretation of the section came into prominence in 1957 in the Internal Revenue Service's Revenue Ruling 57-418.

Prior to 1957, the expenditures for preliminary investigations of business or investment opportunities were allowed as deductions even though the taxpayer did not, eventually, enter the transaction. I have today offered a bill which would in effect overrule Revenue Ruling 57-418 and reinstate the earlier rule as set out above.

The basis of this amendment is to encourage taxpayers to investigate new ventures and investments. Requiring that a taxpayer materially commit himself to the development of a particular undertaking before the expenses of investigating it in order to weigh its possibilities are allowed as a tax deduction limits the scope of ventures into which careful and responsible taxpayers will look for possible development and this, in turn, limits the development potential of our economy.

Living as we do in a period of rapid technological change and innovation, I feel it is wiser for us to stimulate the activities of those who would move us into new fields by exploring their economic possibilities than to hobble their efforts to help America move forward.

A BILL TO ENCOURAGE BASIC RESEARCH

Progress in the modern world is intimately linked to the efforts of basic research and to maintain America's scientific and industrial preeminence we must encourage basic scientific research in this country.

To this end, I have today reintroduced legislation which would permit tax credits to individuals and corporations for their contributions to basic research. For individuals, contributions to universities or nonprofit organizations for basic research would be treated as a credit against taxes. By the provisions of the bill, the individual taxpayer could claim 90 percent of his contribution as a credit against his tax liability, up to a total of 5 percent of that liability. For business which undertakes basic research, there would be a credit of 75 percent of the contribution made up to a total of 3 percent of the tax liability.

The control of the incidence of the tax burden has proven to be an effective way to encourage certain activities and discourage others. What it does, in effect, is tell the individual or corporate taxpayer, "We will not order you to make certain expenditures and not others, for this is the legitimate area of personal choice; the disposition of your funds is in your hands alone. We will, however, recognize expenditures which contribute to the general welfare, we will encourage better exercise of your right to do with your funds as you see fit, and we will do this by making the amounts so spent or some part of them free from taxation." The legitimate right of choice remains with the taxpayer, both in the question of how to spend his money and its exact distribution among the competing areas of basic research.

Such a system would be, in my estimation, far preferable to a program by which the Federal Government would underwrite these costs. Guarantees of

the good faith of the research expenditures would be left in the hands of the universities and nonprofit organizations where they are involved and in the hands of a certifying board of scientists where corporations are concerned. This bill would foster our national progress in the context of individual freedom which has been so important to our growth in the past.

**A BILL TO PROVIDE A TAX CREDIT FOR EXPENSES
FOR CONSTRUCTION OF POLLUTION CONTROL
FACILITIES**

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment a tax credit is an excellent method to encourage business and industry to tackle the air and water pollution problem which is becoming more serious every day. It must be remembered that facilities for pollution control are nonproductive essentially, and that the appropriate facility must be constructed specifically for the needs of the particular industry. Thus, a tax credit allowing for great flexibility, is most appropriate.

This bill provides for a 20-percent credit for all costs of the facility—buildings, land, improvements, machinery, and equipment. If the taxpayer chooses to apply for the 20-percent credit, he would, of course, not be additionally eligible for the 7-percent tax credit which Republicans salvaged from the administration's efforts to suspend the investment tax credit on machinery during the last Congress.

The taxpayer may elect to amortize these expenditures during the tax year or over the next 4 years after the year in which the expenditures were made. In order for the taxpayer to qualify for the benefits of the tax credit and the rapid tax amortization provisions the taxpayer must have the appropriate State agency approve the facility to be sure that it is in accordance with the State's program for air and water pollution abatement.

**THE GUARANTEED OPPORTUNITY
TO EARN AN ANNUAL INCOME**

Mr. DICKINSON. 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson in his 1967 Economic Report stated his intention to establish a Commission to examine the merits and disadvantages of the many proposals for guaranteeing minimum incomes. In December, I participated in a symposium on guaranteed annual income held by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and presented my approach to aiding the poor and alleviating poverty. My proposal is to guarantee each of our citizens not an annual income, but the opportunity to earn an annual income. This program would strike at the deep cultural, emotional, and political roots of poverty without weakening individual dignity or discouraging individual incentive. I would like at this point to insert in the RECORD the speech which I gave to the

symposium with the hope that the approach it makes will receive serious consideration from the Commission the President intends to establish:

THE GUARANTEED OPPORTUNITY TO EARN AN ANNUAL INCOME

The guaranteed annual income, like a guarantee of happiness, has a direct and simple appeal. The proponents imply that poverty can be wiped out in a single stroke by giving a subsidy to the poor. If poverty is a lack of income, then the solution is obvious; provide the income necessary to raise the poor family or individual above the poverty level. The beguiling simplicity of the idea is its most attractive—and dangerous—feature. The writers of the United States Constitution resisted this simplicity and spoke of government providing for the pursuit of happiness, not happiness itself. So I think we must resist the present day simplicity and speak of providing for the opportunity to earn an income, not providing the income itself.

The trouble with this seemingly new theory is that the more we learn about poverty, particularly hardcore poverty, the more we realize that it is not just an economic problem. It is a problem with deep cultural, emotional, and political roots. In truth, hardcore poverty in the United States is as much a state of mind as a lack of money. Merely providing direct money payments to the poor will not solve the poverty problem. In fact, I believe that providing a guaranteed annual income would perpetuate poverty and might even make it worse.

As a matter of fact, the term "poverty" must be more clearly understood. In the United States today, it is definitely *not* subsistence-poverty which is the term developed in the Western world over the past seventeen decades as a scientific word of art, which is used in the United Nations and applied with a real and practical meaning to most societies in the world today. The term "poverty" as used in the United States today can only mean comparative-poverty—an entirely new concept and one which has little relationship to subsistence-poverty, albeit it is descriptive of a very real and important bundle of social and economic problems.

In my opinion, the guaranteed income would harden the poverty subcultures in our society. It would make millions of individuals wholly dependent upon some new form of welfare check and give them the feeling that they had no chance to obtain more. This is why I am opposed to the guaranteed income and why I believe it would be a cruel mistake to adopt it as public policy.

There is a better, more realistic and more enlightened way to fight comparative-poverty. It is by guaranteeing opportunity. Or as Abraham Lincoln put it, by affording every man "an unfettered start in the race of life." But before explaining how I think we can do a better job of guaranteeing opportunity, I want to discuss why I think adoption of the guaranteed annual income would be a major mistake.

A complete evaluation of the guaranteed income requires the skills and insights of an economist, sociologist, philosopher, and psychologist. For some reason, the economists seem to have made the subject their own special province. Admittedly, economists can provide a part of the answer. They can tell us something of the cost and of the alternative uses to which we might put our resources. But economists can tell us very little about the social, cultural, and psychological effects of the guaranteed income. And in my opinion, these are critical.

I suppose that is part of the reason why I am here. Just as I feel that war is too serious to be left to the generals, so do I believe that the outcome of the guaranteed income debate is too important to be left to the economists. As a lawyer-politician by profession and an economist by avocation, per-

haps I can contribute a different and, I hope, useful point of view to the discussion.

Before examining the concept of the guaranteed income, I think it would be helpful if I stated the basic assumptions upon which I am proceeding.

First, one of the major objectives of our society should be the rapid reduction of comparative-poverty with the ultimate goal of its virtual elimination within a reasonably short time, so that standards of living are truly free choices of living, differences not superiorities or inferiorities, and what measures less in dollars may well measure more in terms of human happiness.

Second, our economic and social system has produced unprecedented successes in eliminating subsistence-poverty and in reducing comparative-poverty over the years. In the postwar period alone, the number of persons in comparative-poverty has been reduced by an average of 700,000 a year. This is hardly a record of failure that justifies basic and far-reaching changes in our social and economic system. In fact, such changes might destroy the sources of our success and impede further progress.

Third, in spite of our successes, substantial numbers of Americans continue to live in comparative-poverty. As yet we have found no answer to the problem of the passing of poverty from generation to generation, nor have we found the proper approach to attacking the intractable islands of comparative-poverty and stagnation that exist in our otherwise prosperous and advancing society.

Fourth, as presently being developed, our welfare system is incapable of eliminating poverty and actually helps to perpetuate it. It not only falls short of providing adequate relief to those while they are in need, but it fails to provide the opportunities to make self-supporting citizens of welfare recipients.

If we can agree on these basic assumptions, then we are faced with deciding what is the best way to eliminate chronic hard-core comparative-poverty. Basically, I think we have only two choices. We can guarantee income to the impoverished, or we can guarantee them opportunity.

For my part, I choose opportunity. Guaranteeing opportunity is better for the country, and it is better for the individual. There possibly will always be some people for whom subsidization is the only way out. The chronically sick or disabled and certain mental defectives are cases in point. But for the vast majority of the poor, habilitation (largely education) and rehabilitation are attainable goals. What are the advantages of this approach over the guaranteed annual income?

Guaranteeing opportunity promotes individual dignity; guaranteeing income weakens it.

Guaranteeing opportunity recognizes that a man grows with responsibility; guaranteeing income denies his capacity for growth and self-sufficiency.

Guaranteeing opportunity is the humane approach to defeating poverty; guaranteeing income in effect says to millions of the poor: "We can't use you, we don't want you, but we won't let you starve."

Guaranteeing opportunity helps to eliminate poverty; guaranteeing income simply helps to alleviate it.

The idea of a guaranteed annual income for all citizens as a matter of right is not new. The expression itself has a daring, modern ring, but the concept was discussed by utopian thinkers as far back as Edward Bellamy in the late nineteenth century. Thirty years ago, Francis Townsend proposed a guaranteed income of \$200 a month for the aged. His plan was not adopted, but it influenced the passage of social security and was a major factor in making the aged a powerful political force in American life.

What is new is that the idea for a guaranteed annual income is now receiving power-

ful support from eminent scholars and social thinkers as a solution to the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty. Advocates include liberals of both the modern and classical schools. Any plan having the support of such a disparate and growing body of intellectuals demands the attention of those of us who operate in the area of public policy.

How has the idea gained such momentum? You will recall that it was only a few years ago that the notion that America was an "affluent society" entered the conventional wisdom. We admitted to our affluence almost with a sense of shame or guilt, rather than with justifiable pride in the achievements of our system. The public sector, it was said, was starving, while most individuals were glutted with goods.

The picture was undoubtedly overdrawn but it left its impact. Professors, pundits, and publicists began to dramatize—and sometimes overdramatize—the fact that a sizable minority of our fellow citizens were living in comparative-poverty in spite of the general affluence. The Conference on Economic Progress claimed that over 40 percent of our people were poor or deprived, notably without any clear definition of the words "poor" and "deprived."

While the extent and nature of poverty often was exaggerated, the point was driven home forcefully that millions of Americans live under substandard conditions and—even more important—many feel little hope (or is it desire) of ever bettering their lot. Their consensus that something was wrong with the present programs, many of which they had helped design, was really a remarkable admission. They who had supported ever-expanding social welfare programs over the years were admitting that these programs largely bypassed the poor and were arguing that specific measures aimed at poverty were required. Thus the poverty war was declared.

I believe that it is fair to say that thus far the war on poverty has been a great disappointment. Most of the programs are not new and still have potential, but they were pushed too fast and without coordination with each other in a desire to produce quick and dramatic results. Even more to the point, the war on poverty was launched before anyone knew how to fight it or had studied carefully the techniques of those who had been fighting it for years. Those responsible for conducting the "war" acted on the basis of beliefs and dogmatic assumptions rather than tested facts arrived at from hard research. This is perhaps the most important reason for the failure of the program.

Now we are threatening to make the same mistake with regard to the guaranteed annual income. My suggestion is that before we undertake what would be a major social revolution, we investigate thoroughly and with open minds what the consequences would be. I think we are likely to find that undesirable side effects of the plan would far outweigh any benefits that we might hope to realize.

Those who propose a guaranteed annual income, or—what is simply another approach to the same goal, the negative income tax—do so for a variety of reasons. All advocates of such a plan would, I suppose, base their support to some degree on humanitarian grounds. Poor people should be helped by society. I, of course, would agree. The question is how best to do it.

Some proponents of the plan believe that machines soon will do most of men's work and that unless the link between jobs and income is broken, mass unemployment and human suffering will result. An interesting thought perhaps, but it is one which elicits little professional support and no verification either from history or recent experience.

Let's study and debate these crucial questions, not beg them or bury them in dogma. Does automation create more jobs than it destroys? Do the jobs automation create require more brains and less brawn? Are sufficient jobs left (and created) to employ all the people in the lower i.q. percentiles? There seems to be ample evidence to support an affirmative answer to all three of these questions.

Others propose the plan because it seems to offer a simpler and less costly way of helping the poor. The complex array of public and private programs, which comprise the welfare-poverty establishment, could be dismantled, they argue, once the poor directly got what they are alleged to need most, i.e., money. Even if this goal were desirable, I doubt whether it could be achieved. Somehow the most minor Washington agency, after having long outlived its original purpose, manages to survive. How much more difficult it would be to substitute direct money payments for the welfare-poverty power structure.

No, I believe the guaranteed income or the negative income tax would be superimposed upon already existing welfare and poverty programs. Interestingly enough, there is a plan which proposes just this: a guaranteed annual income along with an array of welfare and poverty-fighting measures. The trouble with this scheme is that it fails to take into account the human and political realities. To the extent society devoted resources to guarantee income, its commitment to the costly and slow-acting structural correctives would weaken.

Whatever the differences in detail or in justification among the various plans, they are essentially the same in their implications. Each plan is revolutionary because it would break the link between income and work. Each would enshrine in law the concept that society owes every citizen a living regardless of his willingness or ability to work. The lazy and shiftless would benefit as much as the deserving.

We all know individuals who secretly believe that society owes them a living. But, fortunately, society has not yet been willing to concede it. In our culture one generally receives income in relation to his contribution to the production of goods and services. For those unable to work, our public assistance programs have stood as a basic income guarantee, however inadequate. But the guaranteed income scheme omits the test of need and gives income as a matter of right alone. I think the right to public support, to the extent the public is able, exists, but only where the need has been established with reasonable certainty. When the need has not been established, there can be no intelligent program designed to eliminate the reasons for the need.

In my view, the guaranteed income approach would create deep social divisions in society; it would tend to perpetuate poverty and might even worsen it by its impact on economic growth; and it would create a host of administrative problems whose solution would require greater social control of the individual. Furthermore, it would require a new and radically different federal constitution which should be of concern even to academic political scientists.

To treat abnormalities, one must first be able to understand normality. Today in America we are beginning to look at a person's full life—his tender years, his years of education, his productive years and his years of retirement. We have been developing the mechanisms and the programs for spreading a person's lifetime income from his productive and earning years to the non-productive years. The first mechanisms developed were in the nature of savings from the productive years to provide for retirement pensions, annuities and retirement systems. At the same time, we were developing the

mechanisms whereby people could pool their common risks against an untimely diminution of earning capacity from (a) death, (b) disability through accident or sickness, (c) interrupted earnings resulting from e.g. military service and economic downturn, (d) and now obsolescence of skills. So since World War II we have been developing the mechanisms to spread income forward in anticipation of earnings from the more productive years to the less productive years through consumer credit to buy homes, consumer durables and now wisely to provide the capital investment for education. A great deal of today's consumer credit constitutes real savings inasmuch as the expenditures do relate to increased wealth and increased earning capacity, not to mention increased standard of living of the debtor. It is indicative of this understanding of lifetime income that income averaging techniques, crude as they are, were introduced into the federal personal income tax laws in 1964.

The emphasis needed for further development lies in phasing-in individuals and phasing them out of the labor market. One does not abruptly—or should not abruptly—enter the labor market or retire from it. The better retirement systems we are developing permit a phrasing-out utilizing in different ways the talent perfected by experience of the older citizens. The better educational systems use a variety of phasing-in mechanisms.

Above all we are beginning to understand that people are not committed full time in the labor market. The eight hour day and the forty hour week attest this. Hopefully we will begin to move more broadly into the eleven month year and possibly to the concept of the fallow seventh year—the sabbatical leave. However, the women in our society are increasingly developing work patterns of great interest entering the labor market pre-nuptially only to retire for the period of raising children, and then to re-enter later on planned, part time basis which frequently develops into full time employment again.

As rapid technological change continues, skills change and become obsolete. No longer can a skill learned in the formative years assure lifetime employment. Training and retraining on or off the job are increasingly a part of the work pattern. The hard realities of training the unemployables are that they will not be capable of learning the higher skills demanded in the jobs newly created by automation, but those with jobs must be trained and willing to do so, to take the new jobs thus leaving their old but needed jobs available to those below them in the ladder of skills if they too will train. The unskilled and semi-skilled with training will fit into the jobs left vacant by those upgrading their skills.

This process requires understanding, study and constant research to identify the jobs going begging and the skills and training needed to fill them. Just as the rehabilitation program for the physically handicapped requires cooperation by employers to identify the jobs they may have which a one-armed man, for example, might productively fill, so the rehabilitation program for the comparative poor will require similar cooperation and understanding.

Let us consider for a moment the major objections to the guaranteed income.

First, to what extent will common agreement be possible in the support and implementation of a guaranteed income? Assuming both the economic and political feasibility of some plan of guaranteed income, would this assure sufficient and broad enough support to avoid disruptive conflict and social disorganization?

The value system of Western Man has for centuries associated work with income. It is a Judea-Christian ethic with special em-

phasis incorporated in the Protestant norm in American society.

Specifically, can a right to income without work be adopted without creating deep cleavages and conflicts in our society? Is it possible to have a dual set of values and norms; one predicated on income for work and one on income without work? Isn't it possible that the existing gulf between the middle-class culture and the sub-culture of poverty will be deepened and problems of national cohesiveness and accommodation be aggravated?

Any social system is composed of many interrelated units and functions. Any drastic change in one part of the social system will affect the total in many unforeseen and unpredictable ways. We have never been able to predict the total impact of change. Increasingly and frequently we have learned that the treatment of a social problem may produce additional problems and, in the final analysis, the treatment may be worse than the disease. The "side effects" may leave the patient worse off than before.

Second, the plan would help to perpetuate welfare as a way of life by sacrificing social services designed to eliminate the causes of need for an income guarantee. Proponents of guaranteed income plans fail to distinguish between those families and individuals who could and would make good use of an interim guaranteed income grant and those who would not. They also fail to distinguish between those in poverty and those who lead decent lives, although having no margin for waste or luxury. They would create a costly program that would spread our resources over both groups without regard to social priorities or the likelihood of productive use of those resources.

The provision of this "social conscience money" would lull us into a sense of complacency about the poverty problem and divert our attention from the critical need to provide remedial services to the hard-core poor.

In order to solve the problem of comparative-poverty, we must be concerned with much more than providing income. For many of the comparative-poor, providing income would not mean a better diet for the children, improved medical care, more adequate housing, or a move into self-sufficiency. There is evidence that prolonged chronic relief is a factor in the acceptance of a dependency state.

Any real remedy to this chronic poverty must be concerned with cultural change, with an alteration of attitudes toward life and work. This change is particularly required in the urban slums where apathy, social inadequacy, and an inability to cope with the environment are breeding grounds for a form of self-perpetuating poverty that could infect the rest of the population with a host of social ills.

Our resources are ample. However, they must be spent efficiently, that is where they are needed and in an amount sufficient to do the job. This means a deeper commitment and a more intelligent strategy. It means that individuals must not be encouraged to remain in the poverty cycle. Conversely, they must be given specific assistance and direction and not just left to drift for themselves subsisting on a new form of dole.

Even at that, it will be a long and difficult job marked by many setbacks. But I believe our goal can be reached if we concentrate our resources on the areas of need and if we move ahead at a pace consistent with our growing knowledge and understanding of the problem. In this way progress replaces promise in the war on poverty.

We should constantly strive to strengthen our public and private retirement systems and provide basic protections against financial hazards and hardships, including catastrophic illness and unemployment, against

which the individual has no control. But it would be a great mistake to direct our attention and resources from the real poverty problem in this country and put millions of self-respecting and self-sufficient citizens on a new dole that in many cases is neither needed nor wanted. This, I fear, would be one result of the guaranteed income proposal.

Third, the guaranteed annual income would slow down the rate of economic growth by reducing incentives to work and save. Automatically providing an adequate minimum standard of living to any citizen would be sufficient to eliminate incentives to work for most of those unemployed or those earning less than the minimum standard level. Those who earn only slightly more than the minimum might also decide not to work at all. Admittedly, the adverse incentive effect differs among plans, but in every instance there is at least some negative incentive effect. The result would be a lower gross national product and a lower rate of economic growth than would otherwise exist.

A recent empirical study by Professor Lowell E. Gallaway of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce on the "Negative Income Tax Rates and the Elimination of Poverty" is helpful in this area. It throws some interesting light on the individual's labor market response to the receipt of transfer payment income. Professor Gallaway thinks the evidence of his study establishes a basis for a skeptical view of the contribution which the negative income tax can make to improving the income position of poverty groups with a relatively high degree of labor force participation.

Economic growth also would suffer to the extent that a guaranteed annual income weakened incentives to save. With an annual income assured, the future for many individuals would become more certain. Families would be less likely on the whole to save for emergencies, retirement, death, and disability. The pressure on business to make substantial contributions to employee pension funds would also be less urgent, and this source of capital accumulation could decline sharply as well. The likely result would be a higher rate of current consumption, less saving, and a slowdown in the modernization and expansion of plant and equipment.

This is a direct threat to employment opportunities for all those able and willing to work. Such opportunities directly depend upon a high level of investment in the future. The creation of new jobs for our rapidly growing labor force requires substantial growth of investment spending. Moreover, increasing technological progress raises the amount of capital equipment per worker and thus the investment costs of keeping a worker employed and providing the new jobs. The amount of investment required to create a new job in manufacturing has been rising steadily and now is \$19,600 compared to \$14,300 only ten years ago. If we guarantee income, it seems to me that we also would have to devise some scheme to guarantee saving.

The fact that the guaranteed income would have an adverse impact on economic growth grossly understates the real costs of the plan. The proponents have said that it would cost about two percent of GNP. This is misleading in itself, since a more accurate measure of cost to the society's producing element would be a percentage of personal income, after deducting transfer payments and other non-taxable items. But even this cost would be higher if the guaranteed income resulted in a lower level of personal income than would exist in its absence.

Finally, discussions of some form of income guarantee have exhibited a marked indisposition to consider the administrative problems of such a program. Finding workable solutions would require an intensive research effort. Even at that, no in-

come guarantee program, contrary to the hopes of some advocates, could be run without a large-scale administrative organization and an increased degree of social control of the individual.

The first problem is that of defining income. Certain income as defined in the Tax Code would be unacceptable. It is for this reason that any simple negative income tax is not feasible. Two computations of income would be required. First, a person would reckon income for regular income tax purposes. If this computation yielded a net income figure which was low enough to entitle the person to a tentative refund, he would then have to make another computation which in effect added back into his income items excluded in the regular tax computation. The one-half of capital gains excluded from taxable income is one example of income which would have to be added back before a person could claim a "refund." Tax exempt interest is another example.

The second problem is that of fluctuating income. Would we want to permit people to concentrate income in one year and claim a refund in the next year because their income in that year was low? Not everyone is in a position to reallocate income between years, but some people are able to do so. A person could, for example, realize capital gains in one year and capital losses in the next year, claiming a refund in the second year because net income is so low. Business profits and losses often can be shifted between years.

The third problem is that of the weight to be given to wealth in determining entitlement to a payment from the Federal Government. Presently, under public assistance programs, savings as a source of funds for family support is taken into account. But the regular income tax computation takes no account of wealth. However rich a person may be, he might show a negative income in a year and pay no positive tax. The loss might make him eligible for a refund under a negative income tax unless wealth were taken into account in determining eligibility.

The fourth problem arises from the definition of the filing unit. Thus, under the regular income tax a husband and wife may elect to file joint or separate returns. Suppose the husband earns all of the family's income. Should the wife be permitted to file a separate return and claim a negative income tax refund?

If, in the light of these objections, we do not take the guaranteed income route, then how do we eliminate comparative-poverty? First we should take stock of what we are already doing. The fact is that we are doing a great deal. Between 1950 and 1965, the total public and private effort to reduce poverty and human suffering increased 97 percent, measured by constant dollar per capita annual expenditures for health, education, and welfare. During the same 15-year period, the share of the total output of the U.S. economy devoted to these purposes rose from about 13 percent of GNP to over 16 percent. And if we compared this more properly with personal income, these percentages would be even greater. This would be an impressive performance under any circumstances. It is particularly significant in the light of the other heavy and increasing drafts on the economy for defense and space.

One of our first jobs is to make certain that we are spending health, education and welfare funds with the greatest efficiency possible. This is not the case today. Much of our anti-poverty effort is wasteful, redundant, and ineffective. Before even considering vast new outlays on programs such as the guaranteed annual income, we should be certain that we are making the best possible use of the funds now being spent.

In this connection, I think it is essential to review existing policies and programs to determine the extent to which they actually impeded the war on poverty. For example,

our urban renewal programs have primarily benefited the middle third of the Nation, while many of the poor made homeless by these programs have been pressed into other slum areas or areas about to become slums. Our farm programs have poured out hundreds of millions of dollars, but rural poverty persists, and there is evidence to indicate that the distribution of income has actually been worsened because of our agricultural programs. Certainly they have done little or nothing to improve the quality of education or to update the skills of our rural citizens who are particularly handicapped in the urban environment.

We also ought to determine whether the application of our child labor laws may contribute to the unemployment of young people. At the same time, we need to know more about how the minimum wage laws contribute to unemployment among less skilled workers and how our tax laws impede geographical mobility. Another field for study is the tax treatment of individual educational expenses and its impact on upward job mobility. Our unemployment compensation program also could be improved to assist in the reduction of poverty. For example, under the encouragement of the Manpower Training Act of 1962, all states now permit an individual to take training without loss of unemployment benefits. However, we still do not relate improvement of the unemployment insurance system to improvement of our training, rehabilitation and retirement programs and correlate these programs.

We should also determine the poverty-creating effect of the present income limitations applied to those aged persons receiving social security retirement or survivor's payments. We need to know more about whether the aid-to-dependent-children program actually encourages illegitimacy by discouraging remarriage of an AFDC mother, and whether the so-called "man-in-the-house" rule, in effect, contributes to the break up of families and the perpetuation of poverty. We also need to review the extent to which public assistance programs create an incentive for beneficiaries to withdraw from the labor force because of the deduction of earnings from benefits received.

In addition to taking a hard look at present programs and policies, we must remember that economic policy has an important contribution to make toward eliminating poverty. This means that we must strive to maximize economic growth which results in increased wealth both to provide jobs for our rapidly increasing labor force and to have resources available for the fight against poverty.

We have been entirely too much concerned about increasing economic activity (GNP) and too little concerned about being certain that that activity is increasing the true wealth of the society of which the physical wealth is the lesser part. There is not sufficient realization that the greatest wealth a society can possess constitutes the skills of the people and the accumulated knowledge with its ready availability within the society. Our tax laws for example, do not treat employer or personal expenditures for education and training as capital expenditures—which I believe should receive specific tax treatment.

It also means that we must avoid inflation. The constant erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar since the end of World War II has pushed millions of individuals living on fixed incomes below the poverty level and made life even more difficult for those already impoverished. Because of inflation, the purchasing power of social security benefits, even after several increases, has barely kept pace with the rising cost of living.

Finally, general economic policy can make a contribution to the elimination of poverty

by promoting occupational and geographical mobility. In an age of rapid technological change and adjustment it is important that government and private business policies help to promote the maximum of flexible response to changing conditions among our labor force.

There is another precondition to the success of specific and selective anti-poverty measures. That is, the abolition of all unjustifiable discrimination in employment and education based upon race, creed, age, sex, physically handicapped or whatever. In the opinion of many, we have made great strides toward this goal. However, in the opinion of others, we may have gone backwards by failing to distinguish between discrimination based upon real differences which properly require differential economic treatment, from discrimination based upon unreasoned prejudice. Whatever the present movement may be, a sizable amount of unjustifiable discrimination exists as a structural barrier . . . discrimination as a barrier to equal opportunities for all of our citizens.

It would be very helpful in this connection if labor unions, particularly those which use the sanction of government to bind minorities through union shop provisions opened their doors to equal membership opportunities to all persons, particularly to members of minority groups. In many places and in many jobs, union membership is a condition of apprenticeship or employment from a practical if not a legal standpoint. Where this is true, business efforts to find job opportunities for minority Americans can be successful only to the extent that labor unions, with the cooperation of management, not its behind scenes condonation or encouragement which frequently exists, abolish discriminatory practices in their own membership and training programs. Today the values which occur from passing skills from father to son as it were must be realized within a structure which does not exclude others from learning and following these occupations.

Aside from these general considerations, our specific policies to combat poverty must emphasize alleviation, rehabilitation, and prevention.

Alleviating poverty means that every person in need, which means a person facing a basic economic problem the solution of which is beyond his own or his family's capabilities, should have relief from the Community as a whole—to the extent it can afford it. I emphasize the requirement of need. This is what divides me from those who advocate a guaranteed income given to all as a matter of right. I see nothing intrinsically wrong with the requirement of tests to determine need. Whether a means test is acceptable or not is usually a question of how it is administratively determined. The means test obviously should be given so that it infringes upon the rights and dignity of the individual receiving the assistance, in the most minimal way. And I have already indicated that technical problems connected with the guaranteed annual income would require the government to find out a great deal about the individual in order to insure that the intent of the guaranteed income law is carried out in practice.

One of the shortcomings of our present public assistance programs is that benefits are unrelated to specific needs and so are frequently too low to meet even minimum needs established by the states themselves. In other instances, states continue payments after the specific needs have actually disappeared or are within the ability of the individual to make them disappear. Rehabilitative social services are the essence of good welfare programs. The purpose of welfare is to provide income during the period a person is getting onto his own feet again, or getting onto his feet in the first instance.

Our public assistance programs also bypass many of the poor. The federal government

today shares the cost of aid to the blind, aged, permanently disabled, and families with dependent children. Persons not fitting neatly into one of these categories are dependent on state and local general assistance. In 1964, such general assistance provided an average of \$7 a week in support for about 800,000 persons. I can see no justification either for providing assistance by categories or for the federal government participating in one group over another. The problems of determining eligibility for a particular category of assistance is costly in terms of funds and precious professional time which could be better spent in improving social services. I would favor abolishing all categories of assistance and providing aid on the basis of demonstrated and specific need to the unemployed or underemployed poor whose income falls below the minimum standards established by the state itself, geared to programs designed wherever possible to getting them onto or back onto their own feet.

Rehabilitation—our second goal—involves making an all-out effort to make productive and self-sustaining citizens out of all those unable to find or keep a job. This means that everyone of labor force age who is on public welfare—a money income to which our laws give them a right—should have a responsibility under these same laws in return for this right. This responsibility is to take any necessary training or basic education needed to equip themselves to be self-supporting. In order to provide a positive incentive to train or work, I would reduce public assistance benefits substantially less than the added income arising from wages or the training allowance.

The importance of education is illustrated with respect to the aid to dependent children program. The higher the educational attainment of the mother, the less the period of dependence on public assistance. I think this points to another area where rehabilitative services could be critical in getting families off the relief rolls and into the ranks of job holders.

Mothers on aid to dependent children should be encouraged to take basic education and training in job skills. This requires that they receive training allowances and access to day-care facilities for the children. Not only would such centers free the mothers for education and training, but they could provide a creative and enriching experience for the children themselves.

The gloomy predictions about the job-destroying effects of cybernation are unjustifiable. Much of the work of society is not being done today. I think our rehabilitative programs should strive to get these jobs done through working with the job-creation process of private enterprise, even to the extent of providing incentives if this proves to be necessary.

Reforestation, stream clearance, urban beautification, slum cleanups, various educational work-study jobs and even simple maintenance jobs in public buildings are examples of the kind of interim work that could be usefully done by the unskilled and poorly trained. These tasks could be undertaken by private firms under contract to the government with a guarantee that at least the minimum wage would be paid. Not only would this get needed work done, but it would give the former welfare recipient personal satisfaction plus skills and work attitudes that would stand him in good stead in his future employment.

Obviously this covers only a part of the rehabilitative action that is needed. A wide range of social services is needed, and to a large degree is presently available, to advise the poor on legal problems, family budgeting, simple health care, and the like. We should also remember the physically and mentally handicapped. They pose special problems but in most cases rehabilitation is possible and, in some ways, simpler than for those who suffer serious cultural and educational handicaps. Indeed, by studying the tech-

niques that have proved successful in rehabilitating and habituating the physically handicapped people, we can learn a great deal in properly structuring the programs for the culturally or educationally handicapped.

Our final goal is the prevention of new poverty. Here the focus should be on all children, not just those of the poor, with the objective of minimizing school dropouts who later become the unemployable adults. It has been said many times before, but it bears repeating, that the key is high-quality education and training, all along the rungs of the ladder of skills. Also needed is a better understanding among the self-styled intelligencia in our society, that technical training is just as socially important and accordingly should be as socially dignified as liberal arts training. By this statement I do not mean to minimize the importance of liberal arts training which in the past—and still in the minds of all too many in the present—has suffered from both envy and misunderstanding. I do mean to say that in many important educational and social circles there has been an unfortunate downgrading of vocational and technical training which has been a deterrent to getting both the number and quality of persons needed into these fields.

I would hope that by this time our society has reached the intellectual maturity to realize that differences in human beings do not per se spell out superiorities or inferiorities. Differences provide the variety which renders the total society rich, productive, variable, and capable of continuing understanding and innovation. In a society of nightingales with any crow-like voice, I would be discriminated against and justifiably so, and not as a result of bigotry. However, in a society which recognizes its needs for variety in talents and skills hopefully I could identify some talent I truly have, with hard work develop it, and become a citizen self-satisfied from doing a job well and socially satisfied doing a job that needed doing.

The schools for both urban and rural disadvantaged children should be among the best in the country. Who needs good schools more than the children of the poor? Although the situation is improving today, schools in poverty neighborhoods are very often among the worst the country has to offer.

A clean, attractive, well equipped and well-staffed school in a deteriorating neighborhood could serve as an example and an inspiration for many of our disadvantaged children. Both public and private educational groups should direct their attention to improving the quality of schools in poverty neighborhoods.

The states should update the school-grant formulae in their equalization laws which take into account the costs involved in educating children in school districts with low tax bases. Many counties in the United States need to develop equalization laws because within counties just as within municipalities or states there are school districts of low wealth and districts of high wealth. The differentials in these tax bases need to be equalized. Let me say along this line, however, I know of no poor state, with the possible exception of Alaska, that needs federal equalization of tax bases. The common misunderstanding on this point arises from the failure to understand that education, as well as community facilities, are financed from tax systems using wealth as a tax base not income. The per capita income of a state is not the test of whether it can support schools but rather the per capita wealth. Absentee ownership or a poorly structured real estate tax permits many of the lower per capita income states which are reasonably wealthy to talk poor-mouth. If the children of the poor are to get a better education, there will need to be recognition and action on the proposition that expenditures per pupil will need to be higher in these

districts than in those more fortunately endowed.

Breaking the poverty cycle often requires preschool training. The accomplishments of the local and private Head Start Program, which the federal program properly emphasized, indicates that the states are correct in developing these remedial preschool programs on a large scale in poverty areas.

Perhaps the highest priority for the prevention of poverty should be given to providing birth control information to public assistance recipients on a voluntary basis. A broad program to make available birth control information would encourage family planning and reduce the incidence of unsupported children among the poor. I believe that helping the poor control the size of their families offers our most promising opportunity for halting the growth of poverty.

We should also do something for young people who are of working age but who are neither in school nor in a job, those for whom the educational and welfare reforms have come too late. I think we should consider a pilot plan which might mean some subsidization to their employment by private business based upon a comprehensive study of what is already being done in this area. This could involve a program under which business would provide work at less than minimum wages for young people who would not otherwise be employed. The actual wage could be based on an estimate of their productivity and their value to the firm in relation to other employees. In addition, a direct government supplement would be paid to such employees in order to bring them up, if necessary, to a minimum wage. Obviously such a plan would involve administrative problems, but I think it is worth considering. It might well speed the movement of people needed in occupations paying low wages and thus increase the demand for labor in such areas. Perhaps the Human Investment tax credit, which I have proposed, would be sufficient. This is a 7% tax credit comparable to the investment tax credit for capital costs invested in machinery and capital cost invested in training and retraining manpower.

These, then, are some of the possible approaches to guaranteeing opportunity. Obviously there are many others which time has prevented me from mentioning. One thing is clear, the magnitude of the task is immense and requires a continuing effort by the private sector and understanding by all levels of government so that their programs work in conformity with and not against the operation of the private sector.

Guaranteeing opportunity has many advantages. It is positive and assumes that every individual should, and will if the climate is right, make a contribution of his own. It challenges our ingenuity to find ways and means for maximum utilization of our human resources. It is consistent with our value system and what we think we know about human behavior. It would be supported with a greater public consensus. And it would tend to protect the balanced mechanism of freedom with responsibility, calling for less social control of the individual.

In his 1962 State of the Union Message, President Kennedy proposed that amendments to the public welfare program stress "services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work rather than prolonged dependency."

We are far from the mark. Indeed programs going in the opposite direction have been sold under this fine label.

The guaranteed income, the negative income tax and other well meaning programs would take us further afield. We need to develop our society so we can truthfully guarantee opportunities to all who gain satisfaction from doing a meaningful job well; and in this development we will find that

we probably have attained a society where all have ample incomes.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent to Congress his message on protecting our natural heritage. He spoke at great length about the growing problem of air and water pollution. He pointed out the seriousness of this problem and offered some suggestions for meeting the challenge of air and water pollution.

I fully agree with the President when he says that pollution is an urgent problem. Private citizens as well as Federal, State and local governmental units have come to recognize the increasing dangers presented by air and water pollution. We in the Congress have enacted legislation in this area. During the 88th Congress, I was pleased to assist in drafting legislation which culminated in the enactment of the Clean Air Act. And, during the last Congress, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was passed.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we in Colorado have been more fortunate than many of our more industrialized sister States. We have not had the same experiences as California, or New York, or New Jersey. But, Mr. Speaker, pollution is coming to Colorado, and it is coming fast. In a recent issue of Time magazine, the air pollution problem in Denver was summarized in one sentence. Time said:

Rapidly industrializing Denver, which for many years boasted of its crystalline air, is now often smogbound.

We have a similar situation with regard to water pollution. The once sparkling waters of Colorado's many rivers and streams increasingly are becoming clogged with industrial refuse.

There are many persons who share our great concern. Industry itself is concerned. However, it is difficult for private industry and even State and local governments to meet the full challenge of air and water pollution. Pollution abatement is expensive. And, because it is expensive, it often goes unheeded.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we find a means to encourage those who are willing to help meet the challenge of pollution, but who simply cannot because of the tremendous expense involved.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today that will provide a 20-percent incentive tax credit for an industry that undertakes the construction of air or water pollution treatment facilities in cooperation with Federal and State governments on pollution programs. This legislation would enable industries to write off nearly 30 percent of the cost of constructing such facilities over a 5-year period.

The purpose of this legislation is to encourage the immediate construction of

pollution abatement facilities so that no time will be wasted in getting to the heart of the problem. Legislation to require pollution abatement facilities to meet Federal, State, and local standards already has been enacted, and many industries have expressed a willingness to tackle this problem.

A tax credit arrangement would enable them to immediately undertake the construction of the costly facilities without having to wait for the availability of funds from Government grants.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Congress has been attempting to deal with the problem of air and water pollution. As a member of the Public Works Committee for 10 years, I have heard hours of testimony on the problem of water pollution and have heard a multitude of suggestions offered on how to deal with the problem.

In 1961 I supported the water pollution abatement legislation passed during the 87th Congress. However, I pointed out at that time that it seemed to me that more research was needed on how to deal with the problem more effectively and efficiently. I believe that this is still a major problem in control. However, some techniques have been developed and we can start on the awesome task of trying to keep our air clean and to free our rivers and streams from pollution.

For this reason I am joining today with a number of my colleagues in the House in introducing legislation aimed at creating a favorable atmosphere for those who want to join the fight against pollution. Under the legislation I am introducing, a taxpayer would receive a tax credit for undertaking a construction program for air and water pollution abatement facilities. To qualify for the 20-percent tax credit allowable under the provisions of the bill, the facilities to be constructed would have to meet the standards set by appropriate State agencies. This would insure that quality control facilities would be constructed.

The legislation being introduced today will give business and industry an incentive to get into the fight against water and air pollution. The program presented here today, if adopted, would mean that pollution control could take place without a massive program of Federal grants, and therefore could eliminate the costly administration of yet another Federal program.

As I stated earlier, more research in the field of water and air pollution control is needed. New standards must be developed. More efficient methods of pollution control must be found, and with the cooperation of government at all levels and industry, they can be found. I am exploring this possibility and hope to introduce legislation of this

kind to provide for this kind of cooperative effort.

MEDICAL HISTORY MADE AT THE ST. BARNABAS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of considerable pride to me that one of the most advanced medical centers in the world is situated in the congressional district which I represent. The St. Barnabas Medical Center in Livingston, N.J., is a monument to progress, to humanity, and to the healing arts, and it was a deeply impressive experience for me to visit this great institution for the first time less than 2 weeks ago.

Only a few days before my visit, doctors at the center made medical history by using two of the latest medical techniques in conjunction—cryosurgery and hyperbaric medicine—to perform a prostate operation on an 80-year-old patient who might not have survived conventional surgery.

A description of this event was published in the January 19 issue of the West Essex Tribune of Livingston and I include the article at the end of my remarks for the information of our colleagues.

To a great extent, Mr. Speaker, the St. Barnabas Medical Center is a product of the vision and tireless effort of one of this House's most distinguished former Members, the Honorable Robert W. Kean, of Livingston, who served so long and so brilliantly on the Committee on Ways and Means.

As a result of last year's realignment of New Jersey's congressional districts, it is now my privilege to represent Congressman Kean. And it was in his capacity as chairman of the board of St. Barnabas that my notable constituent escorted me throughout this remarkable facility together with his associate, Mr. Anthony Scala, president of the medical center and also a guiding force in bringing it into reality.

As the following news story will illustrate in one particular area, the St. Barnabas Medical Center is unsurpassed in the breadth and scope of its medical and research services, its superior facilities and equipment, and in the significance of the work being done by its staff on the frontiers of medical science.

The article follows:

FIRST OPERATION IN HYPERBARIC CHAMBER AT ST. BARNABAS COMBINED WITH CRYOSURGERY; OPERATION SUCCESSFUL

Physicians at Saint Barnabas Medical Center made medical history on Friday when they combined the two latest medical techniques to perform a prostate operation on an eighty year old patient who they felt would not survive conventional surgery. The procedure marked the first time anywhere

that cryosurgery had been used in conjunction with hyperbaric medicine.

The patient, a resident of Freehold, was suffering from an enlarged prostate, but because of his age and past medical history, physicians were skeptical about using conventional surgical means to remove the gland. It was decided that by using cryosurgery, which is the removal of body tissue by freezing rather than by cutting, the risk could be greatly reduced.

However, physicians also were skeptical about how the operation might affect the cardiovascular system of the patient in view of the fact that he had recently suffered four heart attacks. Because of this it was decided that the operation would take place in the new Hyperbaric Medicine and Research Facility at Saint Barnabas. Hyperbaric medicine is the use of high pressure oxygen either to treat a patient or to aid in a procedure. In this case it was used to decrease the risk involved in the surgery. By performing the operation in the chamber no effort was placed on the cardiovascular and neuromuscular systems which were fully nourished with oxygen at all times. It marked the first time that the newly completed surgical chamber at Saint Barnabas had been used, although the medical chamber, which is a twin to the one used for surgery, is being used extensively.

By combining these two procedures, the risk involved in performing the operation on Frank Krystoff, Jr. of Freehold was greatly reduced. The team of physicians involved in the procedure included Dr. Ward A. Soanes of Buffalo, a consultant in urology at Saint Barnabas, Dr. Robert Lieb, attending physician in urology at Saint Barnabas, Dr. Joseph A. Cox, chief of anesthesiology at the Medical Center, Dr. Charles Abbott, director of Hyperbaric Medicine Department at Saint Barnabas, and Dr. Thomas Libby, coordinator of the Hyperbaric Medicine Team. The entire procedure, which took place under 30 pounds per square inch of pressure, or two atmospheres more than sea level, lasted only 23 minutes and the patient's condition is now listed as "good" by Medical Center officials.

In announcing the procedure Anthony Scala, president of the Medical Center, who assisted in the chamber by handling the technical equipment used for cryosurgery, said, "We at Saint Barnabas are justly proud of what has been accomplished here. It represents a breakthrough in medicine and the public can be assured that we will continue our work both in hyperbaric medicine and cryosurgery."

A MEANS TO HALT WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to join with a number of my colleagues in introducing legislation designed to help combat air and water pollution.

We are all aware that the pollution of our air and water is not a new problem. In the 1940's and early 1950's, people laughed and joked about the smoke in Pittsburgh and smog in Los Angeles. Mr. Speaker, no one laughs anymore.

And during that same period, there

were claims that we should not worry about the silt and waste being pumped into our waters because nature would take care of it, after all, streams are self-cleaning in the sense that bacteria in them break down wastes. Nature used to be able to do its job, Mr. Speaker. Fifty years ago the system worked well. A recent presentation by the League of Women Voters, called "It's Your Decision—Clean Water," explained the reasons this system no longer works. The presentation noted:

Now if the laws of nature worked so well in 1900 why don't they work today? The answer is: they do. Nature hasn't changed, but we have.

Our answer number one is people—three times as many people.

We have given up the simple life for higher standards of prosperity. Instead of the 1900 average of five gallons of water used in the home per person per day, it is now estimated we use an average of 50 gallons of water per person per day and 150 gallons if we include both domestic and municipal services from 1500 to 2000 gallons per person per day to supply us with the products of agriculture and industry.

Which brings us to answer Number 3—products. Few people realize the amount of water required for all the products of this highly complex society.

During the last 20 years we have created six times as much pollution for each individual in the nation. Raw sewage, industrial wastes, drainage from farmlands, all the side effects of more people, more prosperity and more products.

Mr. Speaker, I think this clearly points out the problem we face. Nature can no longer do the job for us. We must provide a better answer in order to insure both clean air and clean water. In some areas this problem is reaching crisis proportions.

The State of Wisconsin today has one of the most farsighted and toughest water pollution laws in the United States. Wisconsin has been a leader in the fight for clean water. We must, however, as a nation, increase our efforts to arrest environmental contamination.

The bill my colleagues and I have introduced today is designed to aid nature. It is designed to provide incentive to the genius of private enterprise to do the job. This legislation will encourage industry to act promptly in building facilities to control water and air pollution by providing a 20-percent investment tax credit for the installation of control equipment. I trust this Congress will consider very carefully this much-needed legislation.

HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EXPORT CONTROL

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] 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 Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a House resolution providing for the reestablishment of the House Select Committee on Export Control.

The function of this select committee would be to conduct a full investigation of the operations of the Export Control Act of 1949.

A study of this kind is essential in view of the complex issues which face us with regard to U.S. trade with Communist countries. It is needed because of the proposals which have been made by the President and because of actions already taken by the executive branch in the direction of expanded trade with these Communist nations.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution states:

The Congress shall have power . . . to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

In 1949 the Congress passed the Export Control Act on the basis of its constitutional authority. The objective was to help "regulate" U.S. commerce with nations in cases where our national interests might be adversely affected.

But today Congress has no effective committee with the responsibility and equipment needed to ascertain whether provisions of the Export Control Act are actually in force, or whether new legislation is now needed.

My resolution would fill the gap, and would give us the tool we need to handle our responsibility in this important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that in some circles the Constitution is considered as an outdated document which is not adequate for a changing world. Further than that, there are those who feel that Congress itself is only a quaint and interesting institution, valued more as a tourist attraction than as one of the three coequal branches of the Federal Government.

Of course I do not subscribe to these notions. But I do believe that we had better heed the Constitution until we devise something better, or prepare to give up the whole idea of representative government.

And I believe that Congress has an obligation to accept and to fulfill its constitutional responsibility in vital matters of national policy.

The question of East-West trade is one of these matters of national policy. The President has proposed that we expand this trade. Actions of the executive branch have already been taken to expand U.S. trade with Communist nations.

It may be that these actions, those taken and those proposed, are indeed in our national interest. I rather doubt it; but at any rate, Congress has not informed itself adequately on the issue. It is time that we learn more about it.

Observations of recent events indicate serious contradictions in any U.S. eagerness to expand East-West trade. These contradictions cry out for explanation.

For example, our Government has imposed a blockade on trade with Cuba. We ask other nations to refrain from trading with Cuba because Cuba's Communist government is unfriendly to us.

Just a few days ago the United Kingdom agreed to grant 5 years' credit to Cuba to be used for the construction of a \$39 million fertilizer plant by a British firm.

In 1964 a British firm was allowed by its Government to sell \$22 million worth of buses to Cuba. In 1965 British exports to Cuba amounted to \$70 million. In the first 9 months of 1966 they totalled nearly \$19 million.

Our State Department apparently has raised objections, publicly or privately, with the United Kingdom regarding this trade.

But how can we do this when we ourselves are now evidently engaged in expanding trade with Russia and other Communist countries?

An even more basic contradiction presents itself when we ascertain the positions of the U.S.S.R. and this country with respect to each other.

President Johnson speaks of "building bridges" and we continually hear of the need for additional U.S. gestures of good will as a means of breaking down the deep and longstanding suspicion which the Kremlin is said to harbor against the United States.

For more than 20 years now, ever since the American armies of World War II took deliberate action to allow the Russian army to capture Berlin ahead of us, we have been told of the need for gestures of good will.

In October of last year our Government decided to drop restrictions on the export of many kinds of goods to Russia. And while the official announcement stressed that the goods included things like food and medicine, the list also included jet airplane engines, diesel engines, machine tools, and various chemical and scientific instruments.

At the same time it was announced that the Export-Import Bank, supported primarily by the United States, would finance exports of U.S. automobile machinery with which to equip a huge automobile plant in Russia.

And while this is going on the whole world knows that Russia and other Communist nations are supplying military equipment to North Vietnam for use against American soldiers in South Vietnam.

The Communists make no secret of this. In fact they boast of it in their newspapers and on their worldwide radio broadcasts. They vow to support Hanoi against the "American imperialists."

We are even persuaded that we must not make trouble for the Communists in the Haiphong Harbor, through which North Vietnam imports much of its material, because if we do we might damage some of the Russian ships unloading military supplies there.

It is well known by every schoolboy that international communism has long been able to use world commerce as a major weapon in its arsenal.

If there is any evidence that the U.S.S.R. has changed its course, has modified its objectives centered around the triumph of communism over capitalism, then let us hear about it.

If there is any evidence that Russia has abandoned its trade offensive, including a very significant buildup of her merchant shipping strength, then let us hear of it.

The evidence most of us have, shows the opposite: that Russia is stepping up her emphasis on international trade as a means of "burying us".

Many of us feel that for every "bridge" we try to build with the Communist world, Russia will ask for and get two more agreements giving her favorable trade with the United States. History shows that this is what has happened.

The need for congressional study in this matter is further highlighted by what apparently is evasiveness of the executive branch in letting the country know what is going on.

As others have pointed out, the Commerce Department said in October that in deciding to relax export restrictions to Communist countries consultation had been made with the intelligence community. But investigation has shown that no such consultation had in fact been undertaken.

These are all matters that need clarification. They need congressional attention at an early date. A Select Committee on Export Control did function in the House during the 87th Congress.

I urge the Congress to give full consideration to the need for reestablishment of the House Select Committee on Export Control as a means of accepting the congressional responsibility as provided expressly in the Constitution.

The time is late, and must not be allowed to become too late.

THE 1968 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZABLOCKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the President's current budget now under consideration, which came up to the House a week ago yesterday, projects a deficit in fiscal year 1968 of \$8.1 billion; but the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, in a speech here a week ago today, said that this low projection is based upon a number of assumptions and contingencies, all of which will have to be met if the deficit is to remain under \$18 billion next year.

Among those assumptions is that the level of economic activity will continue high in order to produce substantially higher funds from individual income taxes. Right at this point I might remind the House today that the projection of receipts from corporate income taxes next year is substantially lower than this year. This result follows by reason of the gimmick brought into play last year by the Administration in requiring the acceleration of corporate income tax payments. That was a one-shot proposition, as many of us pointed out at the time, and the results will be felt next year when receipts from corporate income taxes will be lower than they are this year.

There are several other contingencies involved. Many of them require legislative action which Congress on previous occasions has declined to approve. Another contingency is that Congress will

raise first-class postal rates by 20 percent. It is also contingent on the imposition of a 6 percent surcharge on corporate and income taxes as the President recommends. It is also contingent on the Government being able to dispose of around \$5 billion in participation certificates.

This use of participation certificates is a real interesting little device by which the level of expenditures by Government agencies is pretended to be held down. The amount of funds received by an agency as a result of the sale of PC's can be counted as a reduction of expenditures rather than a receipt by virtue of the peculiar way in which the books are kept around here. Of course, these certificates cannot be sold on the open market for their face value, because the interest return is less than an investor can get on his investments elsewhere.

So, Mr. Speaker, in order to induce an investor to buy one of these certificates, the Government has to subsidize the interest. Therefore, Congress, this year, will be requested to provide, out of the General Treasury, a subsidy of x number of dollars, depending upon how many of the certificates are disposed of in order to bring the level of return on these certificates up to the level at which an investor would invest his money therein.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this is alleged to be a sale. But, it is not a sale. It is simply a clever way of borrowing money without having it added to the national debt. The title to the mortgages will be retained by the Government; the Government will continue to service the loans and will guarantee the repayment of the sums advanced by the purchasers of the participating certificates.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has ruled that these obligations are similar to general obligations of the Federal Government. Therefore, the \$5 billion, if we sell that many next year, should be added to the national debt, but will not be. This is just a convenient way of borrowing money for additional spending without having it reflected in the national debt. But, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the contingencies, and there are some others.

Mr. Speaker, unless all these contingencies are met and unless all of the assumptions stand up, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, the deficit next year might well be \$18 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a man from Mars who might be visiting this continent would think we are all off—if he should examine this budget. As a matter of fact, it takes a magician to figure out what the budget contemplates in the way of spending next year, because there are five separate sets of figures in the budget showing different levels of spending.

One set of figures is used in the administrative budget. It covers only estimated receipts and proposed expenditures of funds owned by the Government. It is shown on table 1 of page 41 of the budget and lists estimated receipts for 1968 at \$126.9 billion and expenditures at \$135 billion—for a deficit of \$8.1 billion.

Another set of figures is used in the consolidated cash budget. It is shown on table 2 of page 41 of the budget and records the flow of money between the Government and the public on a cash basis, including trust fund transactions. It lists estimated receipts from the public at \$168.1 billion during 1968 and projected payments to the public at \$272.4 billion—for a deficit of \$4.3 billion.

The third set of figures is used in the national income accounts budget. It is shown on table 3 of page 43 of the budget and includes actual cash receipts and expenditures plus accruals but excludes loans and receipts from the sale of loans. Estimated receipts for 1968 are listed in this table at \$167.1 billion and expenditures at \$169.2 billion—for a deficit of \$2.1 billion.

The fourth set of figures is used to show gross expenditures of Government-administered funds. It appears on table B-9 on page 413 of the budget, and shows that gross expenditures on a checks-issued basis will in 1968 reach the fantastic total of \$210.2 billion.

The fifth set of figures is used to show new obligational authority requested of Congress. The amount requested is shown on tables 4 and 5 on pages 44 and 45 of the budget. These tables show that the President is requesting \$144 billion in new obligational authority. This means that he is requesting Congress to appropriate that much additional money for fiscal year 1968. The request this year is for \$17.5 billion more than was requested in the original budget submission for fiscal year 1966.

It is this \$144 billion in new obligational authority which the House Committee on Appropriations will be considering in hearings this spring. What Congress appropriates for fiscal year 1968 will not control the level of spending in 1968 or even thereafter because while some of whatever is appropriated will be spent in 1968 some will be retained for spending in subsequent years. But of one thing we all can be sure, the President does not have a dime to spend that Congress does not first authorize and later appropriate—so whatever amount of the \$144 billion in requested new obligational authority is denied—can never be spent because it will not be available.

It must not be forgotten that, while the President is only asking Congress to appropriate new money in the amount of \$144 billion next year, expenditures are projected at \$210 billion in the gross expenditures budget, at \$172.4 billion in the cash budget, at \$169.2 billion in the national income accounts budget, and at \$135 billion in the administrative budget.

The funds that will be spent next year, in addition to those appropriated in new obligational authority, will come out of a backlog of \$125 billion in previously appropriated but unspent funds. The budget estimates that, at the end of fiscal year 1968, this pool of unspent funds will amount to \$132.8 billion, and this money, of course, will be available for expenditures in 1969 and beyond.

But some of the money in this pool, while unspent, will already have been obligated by the time we come to the end of 1968, but not all of it. The balances of obligated authority by agency are shown in table 10 of page 51 of the budget and show, for example, that \$9.5 billion will remain unobligated at the end of 1968 in funds appropriated to the President, that \$2.5 billion will remain unobligated in the Department of Agriculture, and that \$8.6 billion will remain unobligated in other independent agencies not listed in the table. The total of unobligated funds to be on hand in the executive branch of the Government at the end of 1968 will be \$49.5 billion as will be shown in table 10.

While it is understood that some lead-time is necessary, particularly in areas such as construction, research and development, and the procurement of material requiring manufacture, it seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations has a clear duty to make a close and searching examination of the need to maintain these huge unobligated sums of money. It is possible that this examination will disclose a clear necessity to carry over this \$50 billion into 1969 but at the same time it is possible that a close and careful examination will disclose that all of it is not so required. And for any part of these unobligated funds that we can pry loose for use in 1968, we can reduce the request for new obligational authority by that same amount. The job of making this examination will fall on each subcommittee and for whatever it may be worth I strongly recommend aggressive action in this area because I believe an extra effort will bear fruit and enhance our opportunity to make substantial cuts in the requests for new obligational authority—new appropriations.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for the very fine and thorough statement that he is making concerning this budget.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question apropos of the subject he has just dealt with, the subject of unobligated balances.

Is it not a rather strange phenomenon that the House of Representatives and the Senate, that is the Congress of the United States, cannot under the rules of the House at least repeal an appropriation or unappropriate funds that have been appropriated? It has always seemed to me to be singularly unwise for such a situation to exist.

We know that in past years funds have been appropriated for purposes that are no longer valid and I, for one, have suggested, and I know that other Members have, that when we consider revising the rules of the House and reorganizing the House as we sometimes do, that we ought to deal with this situation and make it possible for the House today to repeal or to rescind an unwise appropriation, which appropriation had been made in

years past; or perhaps in the case of an appropriation which was wise when it was made but as to which the purpose originally existing is no longer in existence or may be invalid as of today.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman. About the only way we can attack that problem is to take into consideration, in granting new obligational authority for specific agencies, if there are any strings tied to the funds they wish to carry over.

While we are on the subject of unobligated balances, just to give you an idea where some of this money will be: \$9½ billion is in funds appropriated to the President—not to the Department of Defense and not to any other Department—but foreign aid and other funds appropriated to the President. That is \$9½ billion; \$2,500 million will be in the Department of Agriculture; \$8.6 billion will remain in other independent agencies lumped together in the table and not identified by the specific agency.

I think the job of examining these unobligated balances is one that should come to the attention of the subcommittee members who will be considering this budget.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

There are several other areas in which substantial savings can be made. One is in the field of civilian employment in the executive branch, which has been growing by leaps and bounds under this administration. Table 4 on page 53 of the budget document shows this growth trend in jobs:

1966	2,366,317
1967	2,546,500
1968 (budget estimate)	2,615,000

As recently as a year ago last December, the President announced at the Texas White House an administration plan to eliminate at least 25,000 Government jobs. The record shows that the results did not live up to the advance billing.

At the time this plan was announced there were 1,947,066 permanent civilian employees of the Government, of which number 791,292 were engaged in defense work. But by June 30, 1966, civilian employment had climbed to 2,366,317 of which 1,052,998 were in the Defense Department. While this substantial increase was taking place in the Defense Department, no doubt attributable to escalation of the war in Vietnam, you would think civilian agencies would be redoubling their efforts to comply with the President's directive to reduce employment by 1 percent. But that was not the case. Instead of showing any decrease, nondefense employment increased by 157,545 employees or 13.6 percent.

The President currently anticipates that permanent civilian employment will total 2,546,500 at the end of June, of which nondefense jobs will total 1,366,000 or a further increase of 52,681 jobs in nondefense activities.

And the budget projects a full-time employment total of 2,615,000 at June

30, 1968, of which 1,410,000 will be in nondefense areas. This is a further increase of 44,100 nondefense employees planned for fiscal year 1968.

To recapitulate, notwithstanding the President's announcement of December 1, 1965, of his plan to reduce civilian employment by 25,000, here is what has happened:

	Increases in employment		
	Total	Defense	Non-defense
Dec. 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966	419,251	261,706	157,545
June 30, 1966, to June 30, 1967	180,183	127,502	52,681
June 30, 1967, to June 30, 1968	68,500	24,400	44,100
Total	667,934	413,608	254,326

As of June 30 last, the Civil Service Commission estimated the average Federal civilian employee's salary at \$7,904. And this does not count the cost of fringe benefits, space and supplies necessary to keep one employee on board. On an annual basis, the salary cost alone for the 667,934 new employees added to the rolls since December 1, 1965—through June 30, 1968, as projected—will be \$5.3 billion, and this does not even include collateral costs of providing work space, supplies, and for fringe benefits, and so forth. And this is a recurring cost as long as the jobs are filled.

The following table will show full-time jobs by agency for the years 1966, 1967, and 1968:

Full-time permanent civilian employment in the executive branch as of June

	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate	Comparison	
				1967 with 1966	1968 with 1966
Agriculture	84,070	84,400	85,800	+330	+1,730
Commerce	25,133	25,100	26,800	-33	+1,667
Defense, civil	30,290	32,300	33,000	+2,010	+2,710
Health, Education, and Welfare	91,650	95,900	99,800	+4,250	+8,150
Housing and Urban Development	14,009	14,200	15,400	+191	+1,391
Interior	59,432	60,200	62,100	+768	+2,668
Justice	33,067	33,100	33,700	+33	+633
Labor	9,208	9,250	9,800	+42	+592
Post Office	489,898	525,000	539,300	+35,102	+49,402
State	24,572	25,000	25,400	+428	+828
Agency for International Development	14,892	16,800	17,500	+1,908	+2,608
Peace Corps	1,168	1,240	1,600	+82	+442
Transportation	52,924	53,850	55,800	+926	+2,876
Treasury	80,176	80,900	83,200	+724	+3,024
Atomic Energy Commission	6,974	7,010	7,200	+36	+226
General Services Administration	35,955	36,600	37,500	+645	+1,545
NASA	33,526	33,600	34,000	+74	+474
Veterans' Administration	147,634	149,300	154,200	+1,666	+6,566
Selective Service System	6,969	6,300	6,300	-669	-669
Small Business Administration	3,862	4,050	4,800	+188	+938
Tennessee Valley Authority	11,486	11,800	12,300	+314	+814
Panama Canal	14,129	14,600	14,900	+471	+771
U.S. Information Agency	11,516	11,900	12,000	+384	+484
Miscellaneous agencies	30,789	31,700	32,900	+911	+2,111
Allowance for contingencies		1,900	4,800	+1,900	+4,800
Subtotal	1,313,319	1,366,000	1,410,100	+52,682	+96,781
Department of Defense, military and military assistance	1,052,998	1,180,500	1,204,900	+127,502	+151,902
Total	2,366,317	2,546,500	2,615,000	+180,183	+248,683

The foregoing comments and the table refer only to full-time employment. The budget projects a total of 266,500 part-time employees in 1968 which, of course, will have to be added to the full-time employment shown above so the total number on the payroll in 1968 will be above 2,800,000.

I would invite your attention to a report and statement released to the press yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who is chairman of our House Committee on Appropriations, but who issued the statement in his capacity as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. His report shows that civilian employment by the executive agencies of the Federal Government increased by 104,444 persons during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year.

Now some of these new jobs may be justified in agencies such as the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, and perhaps the Internal Revenue

Service; but I submit that when a President announces that he is going to reduce civilian employment by 1 percent and instead of a reduction there is the substantial increase noted above, I think the heads of the civilian agencies of the Government ought to be brought to task and made to justify in detail the need for these increases. I frankly doubt if a good case can be made to increase personnel in the Department of Agriculture and in some of the other purely civilian departments and agencies. So I recommend to the committee that here is a big field in which to explore for reductions. Remember that in 1968 we will be dealing with a total payroll of \$23.3 billion. For every job we cut out there will be a corresponding saving of approximately \$7,904 in salary alone. If we could eliminate 100,000 of the 254,000 jobs that have been created in non-defense areas since 1965, the saving would amount to nearly a billion dollars a year, and remember that this saving

will be on an annual basis and recur every year.

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would permit, I would like to study for a moment another aspect of this budget-spending proposition in relation to the highway trust funds. The Secretary is directed to invest in short-term loans the money which is in the trust fund, and it is my understanding that at the present time about \$1.1 billion has been borrowed from that fund.

Now, the President—and we would not want to doubt his intention—has asked for a rollback in the highway construction program as an economy coolant.

But is it not a fact that this \$1.1 billion from the highway trust fund has been spent in reality, and that to replenish it, so the highway program can proceed at a normal speed, we would have to have an additional source of revenue for that \$1.1 billion which has been borrowed, or else raise the debt ceiling to get to it? Is that not correct?

Mr. JONAS. I do not know any other way to do it, unless we just turn on the printing presses, which is about what we have been doing.

Mr. KYL. While the intention in collecting the highway construction program funds may be a perfectly legitimate motive, this does in fact hide some Government spending, does it not?

Mr. JONAS. That is quite correct.

I thought the gentleman was going to refer to another proposal of the President to divert out of the administration's budget the highway beautification and safety money and transfer that to the trust fund in 1968, but I would be glad to yield to the gentleman further if he wishes me to.

Mr. KYL. No, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, let me hurry along and move now to one other area which is deserving of very careful consideration. This is a broad area and not a specific project. Then I will have a recommendation to make about how I believe we can proceed through reductions in these specific areas to accomplish the objective of reducing the request for new obligational authority by a sufficient amount to obviate a tax increase.

OTHER OBJECTS

The next area is one we refer to in the budget hearings as "Other objects." In every agency justification there will be a table giving a breakdown of obligations by objects, including travel, transportation of things, printing, supplies, utilities, and so forth. There is no summary of these objects in the budget. For the last several years I have asked for such a summary and always receive it, but usually it comes in a month or two after the budget document has been submitted. I have asked for such a summary this year, but it will be delayed again. Based on the summary supplied last year, I predict that it will contain some shocking information and will open up another area for substantial budget cutting. For example, here are a few

items taken from the summary provided last year:

	Billion
Personnel travel (civilian, \$442 million)	\$1.7
Transportation of things	3.8
Printing and reproductions305
Supplies and materials	28.5
Grants, subsidies, and contributions ..	20.9
Rents, communications, and utilities ..	2.4

Obviously cuts proposed in the area of "other objects" cannot be pinpointed until the individual justifications are received, but I believe the committee should give close and careful attention to these "other objects" because I believe that these large sums can be reduced substantially without damage.

GROWTH IN FEDERAL SPENDING

The last year we had a balanced budget and paid anything on the national debt—\$1.2 billion—was 1960. Since then there has been a succession of deficits—red ink on the Government's books continuously. The impression is sought to be left that these deficits have been caused solely by the escalating war in Vietnam. That is not true as the following figures will show:

In fiscal year 1966 spending was up to \$107 billion from the \$76.5 billion level registered in 1960. The 1966 total was up to \$10.5 billion over 1965 and of that total \$7.5 billion was for defense while \$3 billion was for nondefense purposes.

In fiscal year 1967 the latest spending estimate is \$126.7 billion or \$19.7 billion over 1966, of which \$12.5 billion is attributable to defense and \$7.2 billion to non-defense.

Proposed spending in fiscal year 1968 is estimated to increase still further to \$135 billion—\$8.3 billion for defense and \$3 billion for nondefense.

Thus, unless Congress practices restraint and refuses to follow the administration's unsound fiscal policies, nondefense spending will have increased during the brief period of 3 years—1966, 1967, and 1968—by \$13.2 billion—3 years in which we have seen a vast acceleration of the war in Vietnam.

Never before in the history of this great Nation when we were at war have we attempted to operate the Government on a "business as usual" basis. In World War II and in the Korean conflict, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman recognized the absolute necessity of curtailment nondefense spending and took prompt action to accomplish that goal.

Instead of following examples that served our country well, this administration continued full steam ahead and has increased nondefense spending substantially ever since the decision was made to escalate the war.

Instead of slowing down the rate of nondefense spending to balance the increasing costs of the war, the administration has adopted and is sponsoring a number of restrictive, unsound, and, in some cases, unfair policies designed to increase revenues to make it appear that the deficit is smaller than it really is:

First. It caused the suspension of the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation provisions.

Second. It forced corporations to speed up their income tax payments and

proposes another speedup this year to increase revenues \$800 million this year.

Third. It inaugurated a policy of deliberate overwithholding of individual income taxes and forced taxpayers to be unwilling lenders of money to the Government and collect only by claiming and winning refunds.

Fourth. It now proposes to superimpose a 6-percent tax surcharge on corporate and individual income taxes.

Fifth. It proposes a 20-percent increase in first-class postage.

Sixth. It is cashing in on capital assets by selling participating certificates—pools of Government-owned mortgages and, instead of applying the proceeds to a reduction of the national debt as it should do, is using those proceeds for general operating expenses in order to hold down appropriations. And to add insult to injury, the administration is paying the purchasers of those participating certificates a cash subsidy to bring the yield up to a level to attract purchasers.

Seventh. And it is engaging in other questionable practices all designed to make it appear that we are spending less than is the case.

Despite the use of all these, and other gimmicks, and one-shot in the arm tactics, the deficits continue to mount and the more money that rolls in the higher the spending goes in both defense and nondefense activities.

Thus we have an administrative budget for 1968 which, although receipts in 1968 are estimated to be substantially higher than for 1967, the 1968 deficit is projected to be \$8.3 billion which will be added to the national debt to take it up to \$335 billion.

REDUCTIONS CAN BE MADE

In the light of the foregoing, it is imperative that the administration and the Congress tighten their nondefense spending belts to avoid the necessity for further tax increases and the chance of a recession. What then should be done? One very valid suggestion would be for the administration and Congress to immediately exert every effort to roll 1967 and 1968 nondefense spending, exclusive of interest, back to the \$37,763 million level of fiscal 1966, which ended just 7 months ago. If such an effort were undertaken, it is reasonable to expect that one-half of the \$6 billion spending increase in 1967 over 1966, or \$3 billion, could be saved in the remaining months of the current year and all of the \$7.3 billion increase in 1968 over 1966 could be saved. This effort could reduce planned and proposed spending in the 1967 and 1968 fiscal years by as much as \$10 billion. And the only dislocation would be that resulting from rolling back nondefense spending levels to those in effect 7 months ago.

Despite repeated statements by the President, his advisers, and others that so very small a part of the budget is controllable, every dollar and cent which the Federal Establishment spends can be controlled by the administration and the Congress, acting in concert to set ceilings on spending and to suspend or stretch out civilian programs which

providence dictates we should do until the war is over.

The table which follows details in a broad functional outline Federal spend-

ing in fiscals 1960, 1966, 1967, and 1968. It is broken down to show expenditures for national defense, for interest, and for nondefense purposes:

Expenditures

[In millions of dollars]

	1960 actual	1966 actual	1967 estimate	1968 estimate
National defense:				
Military.....	41,215	54,409	66,950	72,300
Military assistance.....	1,609	968	1,000	800
Atomic energy and defense related activities.....	2,867	2,341	2,271	2,387
Total, national defense.....	45,691	57,718	70,222	75,487
Nondefense:				
International affairs and finance.....	3,195	4,191	4,608	4,797
Space research and technology.....	401	5,933	5,600	5,300
Agriculture and agricultural resources.....	3,475	3,307	3,035	3,173
Natural resources.....	1,798	3,120	3,226	3,518
Commerce and transportation.....	1,963	2,969	3,495	3,089
Housing and community development.....	122	347	890	1,023
Health, labor, and welfare.....	3,650	7,574	10,389	11,304
Education.....	866	2,834	3,304	2,816
Veterans benefits.....	5,266	5,023	6,394	6,124
General government.....	1,542	2,464	2,725	2,781
Total, nondefense.....	22,277	37,762	43,666	43,925
Interest:				
Civilian and military pay increase.....	9,266	12,132	13,508	14,152
Possible shortfall in asset sales.....				1,000
Contingencies.....			100	750
Interfund transactions.....	-694	-635	-766	400
Total.....	76,539	106,978	126,729	135,033

relate interest to income, you will find it is taking 11 cents out of every dollar received by the Government in individual, corporate, estate, and excise taxes, plus custom receipts, just to pay the interest on the national debt. This leaves only 89 cents out of each dollar to pay for national security and the various other programs of the Federal Government. You have to go all the way back to 1950 before this high ratio is exceeded, and it has been exceeded only 10 times during the last 46 years.

I believe it is time to call a halt to deficit financing. Let us refuse to increase this burden of debt. Let us demand that the Government begin to live within its means and stop borrowing more money to pay current bills. We owe this to our constituents and to future generations. Every generation should pay for its own mistakes and for its own benefits. Let us not leave our children a heritage of burdensome debt. We can do our part by reducing this current budget by a sufficient amount to bring it in balance and leave a surplus which can be used to reduce the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be easy to cut \$4 or \$5 billion out of this budget. It is never easy to do so. That is why service on the Committee on Appropriations is really a very frustrating experience. That is why I always wonder that so many of our newly elected Members want to serve on this committee. I said to one new Member just the other day, after he was placed on the committee, "We are mighty glad to have you on the committee and I look forward to working with you." But, I added, "If you got on this committee hoping to win friends to increase your popularity, you got on the wrong committee." He replied, "I did not come to Congress to increase my popularity." I said, "More power to you; congratulations."

Mr. Speaker, if all of us adopt that attitude and go to work on this budget in a realistic way, with the idea of striking a blow to preserve the fiscal integrity of our country and to protect it against the inflationary assaults that continually buffet it, and if we mean what we say when we say we are for economy, we can guide those who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations to areas in which we believe budget cuts can be made, cuts which can be made without sacrificing the security of this country to any degree whatsoever or without curtailing any essential services.

Mr. Speaker, the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations made a calculation which shows that during the last 14 years the House Committee on Appropriations has cut the budgets submitted by four Presidents by a total of more than \$50 billion. All of it did not stand up, because the House did not follow the recommendations of its committee in every instance, and there is another body across the Capitol which has a right to have its say in the appropriations process. However, if the Congress of the United States had followed the recommendations of the House Committee on Appropriations over the years, the national debt would be \$50 billion lower

CONTINUOUS DEFICITS AND MOUNTING DEBT MUST STOP

The budget estimates that the Government will wind up the current fiscal year on June 30, 1967, showing a deficit of \$9.7 billion.

The budget projects the deficit next year at \$8.1 billion.

This means that, at the end of fiscal year 1968, we will have permitted the U.S. Government for 8 successive years to spend more than it has taken in; that we have been operating in the red for 96 successive months; and that the accumulated deficit during that period will reach \$48.3 billion.

The following table will show the annual deficit since 1960, which was the last year we balanced the Government's books and paid anything on the national debt:

[In billions]

Year	Deficit
1961.....	\$3.9
1962.....	6.4
1963.....	6.3
1964.....	8.2
1965.....	3.4
1966.....	2.3
1967.....	9.7
1968.....	8.1
Total.....	48.3

Is it not ridiculous that during these years since 1960, which are alleged to have been the most prosperous in our country's history, the Government has run up a deficit in every single one of them?

Now, faced with a national debt of \$330 billion, a record of six successive budget deficits, and the continuation of a costly war in Vietnam, what kind of fiscal discipline does the President propose? Does he issue a call to arms for economy? Does he urge harder work and more sacrifice? Does he ask that the country agree to defer some of the things it might want or even need but which can be post-

poned until our financial house is in order?

No, he does none of these things. He proposes to continue to spend and spend; to increase taxes and raise postage rates; and to borrow and borrow, thus adding to the already badly swollen national debt.

This would not be so bad if we had a modest debt, but it is quite serious when considered in the light of the fact that at present this debt is larger than the combined debts of the other countries of the world put together. We have already borrowed the money to make up the deficits accumulated in the last 6 years and now it is proposed to borrow more to make up the deficits projected for this year and next, so that at the end of 1968 it is estimated that the national debt will be \$335.4 billion.

The carrying charges on this fantastic debt have gone up also from \$9 billion a year in 1960 to \$14 billion projected for 1968. Here we are paying out \$14 billion a year just for the privilege of refusing to curtail this enormous debt, and adding to the debt each year and thereby increasing the interest charges.

Let me give you something to think about with respect to this interest. In just 23½ years we will pay out, in interest alone, an amount equal to the national debt but will still owe every dime of the principal. It has been figured out that if we would just begin to reduce the debt by 1 percent a year, in less than 30 years we would have paid the principal down to a sufficient point that we could continue to pay interest and curtail principal at 1 percent a year without paying out any more than we are now paying in interest alone.

Administration spokesmen like to relate the interest on the national debt to the gross national product. I do not think that is a realistic relationship and believe that interest should more properly be related to income. If you

than it is today and we would not be in the serious fiscal situation in which our country finds itself today.

Mr. Speaker, I shall insert into the RECORD as a part of my remarks tables that will contain some helpful information for those who take this issue to heart and who are concerned over our country's drift toward financial ruin. We can avoid that if we act now but it will demand a special and determined effort by all who believe in fiscal responsibility, sound money, and the payment of debts.

Cash budget
[In billions]

1966	
Receipts from public.....	\$134.5
Payments to the public.....	137.8
Deficit	3.3
1967	
Receipts from public.....	154.7
Payments to the public.....	160.9
Deficit	6.2
1968	
Receipts from public.....	168.1
Payments to the public.....	172.4
Deficit	4.3
1966	
Defense	58.5
Nondefense	79.3
1967	
Defense	71.3
Nondefense	89.6
1968	
Defense	76.8
Nondefense	95.6
Defense up in 1968 over 1966: \$18.3 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1966: \$16.3 billion.	
Defense up in 1968 over 1967: \$5.5 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1967: \$6 billion.	

Administrative budget
[In billions]

1966	
Receipts	\$104.7
Expenditures	107.0
Deficit	2.3
1967	
Receipts	117.0
Expenditures	126.7
Deficit	9.7
1968	
Receipts	126.9
Expenditures	135.0
Deficit	8.1
EXPENDITURES	
Defense (1966).....	57.7
Nondefense (1966).....	49.3
Defense (1967).....	70.2
Nondefense (1967).....	56.5
Defense (1968).....	75.5
Nondefense (1968).....	59.5
Defense expenditures up in 1968 over 1966: \$17.8 billion.	
Nondefense expenditures up in 1968 over 1966: \$10.2 billion.	
Defense up in 1968 over 1967: \$5.3 billion.	
Nondefense expenditures up in 1968 over 1967: \$3.0 billion.	

National income accounts budget

[In billions]	
1966	
Receipts	\$132.6
Expenditures	132.3
Surplus3
1967	
Receipts	149.8
Expenditures	153.6
Deficit	3.8
1968	
Receipts	167.1
Expenditures	169.2
Deficit	2.1
EXPENDITURES	
Defense (1966).....	56.5
Nondefense (1966).....	75.8
Defense (1967).....	68.3
Nondefense (1967).....	85.3
Defense (1968).....	74.1
Nondefense (1968).....	95.1
Defense up in 1968 over 1966: \$17.6 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1966: \$19.3 billion.	
Defense up in 1968 over 1967: \$5.8 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1967: \$9.8 billion.	
Gross expenditures of Government-administered funds	
[In billions]	
1966	\$164.6
1967	192.1
1968	210.2
EXPENDITURES	
Defense (1966).....	60.6
Nondefense (1966).....	104.1
Defense (1967).....	73.6
Nondefense (1967).....	118.6
Defense (1968).....	79.1
Nondefense (1968).....	131.1
Defense up in 1968 over 1966: \$18.5 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1966: \$27 billion.	
Defense up in 1968 over 1967: \$5.5 billion.	
Nondefense up in 1968 over 1967: \$12.5 billion.	

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and my other distinguished colleagues who have worked so diligently on this initial study of the administration's budget for fiscal year 1968.

Two years ago Members of the minority, headed by my colleague from North Carolina, made a similar report on the budget which had been submitted to Congress by the President. At that time guidelines were recommended by the minority which are even more pertinent this year. They included the following evaluations:

First, is the request essential and should it be approved even though it must be financed out of borrowed money?

Second, is the request for something we can postpone until the budget is balanced and the national debt is reduced?

Mr. Speaker, this year we have been presented a record budget calling for \$135 billion in Federal spending in 1968. Of

that amount, over \$75 billion is projected for defense expenditures.

The administration proposes to spend over \$8 billion more in 1968 than in the current fiscal year, and coincidentally, the red-ink deficit is projected at the same amount as the increase in Government spending.

We soon will be asked to increase the Federal debt limit from the present \$330 billion temporary ceiling. The American taxpayers will be putting up \$14 billion next year just to pay the interest on the debt.

Since 1961 we have seen Federal deficits pile up in the amount of \$40 billion.

If my mail is any indicator I believe the American people want to see prudence and economy practiced by the Federal Government, especially at a time when we are spending \$2 billion a month to fight the war in Vietnam.

Each of us has a responsibility to support economies in Federal spending following the guidelines which I mentioned earlier. As the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations begin their intensive examination of the budget proposals, we should look for the sacrifices and economies which seem to be dictated during these times of mounting defense costs.

We should ask the administration for justification and then make objective determinations of such requests as the following:

First. A \$450 million increase in spending by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Second. Increasing civilian employment by 68,500 with approximately 44,000 jobs in the nondefense areas.

Third. Extension and expansion of the Federal Teachers Corps.

Fourth. Continuing increase in welfare assistance payments.

We have in the past been successful in reducing the administration's budget requests without damaging the operations of the Federal Government. This budget can and should be cut.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, year in and year out, in peacetime and in wartime, the defense budget is the largest and most complex departmental or agency budget before the Congress. The Defense Subcommittee holds extensive hearings because of the magnitude of the estimates involved. Fortunately, the Congress has had the wisdom to support defense authorizations and appropriations which have kept the United States militarily strong throughout the period of the cold war.

It is always difficult to cut funds which are said to provide the sustenance for our Nation's defenses. It is difficult in periods of cold war and it is extremely difficult

when we are fighting a hot war as we are today.

Nevertheless, the Department of Defense is the biggest business on earth and its sheer size would indicate that there are many areas in which savings can be made. We have found such areas in defense budgets in the past, and I am sure that we will find such areas in the fiscal year 1968 budget.

The regular annual defense estimates for fiscal year 1967, last year, were \$57,-664,353,000. The appropriation for fiscal year 1967 totaled \$58,067,472,000, an increase of \$403,119,000 which I will further discuss later. Obviously, the budget did not include adequate funding for the then escalating war in Vietnam. We are now confronted with a supplemental estimate of \$12,275,870,000—including military construction items of \$624,-500,000—for southeast Asia, and will shortly have supplemental requests for pay increases and other items all together totaling about \$590 million.

The regular annual estimates for 1968 are \$71,554 million, an increase of about \$1.245 billion above the appropriations for 1967, assuming Congress grants all of the proposed supplemental funds. Disregarding pending supplementals, we are asked to appropriate for 1968 about \$13.487 billion above the appropriations to date for 1967.

Last year, the House Appropriations Committee recommended and the House voted a net increase of \$947 million in the budget. We made some cuts which were offset by the increases. As I previously mentioned, the defense appropriations bill as ultimately enacted after Senate and conference action provided \$403 million more than was requested.

This was due in part to the fact that the fiscal year 1967 budget submitted to the Congress was inadequate to properly fund the requirements of the war in Vietnam. For instance, there were 108,000 military personnel on active duty at the time the bill was reported to the House for whom no funds for pay and allowances had been requested. In order to keep faith with our colleagues and with our country, we recommended provision of an additional \$569 million for their pay and allowances.

Other areas in which we felt that the budget was inadequate included airlift, the anti-ballistic-missile program, the size of the B-52 bomber force, and nuclear power for naval ships. We searched for and found areas in which reductions could be made and readjusted allocations between programs, but our revisions were more than offset by the budget's inadequacies.

This year, the fiscal year 1968 estimates before the Defense Subcommittee total \$71.5 billion and ostensibly provide the funds required to fight the war in Vietnam and keep our Military Establishment strong otherwise. We cannot be certain at this time that this is entirely the case. At least the 1968 defense budget request appears to be more realistic and the "planned supplemental" approach which was followed last year appears to be less obvious.

The appropriations hearings will look into this carefully, as there were pro-

grams which the Congress recommended and funded last year, such as the more rapid development of an advanced manned strategic bomber, which were not fully implemented by the Defense Department and which may require additional congressional support in fiscal year 1968 if the country is to maintain a modern strategic bomber force.

One of the most significant military decisions to be made in this decade is whether or not to proceed with the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. The Soviet Union is deploying such a system. The Congress provided funds in the amount of \$168 million more than was requested last year for this program and these funds have not been used. The fiscal year 1968 budget carries \$375 million for maintaining the option of initiating deployment of the system without making a commitment for deployment. We will have to look at this program closely and determine just what the real needs are in fiscal year 1968.

In the field of airlift, last year, the Congress resisted efforts of the administration to cut back the all-important military airlift. We insisted on keeping certain Air National Guard squadrons functioning in the belief that, in this day and time, the need for military airlift can arrive suddenly and overwhelmingly. This year, the budget proposes that the squadrons which we tried to keep active will be phased out and that other Reserve airlift squadrons will also be phased out. We may need to take very positive action in this area.

The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has had investigators in the field this fall. We have every hope of finding, and will make every effort to find, areas in which budget requests for the Department of Defense can be reduced without hurting the war effort or the Nation's security.

The making of the budget in the executive branch and the appropriation process in the legislative branch are, in effect, a matter of allocating priorities to various programs. The Defense Subcommittee may discover and have to fund programs this year which we consider to be of high priority but which are not funded. We will make every effort to find any fat or any programs of low priority that the administration has budgeted, and the funds can be reallocated by the committee to higher priority programs. We did this last year and have done so in previous years.

Of course, we will have to examine the requirement for Vietnam very carefully and see that all the funds needed are provided. This is our first priority, but our second priority is economy and efficiency and saving of taxpayers' dollars.

I feel that we can do a good job in both of these areas and will do everything possible to cooperate with other members of the committee in seeing this come about.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 of this year President Lyndon B. Johnson will host the annual Presidential prayer breakfast.

It is my distinct privilege to advise the Congress that the first order of business of the Alaska Legislature after organization this year was to unanimously pass House Concurrent Resolution 1 requesting the distinguished Governor of Alaska, Walter J. Hickel, to appoint State Representative Jack R. Simpson as Alaska's first official ambassador of good will to the Presidential prayer breakfast to be held on February 2, 1967, in Washington, D.C.

Accordingly, Governor Hickel has so appointed Mr. Simpson as the first ambassador of good will to the Presidential prayer breakfast.

I have had the good fortune of being acquainted with Representative Simpson for many years and to know his outstanding qualifications. He has been active in organizing many layman conferences of Christian leaders in Alaska, and has faithfully traveled to Washington for a number of years to attend the Presidential prayer breakfast.

It is my hope that other States may follow this new tradition adopted in Alaska by sending an official ambassador of good will to the Presidential prayer breakfast in future years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with extraneous matter including the provisions of Alaska House Resolution No. 1.

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

There was no objection.

ALASKA HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1
(Relating to the appointment of an ambassador of good will from Alaska to the presidential prayer breakfast)

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas on February 2, 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson will host the annual Presidential Prayer Breakfast in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas representative dignitaries from all areas of the United States and the world as well as representative persons from government and industry will be in attendance; and

Whereas it would be most appropriate to have an official representative from the State of Alaska; and

Whereas Mr. Jack R. Simpson, a member of the Fifth State Legislature has attended the last several Presidential Prayer Breakfasts; and

Whereas Mr. Simpson is uniquely qualified to represent the State of Alaska in that he organized the weekly Anchorage Mayor's Breakfast and was the founder and first president of the United Churchmen Laymen's Conference; and

Whereas Mr. Simpson, as an executive of the International Christian Leadership will play a key role in hosting the world convention of the International Christian Leadership in Anchorage during 1967 which numerous international celebrities and distinguished international Christian leaders will attend;

Be it resolved, That the governor is respectfully requested to appoint Jack R. Simpson as Alaska's first official Ambassador of Good Will to the Presidential Prayer Breakfast to be held February 2, 1967 in Washington, D.C.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who engaged in the colloquy on my special order today may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

POLAND: THE MYTH OF THE INDEPENDENT SATELLITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. proposal to relieve Poland of the need to pay in dollars an \$18 million debt to this country brings into focus our relationship with Communist bloc countries. It raises disturbing questions over the trend of individual freedom and national independence in that area, and the influence U.S. foreign aid has had on that trend.

The current effort to ease Poland's monetary problems suggests that present U.S. policy is rooted in nothing more substantial than hopes for Polish liberalism which should have been set aside years ago as forlorn.

The time has come to face reality. Poland is more dependent on the Soviet Union and the Polish people have less individual freedom today than was true a decade ago.

Independence and liberalism in Soviet satellites—if Poland is typical of them—are myths. U.S. policies should be adjusted accordingly, and the adjustment should include an abrupt halt to financial aid which is not fully and clearly balanced by our own national interest.

During the upheavals of 1956—the Poznan riots in Poland in June, the Hungarian Revolution in October–November, and similar unrest throughout the East-European bloc—the West looked upon the seeming disintegration of the Communist alliance with renewed interest. Stalin was dead and Nikita Khrushchev's so-called secret speech denouncing the tyrannies of the one-time undisputed leader of all Communists unleashed a Pandora's box. No one was quite sure of the new direction that communism would take. It was argued that the unity of the bloc would never be the same—that each satellite country would go its own way, much as Yugoslavia's Tito seemed to be doing.

In Poland, Wladyslaw Gomulka, a man who spent over 5 years in various prisons on orders from Stalin, was elected the first secretary of the Communist Party—an evident anti-Stalinist move. Almost immediately he set out to "change" Poland and purge it of Stalin's era. He freed the jailed Polish church primate, Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński;

amnestied most of the political prisoners; got rid of Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky, Poland's Defense Minister, and announced his willingness to discuss economic aid with the United States. In the agricultural sector, Gomulka also decollectivized the farms into private holdings. Press restrictions were eased and Poland was seen to move by leaps and bounds out of the Communist "orbit."

The Soviet area specialists of various foreign ministries and in our own State Department were quite pleased with these events. There was a movement afoot to give expression to this pleasure in a real and practical way with "aid." The U.S. Congress and the Executive were quite willing to offer significant assistance to the budding flower of Poland's independence from Soviet Union and the hegemony of international communism.

Believing that communism based on national aspirations, rather than visionary international Communist goals would move Gomulka closer to the West without threatening the basic American policy, we undertook a series of steps to help Poland from its serious economic, cumulative failures of the past. Our tacit quid pro quo understanding for such aid was, what we thought, continuation of Gomulka's apparent quest for decentralization of the political, economic, and social life in Poland—a move certainly in tune with our traditions. After all, it was the West that possesses the formula for human, dignified progress which would be to the benefit of all who sought to emulate our achievements—which every Communist leader envied.

For almost a year and a half, events in Poland were progressing toward that hoped-for ideal. Freedom of the press and assembly were partly restored. The ideas of liberalism and "Western image of freedom" was seen slowly emerging. American aid was gradually being increased and the boldness of the Polish populace appeared evermore natural.

Suddenly, the Gomulka regime was seen taking that one step back about which Lenin had written. All the decentralizing elements ceased progress. Stalinism, so it appeared to some, was lurking once again. And the trend is seen as continuing along the similar path—away from liberal, decentralizing direction toward "democratic centralism" as the political pundits describe.

In Poland freedom is in retreat, and Gomulka is still in power—more secure than before despite American aid amounting to over a half a billion dollars. Could it be that American aid worked in reverse, financing regression instead of advance?

Today the substantial gains made following Polish October have been mostly dissipated. The Government continually seeks to restrict the role of the Catholic Church in Polish society. Polish freedoms have been eroding rapidly. The intellectuals are under constant pressure by the state to conform to the original doctrines of the party.

The plain fact is that Poland is veering off from the West. Fearing a new Germany, and economically dependent on the Soviet Union, the Poles have

found their unique kind of independence a luxury they can ill afford.

On one hand, Poland is engaged in a war by proxy with the United States as it subsidizes the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and the Hanoi government at the expense of its own failing economy. On the other, Poland is periodically seeking more U.S. aid and hard currency credits. The more the United States aids and subsidizes the Gomulka regime in Poland, the stronger and more determined it becomes, and the more able to assist our enemies in Vietnam and generally work against our foreign policy objectives.

The basic premise under which the administration is willing to permit Poland to repay her current debt in zlotys rather than dollars is difficult to fathom. I believe that our foreign policy regarding Poland should be reconsidered. We should make it quite plain to the Poles that full payments will be expected in dollars. In this way we may provide the incentive for reforms through which the long-suppressed Polish freedoms will eventually be restored.

At a minimum, we will thus give them substantial reason to reconsider their policy of aiding our enemies in Vietnam.

THE POLISH MYTH

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY has said:

There is a tendency in our country to get into a rather fixed and immobile position on policies even after they have ceased to serve the national interest. What we are really talking about, in other words, is what strategy, policy or tactics we should pursue in any country, or in any area of the world to promote our national interest.¹

No words could more aptly describe our policy toward Poland. We have reached the point where the myth about Poland has become a dogma. Secretary Rusk declared:

A good deal of the national autonomy and domestic liberalization which the Poles won in 1965 persist.²

Yet, statements and actions of the Polish government do not support the second statement. If anything they tend to buttress the sober estimate of former United States Ambassador to Poland, Joseph Beam, given just 2 years ago upon his departure from Warsaw. Said Ambassador Beam:

The American policy of helping the Gomulka regime surmount its economic difficulties has not led to a more liberalizing evolution in Poland which could have been expected.

Present U.S. policy seems to say that since the Communists are here to stay, the local regime should. First, be made more independent of the Soviet Union; second, their rule should be made as truly democratic and dignified as possible; and, third, closer contacts with the West should be encouraged.³

¹ Hubert Humphrey, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 8, p. 10662.

² "Why We Treat Different Communist Governments Differently," March 16, 1964.

³ *Current History*, March, 1965, Pg. 131.

Secretary of State Rusk has periodically articulated this policy by saying:

It is our policy to do what we can to encourage evolution in the Communist world toward national independence and open societies.⁴

I agree that it is in the best interests of the United States to contribute toward the further loosening of the ties linking Communist-ruled countries. The rebirth of national sentiment presents one of the most powerful threats to the uneasy balance of Communist rule in Eastern Europe.

However, it would appear from a practical point of view that Poland cannot be made more independent of the Soviet Union under Gomulka's leadership.

Throughout the long, drawn-out negotiations with Poland conducted in the new spirit of rapprochement since 1956, the only tangible evidence we have secured to date is an agreement signed in Washington in 1959 after 16½ months of negotiations. Under this Poland has agreed to compensate American citizens whose property was confiscated by the Communist regime. It provides for the sum of \$40 million, less than 10 percent of the original value of confiscated property, over a period of 20 years. In return, the United States agreed to release all the assets of Polish nationals blocked since World War II.

The Poles are by nature strongly anti-Communist. Most Western commentators agree that Poland is one of the Eastern European countries most likely to cast off Communist Party domination were free elections held. For a brief time in October 1956 it even appeared that such an action might actually occur. That it did not is due to the political adroitness of Party Secretary Gomulka, who continues to rule Poland. The United States, I believe, is partly responsible for this situation by aiding his vacillating regime. We have not sought to exert enough influence on the Polish Reds to make them realize that a continuation of the liberalizing trend begun in 1956 was in their best interest. It would appear that our economic assistance has prevented, rather than promoted, a situation analogous to that which brought Gomulka to power in 1956.

Although it was made clear that the Communist form of government was to be the only one acceptable, it seemed that a significant change could have been forthcoming through the activity of the quasi-independent parties permitted after 1956. After Stephen Cardinal Wyszynski was released from prison, the Catholics were granted limited representation in the Sejm, and apparently a workable agreement was reached between the church and the state. Attempts by the regime to control the literary works of art were unsuccessful. The appearance of Morsek's highly political and impertinent book, "The Elephant," chastising the system, as well as plays and novels by Gombrowicz, an existentialist author, were viewed with curiosity—both in and out of Poland.

⁴ "Why We Treat Different Communist Countries Differently," March 16, 1964.

Censorship of the press was scant. The journal, *Po Prostu*, went so far as to walk boldly along the brink of direct criticism of the Soviet Union.⁵

October 1956 also meant curbs on the secret police, the almost omnipotent arm of totalitarian regimes. But, that era seems to have taken a turn for the worse. Where before the principal policy issue was to see how many concessions might be extracted from Gomulka and Moscow, now the whittling process of those previous concessions has definitely become evident. At best, the confused and impatient Poles are hoping, and marking time. The liberal minds and the youth believe they are moving backward to keep pace with the Soviets. Poland has lost her old lead in hoping to liberalize the rest of satellite Europe. The enthusiasm of 1956-57 is dead. As the *London Times* of December 3, 1965, said:

What was once the hatchery of new ideas has turned into a graveyard of lost dreams.

The *Times* speculated that the saddest puzzle of East Europe is how Poland slipped away from her position as a pace-maker in political, cultural, and economic affairs. The main reason is perhaps our lack of concern when the centralist, Bolshevik tendencies were again reappearing.

The *New York Times* reported in April 1964:

There is an atmosphere of discontent that envelops the country, compounded by annoyance of the rising prices, shortages of real wages, unemployment and increasing restrictions. An incident could generate a spark to set off a major explosion.⁶

These were the very conditions that brought a change in 1956. But because of Gomulka's retrenchment and an absence of U.S. pressure, no "incident" has generated a spark that could lead to disengagement. The present government representing itself as "heir" to the 1956 uprising has in fact been the opponent, and of late the outspoken foe of the progressive Polish faction within the Communist Party itself.⁷

Today life in Poland is difficult, drab, and without any evident prospect that it is about to improve substantially.⁸

The influence of the liberal group within the Communist Party, who held most of the top positions after 1956, has decreased considerably.⁹

The Communist guerrilla—partisans of World War II fame led by Strzelecki and Klizsko and their kind—are now very prominent in the Polish Ministries of the Interior, Defense, Culture, Foreign Affairs, and Foreign Trade. The partisans, who were cooperating directly with the Red Army and always represented the hard line, have even managed to build up the secret police again. It now keeps tabs on interparty rivalry.¹⁰ The degree to which the Gomulka faction and the partisans have increased their influence can best be demonstrated by the increasing membership on the Central Committee of the Communist

Party. The following chart details the status of the major groups on the committee in 1959 and 1964.

	1959	1964
Gomulka faction.....	25	57
Pulewska faction.....	25	5
Former Socialists.....	11	8
Natolin faction.....	10	0
Revisionist faction.....	6	2
Partisan.....	0	14

The Gomulka faction and the partisans have more than doubled their ranks. In 1956, Gomulka and the revisionists supported each other but it was only a limited affair. Gomulka, an old revolutionary, had strong views about the controls he would exercise. The result has been a steady increase in the influence of the hardliners.¹¹

While the 1956 changes were not interpreted as a Polish *auschluss* out of the Communist camp, the West did expect more from the strong-willed, practical Gomulka. His past record reveals that he was as liberal as he had to be to maintain his power. It is also evident that his leadership has continued to lose popular support since 1959. It was then that Gomulka returned to key positions individuals prominent as adherents of Stalinism.

POLAND'S UNAVAILABILITY TO THE WEST—TIES TO THE SOVIET UNION

It is an old axiom today that in the longrun the foreign policy of any country is determined less by ideological forces than by its geography and history. The striking feature of the current political scene in Poland is that while Communist ideology has failed to take firm roots among the Polish people, the Government's foreign policy on particular issues is endorsed by an increasing number of Poles.¹²

Poland's foreign policy has always been sensitive to her geographic position; sandwiched between an aggressive Germany and historically hostile Russia. Because of the superiority of German technology and organization, Germanization usually presents a far greater threat to Poland than Russification.¹³ It is Germany which in the eyes of the Poles represents the arch enemy.¹⁴ The memory of German occupation of Poland during World War II, when the Poles were literally threatened with national extermination at the hands of the Nazis, only intensifies their inclination.¹⁵ Nor have the Poles forgotten that the West, France and Great Britain did not come to their aid during the Nazi invasion of 1939.¹⁶

Because Soviet policy regarding West Germany meets with the approval of virtually all Poles, and because the Polish regime has been able to obtain a modicum of independence of action, some degree of reconciliation between the Government and the society has occurred. But friction between the two continues.

Poland's main concerns have been in West Germany's reemergence as an in-

⁵ *New Leader*, May 11, 1964, Pg. 5.

⁶ *New York Times*, April 18, 1964.

⁷ *New Leader*, May 11, 1964, Pg. 4.

⁸ *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1966.

⁹ *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, June, 1964.

¹⁰ *Swiss Review of World Affairs*, June, 1964.

¹¹ *New York Times*, Feb. 6, 1966.

¹² *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1962, Pg. 635.

¹³ *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1962, Pg. 640.

¹⁴ *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1962, Pg. 640.

¹⁵ *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1962, Pg. 640.

¹⁶ *Foreign Affairs*, July, 1962, Pg. 641.

dependent state, revival of the German military force, persistent refusal on the part of the Bonn government to accept the Oder-Neisse border, and Germany's prominent role in the anti-Communist alliance. These make the Poles once again fearful of their Western neighbor. The indefinite postponement of recognition of the Oder-Neisse frontier by the Western Powers, made the Soviet support of crucial importance to Poland. Included in this area is the second greatest industrial region of East Europe. Its retention is needed if Poland is to be the industrial power she desires to become. The problem of holding these pre-German provinces overshadows the Polish-Soviet territorial disputes which, for practical political reasons, have gradually faded into the background.¹⁷

Poland's best national interest is seen as protecting herself from Germany, and retaining her Western provinces. Soviet Union has identical interests. Consequently, both benefit from continued present relationship. And, American national interest, it would appear, lies in maintaining the strength of West Germany.

Our attitude with regard to possible disengagement in Central Europe has been influenced—and wisely—by consideration for West Germany, our strongest and possibly the most faithful ally in Europe. For obvious reasons, West Germany is opposed to any relaxation in East-West relations. They fear that any "deal" between the United States and the Soviet Union would, in practice, mean the acceptance of the status quo, implying not only the acceptance of the division of Germany, but also recognition of the Oder-Neisse line. This is difficult for any German politician to accept. If the United States attempts a disengagement policy alone, it will alienate its strongest ally. And, there is no assurance that the various East European regimes would succeed in achieving independence from Moscow.

The Poles so far have little choice other than to cherish the present Soviet guarantee of their territorial interests.

U.S. abandonment of NATO's controversial MLF concept did not significantly improve our relations with Poland as had been anticipated.¹⁸

The United States should not relinquish its legitimate interests in West Germany for a limited degree of internal autonomy in Poland. The condition Poles ask, disengagement from central Europe, is too high a price. That the Polish myth, nevertheless persists may be attributed in large part to our national desire to see in Poland a weakening of Russian influence. Under present conditions, however, it is questionable whether Poland will go any further without direct American influence.

Economic dependence on the Soviet Union, fear of West Germany and her own military weakness make Poland very much a part of the Communist bloc.¹⁹

POLAND'S ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE ON THE SOVIET UNION

Poland's dependency on the Soviet Union would be hard to exaggerate. "A turn of two valves and a flip of a railway switch would halt the flow of vital oil, gas, and iron ore from Russia to Poland."²⁰

Although direct political interference by the Soviet Union is not blatantly exposed, the Soviet ability to mold Polish policy remains. Based on the economic and strategic interests of the Poles, rigid conformity to Soviet dicta has disappeared. However, indirect control through economic pressures may well be a more efficacious technique for maintaining Soviet ascendancy.

The Soviets have been clever in seeking to influence the Poles. In 1965, Soviet Union canceled a \$525 million Polish debt to ease Poland's losses stemming from shipments of coal. Any Polish flexibility must contend with two decades of Soviet economic dominance, and the extent to which that could be altered without considerable damage to Polish interest. The breadth and depth of Soviet economic impact might well be the major feature which, for the time being, offsets some of the recent political concessions and precludes substantially greater Polish economic independence.²¹

Several crucial factors militate against the possibility of Poland's greater economic self-assertion in the immediate future, ignoring for the moment Soviet political and strategic considerations. The Soviet economic involvement of the past has been profound. An obviously limiting factor upon Polish maneuverability is the nature of its industrialization. This has revolved around Soviet blueprints, equipment, and methods, completion of projects, and flow of replacements in accordance with initial technical specifications which depend upon continued Soviet cooperation. Of equal influence is the degree to which the Polish economy has been coordinated in CEMA among bloc countries.

Poland's largest trading partner was and is the Soviet Union. Last year the Soviets bought 32 percent of the goods exported from Poland and supplied it with 29 percent of all imported goods. Soviet Union is Poland's main supplier of industrial equipment. This is especially important, because, like most European Communist-ruled countries, Poland is spending a substantial part of her national income every year in a headlong rush to industrialize. In 1963, Poland ruled out any change in plans to alter the concentration on heavy industry in favor of consumer oriented economy. Without Soviet aid Poland would be helpless.

Since the creation of Polish Peoples Republic the U.S.S.R. has been and remains its biggest trade partner. For several years the share of trade with the Soviets has been about 30 percent, while trade with other Communist countries

was 40 percent. During the period from 1950-55, Soviets were Poland's main suppliers of capital equipment, contributing to its 6-year plan. The Russians have also become the principal supplier of basic raw materials; iron ore, crude oil, nonferrous metals, and so forth. Between 1956 and 1960, trade with the Soviet Union increased by 44 percent, with imports raised by 48 percent and exports to 39 percent. In 1960 the U.S.S.R. exported 100 percent of Poland's crude oil need, 90 percent of its nickel minerals, 78 percent of iron ore, 74 percent of chromium ore, 75 percent of petroleum products, 73 percent of lumber, 65 percent of cotton, 68 percent of tin, 45 percent of zinc concentrates, and 47 percent of grain. In turn, Poland was able to substantially increase its exports of finished industrial goods, machinery, capital equipment, and transportation equipment, to the Soviets. A 5-year trade agreement for 1961-65 signed in March 1960 insured exports of raw materials and capital equipment to assure Poland a steady market for its export commodities.

An agreement on Soviet technical assistance to the Poles, to build large-scale industrial enterprises, was also signed. The Soviet Government newspaper, *Izvestia*, on March 11, 1960, stated:

The agreements signed a further contribution to the deepening and expanding of economic cooperation between the USSR and Poland. They will facilitate better fulfillment of the national economic plans of both countries and hence will promote the strengthening of the economic power of the world socialist system.²²

According to the long-term agreement, the volume of goods exchanged between the U.S.S.R. and Poland was to amount to approximately 22 million rubles between 1961 and 1965. This volume increased approximately 60 percent over the levels reached in the preceding 5 years. During that period, Soviets continued to deliver equipment for industrial enterprises already under construction and offered technical assistance in building certain other industrial enterprises. Poland in turn delivered to the Soviet Union 120 seagoing ships, 15,000 railroad tank cars, 1,750 railroad passenger coaches, equipment for sugar refineries, used factories, and certain other industrial enterprises, machine tools and cables, 23 million tons of coal, and 3 million tons of coke.

In 1962 Poland and the Soviet Union signed another trade protocol which represented an increase in growth of trade between the two countries. The Polish Foreign Trade Minister, Mr. Trampczynski, said that the Polish-Soviet agreement "will be of greater importance for Polish economic development."²³ This increase in the trade exchange of 1962 was a result of the further strengthening and widening of economic cooperation between Soviet Union and Poland.

In 1963, the trade protocol of the Soviet Union constituted a considerable increase in comparison with the trade turn-

¹⁷ Washington Star, July 15, 1966.

¹⁸ The American Slavic and East European Review, article entitled "Soviet Economic Impact on Poland," by Stanley J. Zyzniewski, #2, Vol. 17, 1959, Pg. 5.

¹⁹ The Current Digest of Soviet Press, Vol. 12, No. 10, April 4, 1960, Pg. 26.

²⁰ USSR International Affairs, Section of the daily foreign broadcast, March 21, 1962.

²¹ Foreign Affairs, July, 1964, Pg. 64.

²² Current History, March, 1965, Pg. 182.

²³ Washington Star, July 15, 1966.

over established by the protocol for 1962.²⁴

An announcement on January 8, 1965, on the signing of the Polish-Soviet Trade Protocol provided for a substantial increase in trade and for greater specialization of production in related industries.²⁵

The trend in Soviet-Polish relations since the creation of the Polish Peoples Republic clearly indicates that Poland is economically dependent on the Soviet Union. Without the assistance of the U.S.S.R. Poland's goal as an industrial nation cannot be achieved unless it receives substantial assistance from the Western World. For obvious reasons this assistance to Communist countries would not be in our best national interest.

POLISH FOREIGN POLICY

Poland's foreign policy is not significantly different from that of the Soviet Union.²⁶

Gomulka's foreign policy has followed Moscow's cues for many years. In June 1958 Gomulka strongly denounced Marshal Tito's cooperation with the West and expressed his approval of the execution of the Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy during the days of the revolt. From 1960, his accord with Russian policy has found an even more positive expression. By 1962, Gomulka could say that "never in history have relations between Poland and the U.S.S.R. been as close as now."

Information furnished the CIA in 1963 by important defectors from the Polish secret service revealed the alarming extent of Polish spying activities. The full scope of his testimony still has not been released, but it is known that five State Department officials and marines as signed to guard the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw were compromised by Polish women, agents of the Polish secret police.²⁷

At the U.N. with the exception of the isolated case of Hungary where Poland voted to condemn Soviet suppression of the revolt, Gomulka's representative has not deviated from the position of the Soviets. There have been only a few occasions where the Polish delegates abstained from voting with the bloc. In the main Poland has not taken a public position opposite that taken by the Soviet Union.

POLAND AND VIETNAM

Nowhere is Polish adherence to the Soviet line more pronounced than on the issue of Vietnam. Poland is engaged in a war by proxy against the United States. It is giving moral and economic support to our enemies in Vietnam. Gomulka's reaction to U.S. activities in Vietnam is both vehement and vilifying. American action is daily portrayed in the Polish press and in other communication media. The government has openly accused the United States of genocide.²⁸

²⁴ Daily Foreign Broadcasts Digest, February 21, 1963.

²⁵ New York Times, January 9, 1965.

²⁶ East West Trade, The Background of U.S. Policy, by Nathaniel McKittrick, 20th Century Fund, 1966, Pg. 33.

²⁷ New Leader, May 11, 1964, Pg. 6.

²⁸ Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Italy, by Rep. Clement Zablocki of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 89th Congress, First Session, Pg. 15.

Poland extends credit to North Vietnam for the enlargement of its railroad fabricating plants, building material plants, and gives expert advice in coal mining. On October 2, 1966, the North Vietnamese delegation in Warsaw signed an agreement providing new aid and additional credits for Hanoi. Among the Polish delegation negotiating for this aid was Gen. Marian Granewski, Deputy Chief of the General Staff. Since October 1958, Granewski has been a member of the State Council for Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, since late 1960 a member of the Committee on Technology, and since late 1963, Chief (Armed Forces) Inspector for Technology and Planning. Granewski's presence may have been indicative of the sort of aid North Vietnam is after from Poland.²⁹

According to the New York Times of October 28, 1966, it was announced that Poland would give \$30 million in credits to North Vietnam.

On October 18, 1966, Gomulka sent a letter to all Communist parties of the Soviet bloc calling for a joint conference on aid to North Vietnam. On October 5, 1966, Radio Warsaw announced that Poland was going to establish a permanent representative of the Nationalist Liberation Front of South Vietnam to cooperate with the All-Polish Front of National Unity.

On October 17, 1966, two Polish agreements were made to aid North Vietnam. The Deputy Premier of Poland Jaroszewicz said "both civil and defense deliveries which contributed to repelling aggression in Vietnam." The North Vietnam press agency from Moscow reported on October 19, 1966, that the Polish agreements included the following:

First. Long-term, interest-free loans for 1967 from Poland to Vietnam;

Second. Nonrefundable economic assistance for 1967 from Poland to Vietnam;

Third. Polish training of North Vietnamese technicians and technical workers in Poland, and

Fourth. Goods exchange and payments in 1967.

Similar agreements as outlined above were made between Poland and North Vietnam on January 10, 1965, and June 12, 1965.

In addition, Polish ships regularly make runs to the Haiphong Harbor carrying supplies to sustain the economy of North Vietnam and to support the war machine of the Vietcong.

From all this one could conclude that Poland has significantly contributed to the American casualty list on the battle-grounds of Vietnam. Polish economic assistance only prolongs this conflict. American aid to Poland would seem to be offering the very vehicle through which Gomulka can offer his aid to the enemy we seek to stop. It is sheer folly to continue buttressing this type of self-defeat.

We should demand not only the full payment, in dollars, for credits we extended to Gomulka since 1957, but also a halt to any aid whatsoever unless and until Poland ceases its support of the Vietcong. After all, the \$26 million due this year on the first installment is sig-

nificant enough so that Mr. Gomulka would feel quite a pinch where it hurts him most—his need of hard currency.

POLAND EXPORTS COMMUNISM

A basic premise underlying U.S. policy toward Poland is that while it is a Communist country it is not engaged in subversive activity and accordingly is not a threat to the security of this country. In brief, Poland does not seek to export communism. However, Poland has extended economic credit totalling about \$200 million to various underdeveloped countries of the free world since 1954. Most of this total consists of commitments made since 1958. Although Polish credits account for a small percentage of the economic credits and grants extended to the underdeveloped countries by the Sino-Soviet bloc, nevertheless, Poland is an instrument of Communist foreign policy.

Recipients of Polish credits for economic purposes were: Yugoslavia, Brazil, Iran, Indonesia, India, Tunisia, Guinea, and Ghana.

In addition, Poland has provided some military assistance in the past to Indonesia. Economic credits have generally been used to finance purchases and installations of Polish industrial and transport equipment. In a number of cases Polish technical assistance and services are a part of the grant. This means the presence of Polish citizens in these foreign countries. That foreign aid activity of Communist countries constitutes an excellent cover for subversive activities is well known. In India in 1960 Polish technical services were employed in connection with the establishment of \$30 million dollars worth of industrial projects. Under the terms of the agreement, Indian specialists will undergo training in Polish industries preparatory to operating the plant.

These examples, occurring under the regime of Mr. Gomulka, are an evidence of Poland's willingness to use economic grants and credits to serve the Communist cause.

POLAND BARS U.S. RELATIONS

Credit sales agreement from June, 1957 to the present total over one-half billion dollars. These include surplus agricultural commodities, equipment and materials and medical supplies. It represents a substantial U.S. investment in Poland, but it is not the only one. In 1965, for instance, the U.S. bought \$65 million worth of Polish products while selling Poland only \$35 million, thus providing Poland with a \$30 million favorable balance of trade.³⁰

In addition, we spent over \$15 million for a children's hospital in Cracow. In 1964, the U.S. supported Poland's application to participate in the "Kennedy round" negotiations at Geneva.³¹

One wonders whether our policy has served the cause of freedom or simply helped entrench authoritarian and inefficient regime. The answer appears to be directed toward the latter. Gomulka has indicated that Poland's trade was at a higher level with the West than he personally would like.³² It is evident that

³⁰ Washington Post, July 15, 1966.

³¹ New York Times, May 6, 1964.

³² New York Times, November 27, 1962.

²⁹ RFE—Situation Report, October 6, 1966.

he fears his country's involvement with the West, although his need for hard currency is growing all the time.

The chief Polish advocate of rapprochement between East and West, Hochfeld, was removed from political power by Gomulka. The United States finds itself the largest foreign holder of zlotys, over \$11 billion in all. Despite our lavish assistance, Gomulka has on more than one occasion said that Polish economic troubles could in part be ascribed to the Western World. Mr. Gomulka said in 1962:

We turn our face too much toward the West, toward the highly developed capitalist countries. Almost thirty percent of our total trade turnover is done in capitalist markets. Experience shows how dangerous such a proportion is to our economy.

There are other indications of how the Polish Government has reacted against the United States—in April 1965, the Government-owned newspaper, *Zycie Warsaw*, accused the Warsaw correspondent of the New York Times, David Halderstam, of a "malicious presentation of Poland to readers."

LOSS OF POLITICAL FREEDOM IN POLAND

Party Secretary Gomulka looks at Poland from the eyes of a Communist conservative. While he may object to the terror associated with Stalinism, he believes thoroughly in centralized control of Poland and in top-down economic procedures.

Though the Poles today still enjoy a small measure of personal and cultural liberty, perhaps greater than any other inhabitants of the Communist world, recently even those have been seen eroding. This plus evidence of a tightening of policy in agriculture, education, military scrutiny, and economic planning indicates that at the time when some liberalization is being permitted by certain other Communist regimes, Gomulka pushes toward greater conformity.³³

One indication of the loss of political freedom in Poland is that while, officially, strikes are allowed, they are promoted by the state trade unions subservient more and more to Gomulka's decrees.

Following an example set by the Soviets, Gomulka's courts carried out the first execution for "economic crimes" since Stalin's days, in March 1965.

Criticism of the regime can once again lead to a loss of job. After the protest letter from a group of Poland's most prominent intellectuals in 1964, 12 of the country's best-known writers and teachers were suspended from their posts.³⁴

Another indication of the loss of political freedom in Poland has been an enlargement of the Communist Party candidates in the balloting for the parliament. In each election since Gomulka has returned to power the percentage of seats in the parliament held by the Communists has increased at the expense of the other members of the coalition.

The Communists have made substantial gains in local governing bodies. Today it is estimated that more than 50 percent of the local governing bodies' membership are held by Communists. The Communist Party runs Poland, but

except for the top level of the government, it has been a minority rule, heavily dependent for local administration on the subservient United Peasants and Democratic Party, and on cooperating independent politicians. In many villages there are no Communist Party organizations at all. But the situation is changing. The shortage of Communist activities at the bottom of the pyramid became acute after the 1956 Poznan uprising. A 1958 purge of dissident members ordered by Gomulka cut more than 200,000 from the rolls. The party level in 1959, for example, was 300,000 below the 1956 level. In the 1958 provincial elections, the party was able to find only enough trustworthy Communists to fill an average of one seat in four on the local councils. A major rebuilding drive, not yet completed, was started in 1960 when a total of 167,000 new admissions into the party were granted. Since 1958, worker membership has been raised from 37 percent to near 40 percent, and peasant membership has risen to 12 percent. This indicates that Communist Party membership is on the rise in Poland, at the expense of the independent and non-Communist members of the coalition. The entire political situation in Poland seems to indicate that the Communist Party is moving in giant strides, back to the position of influence and power it had prior to October 1956.

LOSS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN POLAND

There is only one organization in Poland which can successfully compete with the regime for the allegiance of the population. This is the Roman Catholic Church. In order to eliminate any such potential threat, Gomulka has been employing a variety of means to destroy the prestige of the church and to transform it into a government-directed group.

For the past several years, gestures of accommodation toward the church have ceased. In 1958, the government interposed itself to collect "duty" on several million dollars worth of food stock given to the church for relief by Roman Catholic charity groups in the United States. Newsprint paper has been withheld from church-connected papers and journals. Instances of church censorship occurred with growing frequency. A policy of church taxation was instituted in the Catholic University of Lublin, subjected to crippling retroactive action. In 1960, permission to build a new Roman Catholic Church in the newly built industrial complex of Nova Huta was suddenly withdrawn, though it was previously granted.

Building permits for other new churches were similarly denied or withdrawn in what appeared to be a general policy of harassment. In 1961, religious instruction in schools, without state supervision, was prohibited. The new minister of religious education was formerly the director of the Polish Association of Atheists. There have been a number of assaults by the militia on church demonstrations and religious pilgrimages. Church-operated schools have been again closed down and school property seized. Following the trend, students in four important seminaries received orders to report for military duty. Pope Paul's

special service in the Slavic Rite in November 1963 for the "church in silence" was a reminder to East European regimes that the situation was getting out of hand.³⁵

It is inconceivable for Gomulka and the Cardinal to find a long-lasting area of cooperation—one or the other must eventually yield. Many of the party stalwarts are also good Catholics in Poland—which makes the situation that much more complicated. But Gomulka is determined to alienate the clergy from the masses by placing obstacles for training of new clerics and closing various religious institutions. As of now most of the parochial schools and minor seminaries have been closed. Similar fate has been met by most of the nurseries, private schools, nursing schools, and other institutions operated by religious orders. The government imposed exorbitant taxation and unreasonable limitations on the enrollment of students to maintain the opposing force at a minimum. Employees of religious institutions are dropped from social security rolls, deprived of medical and hospital benefits, retirement and disability pensions, and related privileges.

While the Catholic Church still possess sufficient following to be reckoned with, the Government is obviously endeavoring to change that situation.³⁶

Thus the Communist regime church policy is one of unremitting attack in an attempt to remove its strongest competitor for the allegiance of the Polish people. The Government has even gone so far as to misrepresent the position of the church on the German question, inciting Polish Catholics against their German counterparts.³⁷

Last year Poland celebrated its millennium as a Christian nation. Pope Paul VI was denied entry by the Polish Government to attend an open mass in Jasna Gora. The regime went to all extremes to cut attendance at this historic affair—sponsoring soccer matches nearby, warning taxicab drivers not to take fares to Czestochowa, and the like.³⁸

The state travel agency, Orbis, refused to grant passports for travelers at the Polish border for the pilgrimage even at Polish Embassies in Western countries.

LOSS OF INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM

In one other major area the government has moved to impose its will over the years. It is quite evident that the Gomulka government has a distinctly anti-intellectual bias, which is to continue indefinitely.³⁹

Freedom of the press that flowered briefly after 1956 has receded to dark corners once again. The ugly head of censorship is quite evident. Writer's commissions have been reduced and many papers forced to cease publica-

³³ New Leader, May 11, 1964, pg. 5.

³⁴ Report on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria and Italy made by the Honorable Clement Zablocki on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, June, 1965.

³⁵ For full background on the Polish Bishop's letter to the German Bishop and the government's misrepresentation see World Today, May, 1966, pg. 177.

³⁶ East Europe, June 1966, pg. 42.

³⁷ Progressive, May, 1964, pg. 29.

³⁸ Current History, March 1965, pg. 154.

³⁹ New York Times, April 16, 1964.

tion. There is a lot to write—but very little that would pass the censor's scissors.

Defeatism and apathy of the past are again submerging the isolated intellectuals. Open revolt seems out of the question.

To attempt to control this dissatisfied generation the Government is adroitly attempting to buy the support of the intellectual with rewards for works that comply with the cultural policy of the party. Payments ranging from 100 percent up to 250 percent of the honorarium are made to authors whose works are of "high ideological, artistic value." Special literary fellowships are offered to writers who have been previously published. Planning of awards is left to the Minister of Culture and Arts, which indicates that those who refuse to toe the line may not benefit.⁴⁰

A dramatic demonstration against the suppression and press censorship occurred on March 14, 1964, when 34 of Poland's most prominent progressives signed a letter of protest to Premier Cyrankiewicz. Their letter said:

Restrictions on the allocations of paper for the publication of books and periodicals and the tightening of censorship create a situation that threatens the development of our national culture. In recognition of the existence of public opinion, the right to criticism, the right of free discussion and honest information as a necessary element of progress, the undersigned, motivated by civic concern, demand that the Polish cultural policy be altered so as to conform to the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the Polish state and conducive to national welfare.⁴¹

Among the signers, were: first, Leopold Infeld, Poland's most noted theoretical physicist, who worked with Albert Einstein; second, Prof. Todd Katarbinski, one of the country's leading philosophers and until 1963 head of the Polish Academy of Sciences; third, Antonio Slaninski, the nation's most noted poet; fourth, Adam Wazyk, author of the world-famous "Poems for Adults"; fifth, Maria Dabrowska, winner of the Polish state literary prize. The regime's reaction was swift. Almost half were banned from writing for the press or television and lost their passports for traveling abroad. Others had their works in print halted. The only national circulation Catholic newspaper had its allocation of paper permanently cut by 10,000 copies. A 72-year-old naturalized American citizen who returned to Poland to retire was convicted and sentenced to 3 years in prison for distributing false and slanderous material against the regime. He wrote a speech which criticized restrictions on cultural life then mailed a copy to his daughter in the United States.

Gomulka's security police exerted pressures on signatories to induce them to withdraw their names. Most stood firm, accepting reprisals rather than yield. Gomulka's managed press noted afterward:

We do not see a place for books and plays whose ideological and moral sense is directed against socialism.⁴²

In February 1966, Polish writers Badowski, Gass, Smecho, Miller, Grezenski, Mackiewicz, Czemley, and others were sentenced by the state court for anti-Communist views. Czemley was given a 3-year imprisonment with the loss of public and civil rights.

In December 1966, 13 intellectuals were expelled from the party after writing a letter to the Central Committee, criticizing it.

Six students critical of Poland's Communist government were suspended from classes and faced possible expulsion from Warsaw University.⁴³ Two cultural weeklies, *Przegląd Kulturalny* and *Nasza Kultura*, were discontinued.

The *New York Times* for December 21, 1966, reported that the Communist Party was considering sterner measures against its own dissatisfied intellectuals. Among the steps under consideration is the expulsion of some members, which in a state-controlled Poland is next to the poor house.

Typical of the restrictions gradually placed upon writers and journalists can be seen in the case of the literary journal, *Po Prostu*. First, the entire editorial board was dismissed. Then the journal was dissolved altogether. Another popular Warsaw intellectual and literary magazine of similar persuasion, the *Crooked Circle* was also closed as was a similar publication in Cracow, the *Flaming Tomato*. In succeeding months, Gomulka's censorship and dismissals affected numerous other journals. Party control of the writers' union prevented publication of controversial manuscripts. The size of the editions has been cut and republication of certain post-1956 books refused. Novels and plays of progressive Witold Gombrowicz have now been banned from publication and stage.

The effect of communism on the individuals, particularly the intellectual, has already been dramatically discussed in such books as Adam Cshass' "Marxism and the Individual" and "Capital of Mind" by Czeslaw Milosz. These books have concentrated on the individual's feelings of alienation, the bewilderment of the peasant working in heavy industry, the anxiety of the citizen who cannot make his voice heard, and the isolation of a writer who cannot publish what he writes in the Polish state.

The party is fearful of the liberal thought. It recognizes that it is a danger to its hold on the people, but it would threaten party authority to offer people a sense of involvement by permitting party differences to be published and by giving a freedom of reporting in the newspapers.

In the final analysis, political, intellectual, and religious freedom are incompatible with the Communist government. This is true whether the government has its seat in Warsaw or Moscow. The lesson is a brutal one and one difficult for us to comprehend.

It is nevertheless compelling. No amount of U.S. aid, credits, or willingness to foreign debt is going to persuade Gomulka into making significant concessions on the political, religious, and

intellectual front unless pressure is applied.

Mr. Speaker, here is the text of a letter I sent over the weekend to President Johnson:

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United States Ambassador to Poland has made a proposal to the Polish Government whereby certain Polish debts incurred under P.L. 480 (Food for Peace Act) would be payable in zlotys to be spent for mutually agreed upon projects in Poland. If this proposal is accepted by the Polish government, the dollar loss to the United States Treasury between now and January 2, 1968 would be about \$18,000,000.

A thorough study of Poland and its outside relationships brings me to conclude that the proposal is clearly against our national interest. I strongly urge that the United States withdraw it and demand instead full payment in dollars.

My reasons are set out in a "white paper" I have prepared entitled, "Poland: The Myth of the Independent Satellite," a copy of which is attached. In it I question the validity of the theory which underlies our policy toward Poland, and which obviously led to the present proposal. The basic points:

1. In Poland, individual liberty is receding, not advancing.

The moderate progress made toward greater personal, political and religious freedom following the October 1956 election of Mr. Gomulka as Community Party Secretary has receded. The Polish government has progressively and forcefully reasserted the fundamental theory which holds that religious and intellectual freedom are incompatible with Communism.

2. Polish national independence is a myth. Because of the Oder-Neisse boundary dispute, West Germany's international position and Poland's economic and military dependence on the Soviet Union, Poland is simply unavailable to the West.

3. Poland is heavily engaged in a war-by-proxy against the United States.

This is being accomplished through economic, military, political and moral support for our enemies in Vietnam.

Specific evidence is offered to support each of these contentions.

In addition to policy questions, I believe the proposal is subject to legal challenge under the language and legislative history of five applicable statutes:

1. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

2. The Battle Act.

3. Public Law 480, as amended.

4. The "Findley Amendment" to the Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1967.

5. The Foreign Assistance Appropriation Act of 1966.

"Accordingly, I respectfully urge that the proposal be withdrawn and the Polish government notified that the United States will, until further notice, expect full payment in dollars for all obligations as they come due. At the same time it would be helpful to inform the Polish government of our concern over the recession of individual liberty and national independence in Poland, and our outrage over Poland's war-by-proxy against us.

"This would offer a crucial test of the Polish myth. By dropping the war-by-proxy and reversing the tide against individual liberty, the Gomulka government could demonstrate Polish independence—if such is possible—and thus strengthen its application for United States' aid in the future.

"Heretofore our aid has been one of the most important stabilizing forces for the Gomulka regime, helping to maintain an economic level above that which would produce mass dissatisfaction. In effect our aid

⁴⁰ Current History, April 10, 1964.

⁴¹ New York Times, April 18, 1964.

⁴² New York Times, April 18, 1964.

⁴³ Washington Post, November 10, 1966.

has helped to provide the government's margin of safety during the same period in which individual liberty has suffered setbacks and war-by-proxy undertaken.

"At this point common sense dictates that we withhold further aid, and let Mr. Gomulka contemplate the consequences.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, here are two letters on the same subjects I have sent recently to the Comptroller General:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1967.

HON. ELMER STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: At the present time the Executive has directed our ambassador to Poland to enter into negotiations with the Polish government regarding payment this year of about \$18,000,000. This is an obligation that Poland incurred under our PL 480 program. On January 2, 1967, Poland paid \$3,700,000 in dollars, and our government is considering proposals which would allow Poland to pay off this dollar debt with zloties which would be spent for mutually agreed upon purposes in Poland.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, which deals with PL 480, it is my opinion that the legislative history on acts relating to Poland since 1960 clearly demonstrates that Congress intended a restrictive policy in matters of foreign aid, trade and PL 480 funds. I am concerned that the proposals of the executive permitting payment in zloties violates this legislative intent and ask for clarification from your office.

In his 1961 State of the Union message, President Kennedy asked the Congress to enact legislation which would amend the Battle Act to permit the United States to extend aid to Poland when such action might be in the nation's best interest. The Congress did not do so. The proposal passed the Senate, but the House failed to act. Congress' failure to relax a rather stiff ban regarding Poland under the Battle Act is just one indication among many that Congress intended to be restrictive in its policy of aid to Poland.

In the same State of the Union message, President Kennedy asked the Congress to enact legislation which would permit the use of U.S.-owned Polish currency on projects of peace. Congress responded by passing only one such authorization, and it was carefully limited. The Congress authorized the President to use \$100,000 in U.S. owned foreign currencies for construction of a U.S. sponsored trade school in Poland.

In 1962, the Congress again dealt with the question of Poland in the foreign aid appropriations. The House sustained the principle that aid should not be extended to nations "whose government is based upon that theory of government known as Communism" except for funds for construction of a Children's Hospital in Krakow, Poland. The bill as finally enacted prohibited such economic aid to Communist countries except when the President determined that the national interest so required. Thus the Congress again showed general objection to aid to Poland.

In 1964 the Congress removed Poland's status as a "most favored nation" under our tariffs. In 1966 the Congress declined to take up the President's East-West Trade Bill which would have reinstated this provision.

Aside from questions of aid and trade arrangements, Congress has treated Poland as a special case under PL 480.

From the beginning all PL 480 agreements with Poland have carefully specified that all currency proceeds of the transaction be reserved exclusively for U.S. purposes—and none for economic development loans and

other forms of assistance provided in most PL 480 agreements with other countries. All agreements have, furthermore, specified that the local currencies accruing to the U.S. ultimately be convertible into dollars.

Thus the whole record of Congressional intent shows that the Congress has carefully avoided foreign aid to Poland except in very limited situations where exact Congressional authorization and appropriation were given.

The effect of the President's proposal on Poland, as I understand it, would circumvent the route of specific Congressional authorization and would violate the long and consistent record of Congressional intent. The whole basis of these negotiations is that Poland has financial problems which would place a great burden on them to liquidate this debt in dollars. This is established by the President's speech in New York City on October 7 to the National Conference of Editorial Writers in which he said, "The Secretary of State is reviewing the possibility of easing the burden of Polish debts to the U.S. through expenditures of our Polish currency holdings which would be mutually beneficial to both countries." Therefore, to the extent that we ease this burden our proposals constitute economic aid to Poland.

The policy of restricting economic aid to Poland was reaffirmed by the 88th Congress when it enacted my amendment which eliminated Poland from any further soft-currency transactions under PL 480. It was reaffirmed in at least three instances by the 89th Congress; first, in the Findley Amendment to the Appropriation Bill for Agriculture and Related Agencies, under which subsidized credit under PL 480 was denied to any nation like Poland which trades with North Vietnam; second, in a similar provision in the legislative history on the same bill as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 18, page 25308.

Thus in all three instances the Congress clearly demonstrated its opposition to PL 480 being used as foreign economic aid to Poland. The proposals submitted to the Polish government by the executive constitute economic aid in that their principal purpose would be to alleviate Poland's scarcity of dollar resources.

I request the General Accounting Office to investigate the nature of the proposal offered and the terms of payment to determine whether or not they conform with the intent of Congress as expressed in recent years.

Sincerely yours,
PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1967.

HON. ELMER STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: On January 13, 1967 I wrote your office requesting a report on the legality of our proposal to the Polish government in which we would permit the debts incurred by Poland under Public Law 480 to be repaid in zloties. These zloties would then be used for "mutually beneficial" projects in Poland.

The factual circumstances appear to be as follows:

FACTS

Pursuant to agreements under Public Law 480 between the U.S. and Polish governments, during the period 1956-64 large quantities of U.S. farm commodities have been sold to Poland for their local currency (zloties). These currencies (worth approximately one-half billion dollars) are accumulated in Poland and cannot be used for any "country uses" there. Only limited "U.S. uses" are permitted. Poland has agreed to repay the proceeds of these sales in U.S. dollars, rather than in local currency. According to recent

press accounts the Administration has offered the Polish government the option of repaying in zloties a substantial portion of the dollar payments due the United States during 1967. These zloties would then be used for "mutually beneficial" projects in Poland, which is currently reported to be actively assisting the North Vietnamese government.

If these facts are correct, it would seem that very serious legal and policy questions are raised.

LEGAL VALIDITY DOUBTFUL

The legality of the reported Administration proposal is subject to legal challenge under the language and legislative history of five applicable statutes: The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; the Battle Act; Public Law 480, as amended; the "Findley rider" to the Agricultural Appropriations Act of 1967; and the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1966.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961, AS AMENDED

The proposed agreement would seem to be in conflict with Section 620 (f) and (1) of that Act. Section 620 (f) specifically defines Poland as a "Communist country" and Section 620 (1) prohibits any assistance to countries which are "engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts against" the United States, a nation receiving U.S. assistance, or a nation with which the United States has a P.L. 480 sales agreement unless there is a Presidential finding that such efforts have ceased and he reports the same to Congress.¹

In the present situation, if Poland is providing military assistance to North Vietnam, a sister Communist state that is engaged in open warfare against the United States and South Vietnam, a beneficiary of both U.S. foreign aid and P.L. 480 sales, the term "aggressive military efforts" should be con-

¹ Section 620 (f) reads as follows:

"(f) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, as amended (except section 214(b)), to any Communist country. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act unless the President finds and promptly reports to Congress that: (1) such assistance is vital to the security of the United States; (2) that the recipient country is not controlled by the International Communist conspiracy; and (3) such assistance will further promote the independence of the recipient country from international communism. For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase "Communist country" shall include specifically, but not be limited to, the following countries: "Peoples Republic of Albania, Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, Peoples Republic of China, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, German Democratic Republic (East Germany), Estonia, Hungarian Peoples Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korean Peoples Republic, North Vietnam, Outer Mongolia-Mongolian Peoples Republic, Polish Peoples Republic, Rumanian Peoples Republic, Tibet, Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia, Cuba, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (including its captive constituent republics)."

² Section 620 (1) reads as follows:

"(1) No assistance shall be provided under this or any other Act, and no sales shall be made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, to any country which the President determines is engaging in or preparing for aggressive military efforts directed against (1) the United States, (2) any country receiving assistance under this or any other Act, or (3) any country to which sales are made under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, until the President determines that such military efforts or preparations have ceased and he reports to the Congress that he has received assurances satisfactory to him that such military efforts or preparations will not be renewed. This restriction may not be waived pursuant to any authority contained in this Act."

strued to include the shipment of military equipment to a nation actively engaged in armed conflict against American troops. As of this date, Congress has not been informed of a Presidential finding that these efforts have ceased. Therefore, the extension of aid to Poland by converting a dollar obligation into foreign currencies for use by that nation for its internal welfare would appear to be contrary to this provision of law.

BATTLE ACT

Section 101 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (the Battle Act) declares the policy of the United States to be that no military, economic or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on certain military and strategic shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States.³

Again in the present situation, the conversion of dollar repayment obligations into foreign currency grants is certainly a form of "economic or financial assistance" and the shipment by Poland of any "Battle Act" materials to North Vietnam is certainly "threatening the security of the United States." The Presidential waiver authority in other parts of the Battle Act has apparently not been exercised in this particular instance.⁴

PUBLIC LAW 480 AND FINDLEY RIDER

Sales of U.S. farm commodities for zlotys were prohibited by the 1964 amendments to Public Law 480.⁵

The 1964 amendments were adopted by Congress in recognition of the fact that excessive amounts of foreign currency were being accumulated in Poland and that any future problems of repayment in hard currency would only be aggravated by future soft currency sales. In rewriting the provisions dealing with Communist countries in 1964, Poland was treated differently from Yugoslavia, the only other Communist nation receiving concessional sales from the United States under P.L. 480. Both countries were permitted to have dollar credit sales under P.L. 480, but sales to Poland, because of her participation in the Warsaw Pact, were limited to repayment within five years. Yugoslavia was permitted repayment terms to run as long as 20 years.

In the 1966 amendments to P.L. 480,⁶ local currency sales were again prohibited but both Poland and Yugoslavia were treated the same as far as eligibility for long-term dollar credit sales running up to 20 years for repayment.

Both nations, however, were affected by the North Vietnam-Cuba clause in the new law⁷ and by the "Findley rider" to the Agricultural Appropriations Act for FY 1967.⁸ The Findley rider, as far as North Vietnam is concerned, is identical to the language of the new P.L. 480 statute.⁹

Under the language of this law, Poland is obviously ineligible for any P.L. 480 sales agreements at this time. This is true not

only because of Poland's supplying of military equipment to North Vietnam, but also because of the presence of Polish ships in the Haiphong Harbor. (The Polish government has reportedly asked for compensation for damage to a Polish ship that was unloading in North Vietnam.)

In other words, P.L. 480 as now written prohibits any concessional sales agreements with Poland. It is difficult to see how Congressional intent could be construed toward permitting what is in substance, if not in form a dollar gift to a nation with which concessional dollar trade is banned. Put another way, nothing in the language or legislative history of P.L. 480 in any way directly or indirectly authorizes, directs, or encourages the Administration to convert dollar debts into local currency grants to nations which are ineligible for concessional sales.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1966

Section 109(b) of that Act states that there shall be no economic assistance to any nation whose government is based on the theory of Communism unless there is a Presidential determination of national interest and notification to the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees and publication of the same in the Federal Register.¹⁰

In the present case there has not been such a finding in regard to Poland and there has been no notice in the Federal Register. Thus, the furnishing of this form of economic assistance to Poland without an appropriate Presidential finding would not be lawful.

In summary of the legal question, it is clear that there is no specific authority or legislative directive for the Administration to convert Poland's dollar obligations incurred under agreements executed pursuant to P.L. 480 into soft currency grants. On the other hand, there is ample evidence that Congress does not intend for a nation which is at this time legally ineligible to receive concessional sales of farm commodities to be relieved of the obligation of paying her earlier-incurred hard currency debts.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

WHAT A B C'S ARE OUR CHILDREN LEARNING?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate a great American, the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the outstanding article which he has written for the February 1967 issue of the VFW magazine.

¹⁰ Section 109(b) of the Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act of 1966 reads as follows:

"(b) No economic assistance shall be furnished to any nation whose government is based upon that theory of government known as communism under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (except section 214 (b)), unless the President determines that the withholding of such assistance would be contrary to the national interest and reports such determination to the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate. Reports made pursuant to this subsection shall be published in the Federal Register within seven days of submission to the committees and shall contain a statement by the President of the reasons for such determination."

The views that Mr. Hoover expresses have too long been left unrecorded. They should have been stated long ago.

Mr. Hoover places the roots for a revitalization of our spirit where they belong—with the upbringing of our children. Yes, that is where we must again instill the principles of our Founding Fathers in order to halt the growing chaos of crime and immorality. This is where we must commence our actions, individual actions, not the way the administration proposes which is increasing Federal involvement with local police and law-enforcement authorities.

I commend Mr. Hoover, and I include his article in full at this point in my remarks:

A PRIMER FOR TODAY

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice)

For more than a century the children of Colonial America learned to read from a little book of moral texts in which the alphabet was illustrated with woodcuts. Few youthful Americans were unfamiliar with the New England Primer and almost all of them began their memory work with one of its couplets:

"In Adam's fall
We sinned all."

The effect of the New England Primer was twofold. Children learned to read. At the same time they absorbed a beginning of the religious foundation responsible for the kind of conscience which has been termed by visitors to these shores as the key to American independence.

But the moral text no longer stands. To a growing degree, the morality embodied in the famous children's school book is being discarded. Today we appear to be in the process of adopting a new kind of text—one less tangible than the New England Primer. This primer which we are increasingly placing before our young might well be termed a mental handbook for disorder. Its ABCs are to be found in changing Attitudes, in Boredom and Confusion on the part of growing numbers of the American people.

My opinion regarding these current ABCs is derived from observation. One cannot have served for nearly half a century in the field of law enforcement without becoming cognizant, to some degree, of a frightening change in American thinking and American behavior. It is this change I have in mind when I refer to Attitudes.

Let me explain by repeating what I have said on many earlier occasions. Today there is a departure by growing numbers of adults from the recognition of an objective, or absolute, norm of morality. The teaching of "moral behavior" based on a clear-cut right and wrong stemming from an absolute norm of morality has made way, to a growing extent, for what is called "socially acceptable" behavior. In the course of this displacement we have, in my opinion, lost sight of two vital elements—the nature of God and the nature of man. Indeed, we tend to ignore the fact that the very foundations of this Republic rest on the belief that man is a rational creature subject to a rational Creator.

Theologians may describe that which flows from this basic belief as the Natural Law, the Great Plan or the Grand Design. In effect, they have reference to the body of relationship between God and Creation and among His creatures. Generations of men and women who preceded us simply absorbed the fact and lived by it. They knew that when individual man placed himself in opposition to God's immutable laws, his acts did violence to the nature of the Plan and were, therefore, immoral. Thus, the line between right and wrong cut sharp and clear, and few

³ The second paragraph of Section 101 of the Battle Act reads as follows:

"It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination."

⁴ See Section 103(b) of the Battle Act (22 U.S.C. 1611b).

⁵ See Section 107 of Public Law 83-480, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1707).

⁶ See Section 103(d) of Public Law 83-480, as amended by Public Law 89-808 approved November 11, 1966.

⁷ Ibid Section 103(d) (3).

⁸ Public Law 89-556 approved September 7, 1966.

⁹ Ibid 7 and 8.

Americans reached adulthood without an equally clear knowledge of the behavior fitting either category.

For centuries the vast majority of Americans ranged themselves forthrightly on the side of right. The moral obligation which average citizens felt was clearly manifest in their demand for law and order, in their automatic support of legal authority, and in their contempt for those who lacked personal integrity. Respect for law and order was implanted in children and standards of youth discipline were extraordinarily high. That fact is pointed up sharply in editorial comment more than a hundred years ago when, under the heading "Rude Boys," a prominent newspaper in the nation's capital rebuked a group of youths for misbehaving. What constituted delinquent behavior sufficiently reprehensible to evoke press comment in 1858? Two country boys wearing newly purchased shawls were harassed by city youths who followed them about executing a mock war dance and shouting "Indians!"

Today, news items of robbery, brutal assault and even murder committed by youthful Americans are commonplace.

I repeat, the standards of behavior adhered to by our predecessors were remarkably high. Charles Dickens, whose visit to America in 1842 left him extremely critical of practically all things American, nevertheless stated positively that never once, on any occasion, anywhere, during his travels in America, did he see a woman exposed to the slightest act of rudeness, incivility, or even inattention. The police blotters of almost any American city will attest to the fact that times have indeed changed and that few streets today can be deemed truly safe for anyone.

The crimes of theft which were committed in an earlier day, with few exceptions, were perpetrated by a relatively small fringe of known irresponsibles, who, in a very real sense, were outcasts. Such persons were thought of as a criminal class for the average citizen simply refused to tolerate those who lacked personal integrity. In that day, loss of personal honor meant total disgrace. Today, unfortunately, an atmosphere of "it's all right if you can get by with it" appears to be growing, with more and more citizens closing their eyes to flagrant activities which at an earlier date would have earned scorn and ostracism. In that earlier day, too, poverty was no excuse for breaking a law and it was unthinkable that any citizen might decide which laws he would obey and which, if he happened to disagree with them, he might ignore.

Reverence for God, love of country, respect for womankind, acceptance of responsibility—these, for long years, were the hallmarks of Americans. Are we erasing these clear-cut stamps of a great, independent and stable people and substituting for them symbols of weakness and cynicism? Let us ask ourselves: What attitudes are being recorded in our primer for today's children to absorb?

Unfortunately, growing numbers of citizens care nothing about American attitudes. Boredom, therefore, must be inscribed in stark black letters on many pages. Boredom, or apathy, reaches its unattractive height in the phenomenon summed up in the words: "I didn't want to get involved."

This is the excuse projected by citizens who refuse to accept the responsibilities of citizenship. It is the shamed apology of those who can watch a killer stalk his victim without lifting a finger to dial the police or of those who, in the depths of the night, hear a cry for help without responding in any way. Truly, it is a haunting echo down the long centuries of the guilt-ridden cry, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

To changing Attitudes and to Boredom must be added still another item on the pages of today's primer. This is Confusion on the part of the public.

Currently, a great many good Americans appear to be afflicted with a kind of confusion which I can describe only as sentimental myopia. This is the muddled shortsightedness which enables citizens to afford the perpetrator of a crime infinitely greater consideration than the victim of his criminal act. It is the shortsightedness which, in the face of an increasing deluge of crime, permits the fostering of hostility against law enforcement through the use of vicious epithets and false charges. It is the shortsightedness which, through abuses of probation and parole, results in misguided leniencies. It is the shortsightedness, in instance after instance, which permits turnstile justice and judicial technicalities to nullify the most proficient police work. It is the shortsightedness which requires impossible procedures tending to handcuff law enforcement and to release the guilty. It is the shortsightedness which usurps the authority of the police commander by placing his executive responsibilities for the performance, discipline and control of his officers in the hands of civilians who are generally inexperienced and uninformed in law enforcement and police administration. It is the shortsightedness of those who advocate breaking any law which an individual conceives to be "morally unjust."

There are many additional forces adding to the climate of confusion which surrounds all efforts to achieve justice. For example, one of these is the supervisory control which courts exercise over law enforcement through the exclusionary theory whereby evidence obtained in violation of certain complex and indecisive rules cannot be used in a criminal trial. Lack of public support also results in low morale. This adds to the confused situation by raising roadblocks to the recruitment of desperately needed personnel.

These ABCs in the current primer from which our young people absorb so much that will shape their future do not have to be permanent. They can be expunged. But it will take Alert citizens, Better citizens, more Conscientious citizens to effect essential changes and reverse those trends which seem to be moving us almost inexorably toward the edge of chaos.

Unless those changes are made and those trends reversed, the next generation of Americans will learn from a new primer—and its ABCs will read Anarchy, Brutality, and Crime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and all Americans to give Mr. Hoover's words very careful consideration.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM—XI

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in its publication entitled "Channeling," the selective service stresses the importance of its role in procuring the manpower necessary to provide maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development and the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources. All of this is accomplished, according to the Selective Service System, by the deferment policy.

I do not disagree with the selective service that the technological and scientific areas are crucial to the development and future of this Nation. Ever since the orbiting of the first sputnik in 1957 the concern has been expressed that American education must focus greater attention in fostering and strengthening the academic disciplines in the sciences. Furthermore, when nearly all draftable age men saw service, the deferment system may have been a valid way of assuring that certain jobs in the national interest were performed.

Today, however, this type of deferment system can no longer be tolerated. Only 46 percent of the 26-year-olds had seen military service in 1966. The tremendous increase in available manpower has given the draft, through the system of deferments, unanticipated and undesirable authority to designate what civilian jobs are in the national interest for deferment purposes. This deferment system results in the draft regulating the civilian careers of more than 50 percent of our draft-age men who never see military service.

The selective service denies compelling people "by edict as in foreign systems to enter pursuits having to do with essentiality and progress." What it does, however, is to threaten the draftable age man with the loss or denial of a deferment, so that in actuality, the individual "is impelled to pursue his skill rather than embark upon some less important enterprise." This process, as described by the selective service, is "the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in foreign countries where choice is not permitted."

The strength and greatness of our Nation is measured as much in the quality of our teachers, scholars, administrators, statesmen, social workers, writers and artists as it is in the numbers of technologists we produce. I resent the insinuation by the selective service that certain professions and pursuits "lead to various forms of recognized, patriotic service to the Nation" while others do not and I am appalled to learn that—

The club of induction has been used to drive out of areas considered to be less important to the areas of greater importance in which deferments were given, the individuals who did not or could not participate in activities which were considered essential to the defense of the Nation.

The bureaucratic intervention by the selective service in "how to control effectively the service of individuals who are not in the Armed Forces" emphasizes an ominous trend toward central control not only of individuals but of our society itself. We have already been alerted to the dangers that the military-industrial complex poses to our democratic institutions. The indiscriminate continuation of the draft represents but an extension of this concentration of power. The selective service law must be changed.

ENCOURAGING TRAVEL AT HOME

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, last week the President sent to Congress his annual Economic Report. The report covered a wide range of issues, and I am certain each proposal in the report will be given the most careful and closest of scrutiny.

One section of the President's report was of particular interest to me. The President emphasized the necessity to "seek further improvement" in our balance-of-payments posture. He indicated that—

Our goal in the coming year is to continue to move toward balance of payments equilibrium. This goal will be supported through measures and policies consistent with healthy growth at home and our responsibilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the President for emphasizing as one of his major goals creating a more positive structure in our balance-of-payments pictures. Particularly encouraging was one of the specific proposals the President suggested. An increasingly perplexing situation has been the flow of American tourist dollars from the country, and the President addressed himself to this issue by saying:

The most satisfactory way to arrest the increasing gap between American travel abroad and foreign travel here is not to limit the former but to stimulate and encourage the latter.

I believe this proposal is especially enlightened, and I commend the President for his leadership in this area. In 1964 I was privileged to serve on a Special Select Committee on Tourism. After an extensive investigation a number of specific recommendations were considered.

Today Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation that I believe will be effective in dealing with this important issue. The bill I am introducing amends the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States. The bill strongly sets forth its purpose as "strengthening the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States."

The legislation places initial responsibility for the act's administration in the hands of the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce is asked to:

First, formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

Second, develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

Third, encourage the development of tourist facilities, low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United

States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

Fourth, foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

Fifth, encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States;

Sixth, collect, publish, and provide for all the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of matters of interest to tourists;

Seventh, create the Office of Travel Program Coordination to carry out the provisions of the act;

Eighth, create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission composed of knowledgeable people in the field to make a 2-year investigation designed to deal with the present and future needs of the tourist in America.

The President has said he intends to shortly appoint a task force to report to him by May 1, 1967, recommendations that he can propose to Congress. I earnestly suggest that this task force-to-be begin its work with the material prepared by the Select House Committee on Tourism. I am certain they will find much useful and valuable information that will assist in the preparation of their final recommendations to the President.

I am also hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the task force will give serious consideration to the approach outlined in my bill. The steps suggested in the bill are based on the results of the Tourism Committee's work, and I believe are worthy of a full hearing.

Let me stress that I am very encouraged by the President's reference to this matter of promoting travel in the United States. I am optimistic that the 90th Congress will be the one that will pass the required legislation that will institute the necessary programs.

A well reasoned and carefully considered approach in encouraging travel at home will not only eventually result in improving the balance of payments situation, but will also facilitate a better understanding of America by Americans as well as the people of other nations. Such compelling goals are worth our active pursuit.

A CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH TO THE BUDGET

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have been presented with a budget that, unlike budgets of the past, is candid and direct. It represents an honest effort to carry forward Great Society programs, while fighting a war. Such a forthright presentation must be welcomed by Mem-

bers as a constructive step away from the gimmickry and obfuscation that have all too frequently been typical of the budget document.

Past budgets have hardly earned a reputation as pristine documents, exemplifying directness and clarity. In fact, as a budget watcher of some long standing, I must confess an honest inability to cope with the voluminous detail, the technicalities of accounting and the ponderous columns of numbers and cryptic titles attached thereto which have become part and parcel of the budget process. I suspect—no, I know—that there must be awards given downtown at the Bureau of the Budget for devising new and more intricate devices to make the budget document more inscrutable.

Along with the increasing complexity of the budget, there has been a concomitant growth in the tendency to adopt a few oversimplifications, sacred cows, which have become an integral part of budget discussions. Among these hallowed but little valued habits is the concentration on the administrative budget, the budget which understates Federal expenditures and obligations by ignoring the activities of the trust funds.

THE NATIONAL INCOME ACCOUNTS BUDGET

I was pleased and encouraged to find in the budget message a concentration on the national income accounts budget. A measure which has long been used by economists and fiscal experts to analyze the flow of income and production in the economy. Its measures of total Federal receipts and expenditures are identical to those used by corporations and individuals in identifying and recording their receipts and expenditures of business firms and individuals. The national income accounts budget along with a similar data on businesses and individuals goes to make up the measures of gross national product and national income.

The frank and open discussion of the budget on this basis was long overdue. Leaders in public affairs have long called for a more candid and direct disclosure of public finance. In his remarks at Yale University in 1962, President Kennedy said:

In fiscal policy . . . myths are legion and truth is hard to find. But let me take as a prime example the Federal budget. We persist in measuring our Federal fiscal integrity today by the conventional administrative budget—with results which would be regarded as absurd in any business firm—in any country of Europe—or in any careful assessment of the reality of our national finance. The administrative budget has sound administrative uses. But for wider purposes it is less helpful. It omits our special trust funds; it neglects changes in assets or inventories. It cannot tell a loan from a straight expenditure—and worst of all it cannot distinguish between operating expenditures and long-term investments.

The national income accounts budget's most significant advantage is that it does not confuse lending with spending. This is proper and appropriate. Business firms and individuals do not record loans as expenditures, they recognize that for every loan there is an asset acquired of equivalent value. It is proper that the

Federal budget recognizes that loans are offset by tangible assets, assets which add to the Nation's total wealth and the recipient communities resources. It can be shown, historically, that the value added by such investments far exceeds in economic value, to say nothing of social value, the face amount of the loans.

To exclude such loan transaction from Federal budget calculations is also appropriate since it is consistent with what you and I know to be the objective of Federal participation. The aim is not one of a permanent, long-term spending support. It is a limited yet catalytic role—one of restricted involvement—intended to spur activity in areas where the economy has demonstrated an inability or unwillingness to act. In some areas this has meant guaranteeing loans as in the case of FHA and VA insurance; in others it has required a Federal Secondary Market operations role to facilitate the flow of mortgage funds from areas of surplus to areas of need; more recently it has meant a program of participation sales whereby loans made by Federal agencies are packaged and sold to private investors. But in all cases the motion has been made in the direction of temporary or limited activity. To include any of the loan transactions in the budget would both overstate and misstate the Federal role and commitment.

PITFALLS IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET

It is clear to me that to concentrate on other than the national income accounts budget, in relation to the great problems of Federal fiscal policy, is not simply irrelevant; it can be actively misleading. And yet there is a mythology that measures all of our national soundness or unsoundness on the single basis of this same annual administrative budget. If our Federal budget is to serve not the debate but the country, we must avoid this dialog.

There are those who would try to take steps to focus attention on the administrative budget and through budget devices endeavor to misconstrue the size of the budget deficit. This represents a retreat from constructive and effective effort that has been made to clearly and fairly disclose the impact of Federal activity.

The only logically consistent alternative to national income accounts budget is a calculation which would include all Government liabilities. Such an approach would identify all Federal obligations as debts to be paid and fix the Federal debt ceiling accordingly. Such a proposal is more reasonable than the administrative budget. At least it counts all loan obligations consistently and makes no artificial or arbitrary distinctions.

Although more desirable than the administrative budget office, this method shares the absurdity of the administrative budget. It is absurd because, like the administrative budget, it would count the beneficial interest in assets, represented for example by college housing, small businesses, and home mortgages as liabilities. Absurd because it would require the increase of the national debt by some \$100 million to cover the total

extent of the Government's exposure not covered in the public debt.

I would submit, however, that the opponents of the approach of the present budget should, if they desire to be consistent, propose an increase in the debt of not an additional \$5 billion but of an amount sufficient to cover the entirety of the contingent liability of the Federal Government, some \$100 billion.

Let us not bog down in the complexities of the administrative budget or derivations there of with all their traps and misconstructions. Instead, let disagreement over the budget be carried on the same frank and open basis as has characterized our deliberations this session. Let us also resolve to carry on this discussion on the basis which is recognized to the most accurate, available measure of Federal fiscal activity—the national income accounts budget.

THE ISSUE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT: COMMUNITIES OF TOMORROW

Mr. EILBERG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Secretary Freeman made the second in a series of policy speeches concerning the six major operational areas of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The first address, on "Programs and Commodities," was delivered January 20 at the Southwest Agricultural Forum in Tulsa, Okla. The Secretary spoke yesterday on the subject of rural development at a conference on rural poverty sponsored by the National Association for Community Development.

I commend this speech—entitled "The Issue of Rural Development: Communities of Tomorrow"—to the attention of everyone interested in development and jobs and opportunity in both city and country, since the various problems in this field are inseparably intertwined.

The Secretary's speech follows:

THE ISSUE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT: COMMUNITIES OF TOMORROW

We are now seven years into the seventh decade of the Twentieth Century, poised at a point in time when fundamental, widespread and irreversible change in the fabric of the United States is occurring daily.

Thirty-three years ahead of us lies the dawn of a new century. And if that date has the ring of the far-distant future, it might be well to recall just how short a period three decades really is.

We are equidistant in time today from the year 2000 and the year 1934, the second year of the New Deal. Rural America then, as now, was in crisis, but of a different order—a crisis highly visible, affecting almost the total rural population, and part of a larger economic crisis affecting the entire Nation.

The Nation responded to this crisis, creating agencies and programs to conserve the soil, to bring electricity to the countryside, to bring agricultural supply and demand in balance, and a host of other measures which fundamentally altered the condition of American life.

What we did then profoundly affected what we are today.

Now, 33 years later, we face crisis of another order—just as acute, just as widespread as the crisis in the thirties, but with this fundamental difference: Today's crisis in rural America is a hidden crisis, largely invisible, and largely overshadowed by other, more spectacular problems at home and abroad.

DIMENSIONS OF THE CRISIS

The dimensions of the crisis are well known to all of you who are deeply involved in rural development. They consist of too little of everything—jobs, income, education, and services—in rural America, and a continuing one-way flow of people from country to city, damaging to country and city alike.

The crisis is neither simple nor easy of solution. It is complex, multi-faceted, and feeds upon itself. Less economic opportunity in rural America means fewer jobs; underemployment means a lower tax base; a lower tax base means poorer community facilities and education; crippled education and facilities bring the problem full circle by discouraging industry from locating in rural areas.

The result has been a rural America with space to spare, but starved for opportunity—and paradoxically an urban America with opportunity for the many, but starved for space for her residents to move in, to enjoy, to breathe.

Rural residents have roughly half the number of doctors per 100,000 people as city people; a third of the number of dentists. The amount of underemployment in rural America is equivalent to 2.5 million unemployed. 6.8 million rural homes are in need of repairs and 30,000 rural communities need improved water and sewer systems. The educational achievement rate is some two years behind that of urban America and the dropout rate is 7 percent higher than in urban areas.

THE CITY TODAY

An unplanned policy of exporting rural problems to the city has drawn urban America into the rural crisis. For the affluent of the city, the unchecked migration means more crowding, higher taxes, more hours consumed in commuting as urban sprawl continues unabated. For migrants already in the teeming ghettos, further immigration means less opportunity and rising despair.

One urban observer put it this way:

"Our cities exact too much from those who live in them. They are not only increasingly expensive places in which to live or work; more and more, the price of city living is being paid by a sacrifice of fundamental personal freedoms." The author of these words is no agrarian fundamentalist; he is Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City.

THE CITY TOMORROW

By the turn of the century, if present trends continue unchecked, Mayor Lindsay's New York will have become part of a super megalopolis stretching from present-day Boston south to Washington, D.C., and containing 56 million people. This strip city, and 4 other strips like it, will house 174 million Americans on urbanized land ranging in density from 660 to 2,600 people per square mile.

Residents of these 5 super strip cities and other urbanized areas will get up earlier, spend more time breathing their neighbors' car exhaust and return home later. Superhighways and mass transit systems will soak up increasing amounts of urban land in a frantic race to keep the city mobile. If past trends are an indication, crimes of violence will increase as urban life becomes increasingly more depersonalized and hopeless for the disadvantaged.

Nor can we count with any certainty on being rescued by technology from such a reckless concentration of people, vehicles and

industry. The number of automobiles is increasing at a rate twice that of U.S. population. By the year 2000 we will have an estimated 200 million cars in the U.S.—nearly 3 times as many as today. With this many mobile pollution sources crowded into 9 percent of the land area, even the most stringent anti-pollution ordinances will do little more than preserve the status quo, if that. Pollutants produced by industry, sewage plants and land development, will increase apace.

This is the world we're building, simply by allowing present trends to continue to their logical conclusion—for powerful, yet unplanned, forces are tending in the direction of even further imbalance.

CENTRALIZATION FACTORS

1. One of these is tradition. The farm-to-city migration has been under way for a hundred years or more. Cities have traditionally offered better wages, education, community facilities, and cultural activities than rural areas. Both the city and the countryside have undergone tremendous change in recent years, and now many rural communities offer as much as the central city . . . and a great deal more that the urban complex cannot offer. Yet the tug of traditional thinking is strong, both on the average citizen and on those who make the plant-location decisions.

2. A second factor encouraging centralization can be summed up as, "them as has, gets." Those areas which already have industry attract more, and this in turn attracts even more. The sprawling electronics complex in Southern California is an example. Although overcrowding, increased taxation and snarled transportation in urban areas are making rural locations increasingly attractive, the lure of established commerce still is a powerful force.

3. A third factor is negative, but quite possibly more important than the other two combined: *We lack any accepted national goal in rural/urban balance.* We have never seriously asked—let alone answered—questions like these: "What is a desirable maximum size for any one metropolitan area?" "How much weight should be given to rural/urban balance in the location of government facilities and awarding of contracts?" "Are more Federal incentives desirable to encourage rural development? If so, how much?" "What are the social costs involved in this unplanned population shift?"

In the absence of a national policy in this matter, decisions in industrial location, government installations, contract awards, and government program expenditures all tend to favor urban areas.

A continued unplanned stacking up of more people in urban areas, at the expense of rural areas, is a national drift that bodes ill for the future. No one planned it this way; like Topsy, "It just grew." Nobody really wants an America of super strip cities, dotted with explosive and squalid ghettos. It is not too much to call such a drift "national idioy," and it does no good to offer palliatives and pills to cure a disease which has literally assumed epidemic proportions.

THE NEW AWARENESS

Working against this centralizing drift, fortunately, is the flickering beginning of a national awareness of the relationship between urban and rural problems, and a growing commitment to meeting the problems in rural America, rather than exporting them.

Author J. P. Lyford, in his book on the New York slums, "The Airtight Cage," articulates this new awareness by asking:

"Why, for instance, must huge concentrations of unemployed and untrained human beings continue to pile up in financially unstable cities that no longer have the jobs, the housing, the educational opportunities, or any of the other prerequisites for a healthy and productive life? Why do we treat the

consequences and ignore the causes of massive and purposeless migration to the city? Why are we not developing new uses for those rural areas that are rapidly becoming depopulated? Why do we still instinctively deal with urban and rural America as if they were separate, conflicting interests when in fact neither interest can be served independently of the other?"

The President, speaking last September in Dallastown, Pennsylvania, said:

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities. . . . The welfare of this Nation demands it . . . Must we export our youth to the cities faster than we export our crops and our livestock to market? I believe we can do something about this."

We can:

Urban America, according to its spokesmen, can easily absorb one trillion dollars to make existing cities livable. Certainly we should bend every effort to make them livable. But at the same time we should devote much more to building rural America than we have done in the past, to head off even more virulent attacks of urban decay occasioned by uncontrolled growth in the future. Doing this will cost less and get better results.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Basic to any discussion of this rural development is agriculture—because a healthy agricultural plant provides an underpinning to support the rural economy. This basic resource is in a very different position today than it was 5 years ago, or even 12 months ago:

1. Food surpluses have disappeared, and an end to surpluses in cotton and tobacco is within grasp. Our reliance now is on stored acres and improved technology to produce for need, rather than on stored commodities.

2. Farm income, both gross and net, has increased markedly. Last year gross income was the highest in history and net income was the second highest. In the 6 years since 1960, \$31.8 billion more in gross income has been pumped into the rural economy, over and above what would have been earned had 1960 levels continued.

3. Demand for agricultural products is strong and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Exports during 1966 totaled some \$6.9 billion and should surpass \$7 billion this year.

4. The free market, much praised but little used during the fifties, is now freer of government controls than it has been in decades.

5. Our commodities are moving in the world market at world prices, because of an aggressive public and private market development program and because of pricing policies designed to meet competition.

6. Of great significance is the accelerated graduation into "adequate size" class by family farms in recent years. One measure of "adequate size" is gross sales of \$10,000 a year or more. Since 1959, nearly 200,000 farm families have moved into that class.

But let me be emphatically clear at this point: Despite steady progress the last 6 years, the farmer's income still lags far behind that of other Americans.

On a per capita basis, the farmer's income is \$1,700. Other Americans average \$2,610 per capita.

Farm prices, though up last year, have been down the last few months, and today are less than the 1947-49 average. At the same time, food costs are 35 percent higher.

This the farmer bitterly resents—and properly so.

This discrepancy must be corrected. It must be corrected because it is unfair to the farmer and therefore wrong. It must be corrected because if farmers don't get a fair return commensurate with the other segments of society, we will lose our best farmers. If that happens the entire Nation, not just the farmer, will be hurt.

In addition, more financing and technical assistance, both public and private, should be extended to farmers presently in the "less-than-adequate" size, to allow those farmers to expand operations and to take advantage of modern technology. In other words, we should continue to keep the door open for those who wish to remain in commercial agriculture.

Yet there are many operators who do not wish to expand, or lack the capacity to, because of age, physical disability, grossly inadequate resources, or other limitations. It is critically important that there be a place for these farmers in rural America also—for urban America has no place for him.

Take the case of a man 45 years old whose farm has failed. The small town where he's done his modest shopping has no job for him, nor are there any within commuting range. And so, in a desperate search for work, he moves to the city.

He has no money, so he doesn't have much of a choice in housing . . . he settles in the decayed heart of the city. His limited education puts him out of the running for a job. His limited skills are useless in the city . . . for who needs a man to plow a straight furrow in an asphalt field?

He is one of thousands . . . all disenfranchised, all strangers in a strange land. Families break asunder; children are infected with the virus of the ghetto and yet another generation is crippled. This is the human cost we're talking about.

It is true that our farm commodity programs have helped the less-than-adequate farmer—to an extent. From 1959 through 1965 the class of farmers with gross incomes below \$10,000 yearly increased their per farm net income by some 19 percent. Their off-farm income, with greater job opportunities in recent years, increased some 30 percent. Yet their earnings are far from adequate, and it is unrealistic to expect the farmer with "40 acres and a mule" to enter the mainstream of commercial agriculture.

Commodity programs are not welfare programs; they do not provide the whole answer.

Certainly programs are necessary, and certainly they should be improved. Yet those who stake all their hopes on just one set of solutions for rural America perpetuate a cruel and dangerous illusion. Rural development must proceed on more than one track.

We can offer a place in the countryside to those who, for one reason or another, do not find a rewarding place in commercial farming, or who wish to farm part time and supplement their incomes with outside employment.

NEW TOOLS

The need for such a second track has called forth an array of Federal programs to help rural America. A partial list includes the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, the Rural Water Systems and Sanitation Act, the Housing and Urban Development Act, the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Manpower Training and Development Act; Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Local rural development committees, local Resource and Conservation Districts and local leadership give us an apparatus to use these tools.

So far, we have accomplished a great deal. USDA made more rural housing loans during the past 3 years than in all the prior years since the program began in 1949. In the first 6 months of 1966 alone, grants and loans for rural sewer systems totaled \$13 million and helped 46 communities. Today, nearly 30,000 farmers are engaged in marketing recreation for profit. Since 1963, construction has begun on 256 small watershed projects—the largest number of any similar period in the 12-year history of the program.

Measured against what had gone before, accomplishment has been great. But measured against what *needs* to be done, it is apparent that we have only scratched the surface.

But we are making the attempt:

In my Department, the old county-by-county and agency-by-agency approach is giving way to State and county Technical Action Panels, made up of experts in many disciplines, and keyed to multi-county development. Where local leadership is aggressive and strong, the panels provide a ready source of technical aid; where it is lacking, Technical Action Panels seek to stimulate and involve local leaders in finding answers to local problems.

This new approach points up a basic change in Department thinking. Since its founding, and until very recently, the Department has been almost exclusively concerned with agriculture—keeping its records, researching its problems, conserving its soil, and educating its constituency in scientific farming. All of these functions are still necessary and are still being performed. But in the past 6 years the Department has begun to address itself to the problems of the *other* rural America—an America where poverty is ingrained, opportunity is lacking, and basic community growth facilities are sometimes nonexistent.

These problems, which are essentially human and economic, have been approached within the existing agency framework, and it has taken some basic reorientation on the part of all of us. In 1961, for instance, nearly all Farmers Home Administration loans went to farmers. During fiscal 1967, farmers will receive about 50 percent of the FHA loans, and nonfarm rural residents 50 percent. This doesn't mean farmers are being short-changed, since the total dollar amount loaned to farmers is higher this year than in 1961. It does mean more resources and a new priority for the problems of the small farm and nonfarm people in the countryside.

Another important ingredient in rural development is a re-evaluation of the administrative machinery we need to accomplish the job.

President Johnson pointed up the problem in his State of the Union address when he said:

"... (we) are making and breaking new ground. Some (of our programs) do not yet have the capacity to absorb well or wisely all the money that could be put into them. Administrative skills and trained manpower are just as vital to their success as dollars, and I believe these skills will come. But it will take time and patience and hard work. Success cannot be forced at a single stroke. So we must continue to strengthen the administration of every program if that success is to come—as we know it must. . . . Every program will be thoroughly evaluated. . . . where there have been mistakes, we will try very hard to correct them."

Such an evaluation is taking place today in the Department of Agriculture, in other Federal agencies, and in many of the States.

A RISING TIDE OF INTEREST

President Johnson has a deep and abiding interest in rural development. In recent Executive Orders, including Number 11307, issued last fall, the President made this interest unmistakably clear:

1. He directed Federal agencies to coordinate their boundaries for Federally-assisted planning and development districts with existing State planning boundaries, to eliminate confusion and overlap,

2. He directed the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget Bureau to review *all* existing programs with Cabinet and other Federal officials to insure that rural areas receive an equitable share of existing Federal program benefits, and to submit proposals for administrative or leg-

islative changes needed to obtain such equity,

3. And he gave the Secretary of Agriculture responsibility within the Federal establishment for identifying agricultural and rural development problems which require the cooperation of various Federal departments, so that these programs may be better coordinated, and duplication eliminated.

These are a few of the recent Federal actions that bear directly on the problems of rural America.

But this is a big, diverse country and Federal actions alone won't solve rural America's problems. This is a point which cannot be stated too strongly. Nobody in Washington can pre-package a cure for the ills of rural America, ship it out to the country, and expect it to work. The Federal Government has literally hundreds of programs which *can* work, but making them effective takes local initiative, local leadership and local planning.

We have learned that where this local leadership exists, a pipeline through which to channel our development efforts also exists. Without it, development efforts are ineffective.

We have also learned the lesson of planning on a multi-county basis. It is difficult for every single rural community to offer a full set of community services of the calibre needed for sustained growth.

But a group of counties, usually with a small or medium-sized city at its center within easy commuting range, *can* provide the framework needed to make Federal and State programs effective. When united for planning purposes, the people and governments of such a functional community can assess the area's needs and determine the combinations of internal and outside resources essential to spark growth.

The multi-county approach is being taken by a number of States, including Kentucky, Iowa and Georgia, among others. The Appalachian Regional Commission and other regional groups are exploring this approach. Its effectiveness is becoming increasingly apparent.

Achievement of our development objectives will take planning, dedication, hard work, and some basic re-thinking of long-cherished folkways.

Planning is paramount. Building bigger and more sprawling strip cities can proceed without real planning; but upgrading the communities we have now—and building new communities—demands it.

Finally, of course, we have learned that we need to know a great deal more about rural America and its problems than we do now. To find answers to these questions, and to come up with effective solutions, President Johnson has established a Committee on Rural Poverty, which I am privileged to chair, and a National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, chaired by Governor Breathitt of Kentucky.

And while the Commission and Committee are seeking answers, the Department, in cooperation with other Federal Departments, the States, local government, and volunteer groups, will be pushing its own rural development programs at an ever-increasing tempo. In 1967, among other actions, we will:

1. Provide \$33 million in Economic Opportunity loans to help 13,000 low-income families and some 390 cooperatives composed of low-income families.

2. Provide \$435 million in rural housing loans for 48,000 families.

3. Help finance about 200 community recreation centers in rural areas.

4. Finance \$304 million in loans and grants for construction or improvement of some 1,700 central water and waste disposal systems in rural areas.

5. Assist 10 additional local groups with Resource Conservation and Development projects.

6. Approve construction of another 63 multiple purpose small watershed projects with 45 reservoirs.

7. Help 8,500 additional rural land owners with income-producing recreational developments involving 150,000 acres of land.

8. Supervise harvest of another 12½ billion board feet of National Forest timber, providing 700,000 man years of employment, sharing \$40 million of revenue with local governments for roads and schools.

9. Reforest 280,000 acres of timber lands, improve timber stands on another 440,000 acres, and build another 295 recreation sites in the National Forests.

THE MATTER OF CHOICE

What we in rural development are all fundamentally concerned with, it seems to me, is the matter of choice—of offering alternatives to ever-larger cities in the future. President Johnson put it this way:

"History records a long hard struggle to establish man's right to go where he pleases and live where he chooses. It took many centuries—and many bloody revolutions—to break the chains that bound him to a particular plot of land, or confined him within the walls of a particular community.

"We lost that freedom when our children are obliged to live someplace else . . . if they want a job or if they want a decent education.

"Not just sentiment demands that we do more to help our farms and rural communities . . . the welfare of this Nation demands it."

I believe that we *can* choose what kind of America our children will inherit 33 years from now, for we are not the blind pawns of Fate, but rather the shapers of our own destiny.

I believe that we as a nation *should* grasp this chance to shape our destiny—grasp it here and now, without further delay—before the chance for choice eludes us.

Thank you.

PAT HALL: A "DIFFERENT" INDUSTRIALIST

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the domestic textile industry is vital to our economy and to our national security. In peace and war the textile plants of the United States furnish the many textile items required for the use of the Armed Forces and the civilian population. The industry employs hundreds of thousands of Americans and contributes many millions of dollars in local, State, and Federal taxes.

The greatest concentration of textile plants in the Nation is located in the district I am privileged to represent in the Congress. Nearly 230,000 North Carolinians are employed in textile plants. My congressional district has over 63,000 textile employees. The future of the textile industry and the problems of the people who earn their livelihoods in textile plants are of great interest and concern to me.

The textile industry has been characterized by outstanding leadership. The fact that the industry has been able to

survive and prosper in the face of mounting textile imports and other free trade policies of our Government attests to the high type of industrial leadership we find in the textile industry.

One of the men who plays an important role in keeping the textile mills operating at peak efficiency in the South is E. Pat Hall, of Charlotte, N.C. This dynamic industrialist furnishes to textile manufacturers nearly every item of machinery, supplies, and other materials necessary for the operation of textile plants.

E. Pat Hall is known throughout the textile industry for his keen business acumen, his forceful personality, and his tremendous ability to get things done. The Southern Textile News of January 30, 1967, carried a very interesting article concerning Pat Hall's personality and contribution to the textile industry. I include the article as a part of my remarks:

PAT HALL: A "DIFFERENT" INDUSTRIALIST

CHARLOTTE.—One of the exciting announcements originating at the Southern Textile Exposition at Greenville in 1966 was a new concept in textile complexes—a super market for the textile industry—where the mill buyer could make one visit and buy almost anything he needed in the way of machinery, materials or supplies.

The idea was advanced by E. Pat Hall, a well-known figure in the textile machinery field. Mr. Hall, a visitor at textile machinery exhibitions for more than ten years, felt that the industry had a need for such a shopping complex.

And he felt that he had the location for it. Charlotte.

And the name. Texland.

At Southern Textile News, we felt that it might be well to do a story about Mr. Hall—not on Texland itself, for we've already done that—but on what kind of man this is who's going to build the textile shopping center.

So—we checked around with everyone we could find who knew Mr. Hall. With his friends, employees, customers . . . and others.

We found first that practically everyone in textiles knows Pat Hall. That there are dozens of little human-interest stories making the rounds about him.

His personality seems to be filled with the type of flamboyance that makes people want to talk about him.

For instance, there's the story about his getting one of the first automobile telephones in the state, which he had wired to his automobile horn so that everytime the phone would ring, the horn would blow.

Now telephones just weren't to be found in automobiles in those days so it attracted quite a lot of attention when Mr. Hall's car would suddenly begin blowing its horn all by itself, and particularly so when he walked over and answered the phone.

One day while parked on one of Charlotte's main streets the auto horn abruptly began to honk frantically, even though unattended. Mr. Hall dashed out from a store and answered the telephone.

Noting that another car had pulled up alongside with the driver all agog and staring unbelievably, Mr. Hall paused and extended the telephone receiver toward the other driver.

"It's for you!" he said.

The other driver drove off hurriedly.

Most of the employees with the Hall Textile Machinery Organization have been with the firm for many years. And we found that all these employees have an unusual personal loyalty to Mr. Hall. They're willing to work long, abnormal hours if there's a need. They're willing to perform tasks which don't fall under their job description.

One of the stories chortled over by the employes is about the only time Pat Hall was at a loss for words.

It seems that one of the men had to make a delivery of machinery. And that he took his own good time about bringing his truck back and reporting for work. As a matter of fact, he was a whole day late in coming back.

And when he did report in Mr. Hall lit into him with both feet, chewing up one side and down the other.

Finally he ran out of expletives and recriminations.

"What in the world am I going to do with you, Sandy?" he asked plaintively.

"Mr. Hall," he mumbled after a period of thought, "Ef I was as smart as you, you'd be working for me instead of the other way 'round."

The workers at the plant swear that Pat Hall just stood there for a moment, then turned his back and stalked off, without another word.

Mr. Hall believes that entertainment is important to his business. And he keeps his own private railroad car for that reason. Whenever he attends a show or exposition such as Greenville's STE, he carries the railroad car down and parks it near the exposition center.

There are textile machinery salesmen who declare that there are as many sales concluded on Pat Hall's railroad car as there are in the exhibition halls. And not necessarily Pat Hall deals, either. Salesmen say that the railroad car has just the right atmosphere for making deals.

Others claim that Mr. Hall should use the railroad car as his trademark.

"It's what you think of first whenever you think of Pat," they say.

Loyalty is a personal trait which most people attribute to Pat Hall.

There's a story that many years ago when Mr. Hall was first beginning to rise in the business world he developed a sudden urgent need for money. And that a certain bank advanced him the money.

Since then, people say, he's never done business with any other bank because he's never forgotten. It's said that he's the same in all his business dealings—he never forgets a favor done him.

But the stories one hears the most are the stories which have to do with kids.

Pat Hall was one of ten children, himself, and he loves youngsters. He has four of his own.

Every year at Christmas time, Mr. Hall invites all his acquaintances and their kids to come out to his place in the country and chop down their own Christmas Tree. They make an outing of it.

He has a picnic spread for the children and grownups in his railroad car. And after the Trees are carefully chosen and cut, there are antique cars and Chinese rickshaws for the youngsters to ride and play in.

Each year Mr. Hall rents the front convention hall at the local Barringer Hotel and invites his friends to bring their children to watch the annual Carrousel Parade.

One learns a little about Pat Hall by just having lunch with him, or dinner, or even breakfast—One thing is that Pat says grace before every meal. Without fail. Not too many do that anymore.

And another thing. He doesn't like to discuss business while he eats. Politics, religion, the weather, anything else—but no business while you eat.

He's an enthusiastic, energetic man.

Each day he spends part of his time at Texland. At the site of his new building which will house his textile machinery operations. Completion date for the new structure is slated to be in the latter part of March and Mr. Hall wants to make sure it's on time.

That's the kind of guy Pat Hall is.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to lend my wholehearted support to the administration bill on air pollution.

There are many useful and needed improvements contained in this legislation. Among them is a provision calling for new research programs by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to overcome the technological obstacles standing in the way of full control of air pollution.

Sulfur compounds—a serious source of irritating and damaging air pollution in virtually every city and town in this country—will be the target of an important part of this effort.

In addition, a special research program will be inaugurated to find ways of controlling the noxious and obnoxious odors which come from diesel exhausts. These, too, are an affront to the senses and a threat to the health of all our citizens.

I feel that every American will benefit from these research programs—and I urge their establishment without undue delay.

RICKOVER DESERVES MUCH CREDIT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as one who had a passing acquaintance with the early stages of nuclear power in ship propulsion, I should, perhaps, be among the last to be surprised at the developments this has led to. I am, however, not merely surprised but astonished at the extremely rapid progress that is taking place in this country in the development and construction of nuclear power for commercial use. What is taking place today exceeds the most optimistic expectations of those who forecast the future just 2 or 3 short years ago.

It is a characteristic of this country, and perhaps a healthy one, that we say a great deal more about our problems than our successes. Today I want to take note of a remarkable success. In particular, I want to pay tribute to a man who had the foresight and wisdom and drive to get us started down a vital road.

We should not forget that our first central power station at Shippingport, Pa., was Admiral Rickover's project and one which in large measure stemmed from the bold early progress he made in

the field of naval nuclear propulsion. He set not only the pace but also the standards of engineering and manufacturing excellence so essential to safety and success in this new field.

Recently I noticed that a new nuclear core is being developed for the carrier *Enterprise* which will last 13 years or more and that cores are now being installed in submarines which will last over 400,000 miles, at a cost of \$3 million each. The first core for the atomic submarine *Nautilus* cost \$4 million and lasted 62,000 miles.

Last year an avalanche of orders for atomic generating plants went out to builders. By last month, investor-owned utilities in the United States had 13 plants in operation, 26 being designed or under construction, and 7 in the planning or contract negotiation stages.

Just a few years ago we expected that it would take at least two decades for nuclear power to become cost competitive. The Tennessee Valley Authority now plans to build a nuclear generating plant which it believes will produce electricity more cheaply than its coal-fired plants. This is happening in coal country. Northeastern utilities paying up to 7 mills will be able to cut that to less than 5 mills for atomic power, a reduction of about 30 percent. Plans for the world's largest dual purpose desalting power project—a 150 million gallon per day and 1,800 megawatt prototype plant in southern California are moving forward.

Revolutionary steel mills powered by the atom are seen possible. Construction of a nuclear reactor on the ocean floor to produce electricity for protein farming is being talked about.

All of these things constitute a story of amazing and unexpected progress, having the strongest of national and international implications. Let us not forget the man who gave us the giant shove forward, Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover.

THE ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM AND THE OPENING OF A COMMUNITY ACTION CENTER IN WOONSOCKET, R.I.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St GERMAIN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, far too often we dwell upon the negative aspects of Federal programs. One program which has been the recipient of considerable criticism has been the anti-poverty program.

There are many reasons why so much criticism has been directed toward this program, but perhaps that which is foremost in causing so much negative talk is the loss of sight of the goal for which we are striving through the anti-poverty program.

During a recent ceremony at the opening of a community action facility, the

citizens of Woonsocket, R.I., were reminded of the purpose of community action: To help those who need help.

This help is what I think the poverty program is all about. This is the purpose for which the anti-poverty program was established: To make productive members of society out of those who cannot help themselves.

I think it would do well for all my colleagues to dwell upon the words spoken at the opening of the Fairmount Neighborhood Council—Social Progress Action Corp.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include the following declaration presented to the Honorable A. Edgar Lussier, mayor of Woonsocket, to be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

COPY OF DECLARATION PRESENTED TO HIS HONOR, MAYOR E. LUSSIER, ON THE OCCASION OF THE OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE FAIRMOUNT NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL—SPAC—NOVEMBER 11, 1966

Your honor: With the cutting of the ribbon, the Fairmount Neighborhood Council—Social Progress Action Corporation is officially open for the benefit of Fairmount citizens regardless of age, color, or creed.

The formal opening of this center is perhaps one of the answers to the question "What Am I Doing To Build A Better World?"

Hardened and calloused indeed is the man or woman who, in a world grown secular and materialistic, refuses to frankly face the above question, and earnestly seek a satisfactory reply. Such wilful neglect is a distinct threat to our great Heritage. While there is an insistent call upon us to contribute as individuals in this respect, it is as law abiding citizens that a double responsibility is laid upon us. The hope of the nation, this city, this neighborhood, rests squarely upon our shoulders, and upon our hearts, demanding that we do our own part in helping those who need help and also that we so train and guide the youth entrusted to our care that even greater accomplishments can be had through them.

There is a Christian way of living and an American way of living that are in large measure inseparable. More than that, what we are pleased to call our "American way of life" came about primarily because it was founded by God-fearing men. How so? Because the founders of our Nation, for the greater part, prudently and willingly centered their lives in God and accepted their responsibilities as citizens of a great country.

It is very difficult for us, in this richest nation in the world, to realize at times the appalling fact that there are more hungry and miserable people today than there have ever been before, even within our own country. With all our luxuries, we know that there are expanding areas of blight—in the centers of our cities—where chronic unemployment produces poverty, disorganization of families, neglect of education, unfitness for the jobs that are available, a vicious spiral downward that shows no signs of being checked and that will destroy the very fabric of our society through rot or riot if we do not find the solutions.

The only reason we are bogged down is that often we do not have the imagination, the gumption, the boldness of spirit to get started. With the cutting of this ribbon, we the people of this council believe it is a start in the right direction. It is perhaps the answer to some of our problems.

We must never forget that with programs like this one, we are in effect trying to make a better world for all of us to live in. We must not lose sight of our children and responsibilities towards them. If we can bring up our children with a greater concern and respect for others, through our example, they

will be happier people, they will have marriages that are more stable, they will live more harmoniously in their neighborhoods, in addition to having a much better chance of saving the world through the humanity which we have left them as a most precious legacy.

Therefore, your honor, this council wishes to declare and affirm its backing of our city fathers and hereby proclaim its faith in the city of Woonsocket through this community action.

Any grievance and/or suggestions which might occur will be done in the true democratic tradition of law, order, and justice.

May God bless these humble surroundings and may He grant this council the courage of its convictions to help those who are in need so that all can enjoy the fruits of this great American Nation.

All council members affixed their signatures.

Chairman.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St GERMAIN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the rationale of much of our legislation today is to stimulate and support activity in a given area by the States.

One such program is that of interstate highway construction in which the Federal Government repays 90 percent of the cost of construction carried out by the individual States.

Those of us who must travel a great deal are well aware of the importance of the Interstate Highway System in meeting the demands of modern travel. I need not dwell upon the overcrowded and inadequate highways that pose such a problem to our modern way of life and the very apparent need for further expansion and improvement of our highways.

The State of Rhode Island in grasping the need for divided highway construction took up the lead provided by the Federal Government and engaged itself in an accelerated construction program for the Interstate Highway System. Through bond issues voted by the people, the State of Rhode Island was able to finance this accelerated construction program with the intent of collecting its due share from the Federal Government at a later date.

Well, a cutback in Federal funds for highway construction has virtually made Rhode Island an island of uncompleted highways and interrupted support from the Federal Government.

In the Sunday, January 29 edition of the Sun published in Westerly, R.I., an excellent editorial was printed on this subject and was appropriately entitled "Rhode Island Penalized for Progress."

I would like to have this editorial inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so

that my colleagues may become aware of the significance of the "big freeze" on highway construction.

Through such means I hope to gain sufficient support in having these funds restored so that we can get on with the vitally needed program of providing our citizens with adequate and safe roads on which to travel.

The article follows:

RHODE ISLAND PENALIZED FOR PROGRESS

Rhode Island's accelerated construction program for the Interstate Highway System has come to a screeching halt. In fact, Rhode Island finds itself being penalized for working rapidly to produce safe motoring on divided highways within its borders.

A cut-back of \$400,000,000 was announced late last year in the Federal funds allocated for highway construction. The Interstate system is constructed by the individual states with the Federal government repaying ninety percent of the costs to the states. States were permitted to accelerate their construction programs, issue bonds to cover the cost of construction, and receive ninety percent of the cost figure from the Federal government at certain times each year.

Rhode Island elected to work fast, build the roads, create safe driving, permit the nearby land to be developed, pay for the work with bond issues, and collect later from the Federal government.

Today Rhode Island finds almost all of its highway work stopped! The only work being permitted by the Federal government is the completion of the parallel Washington Bridge in Providence and approaches. But no Interstate highway may be built to the bridge approaches!

The \$400,000,000 "big freeze" from Washington meant that each state would be cut approximately 17 percent in government support. But, since Rhode Island has already spent part of the Federal funds allocated for 1968, the smallest state in the Union gets a cutback in funds of 125 percent! This means Rhode Island owes the Federal government 1.8 million dollars!

The Federal money to support interstate construction comes from a special Highway Trust Fund, which is constantly replenished from automotive tax dollars collected from the motoring public through the sale of gasoline, oil and automotive services. This is a trust fund to be used solely for highway purposes. But the Federal government is tapping this money for use in the Viet Nam war, just as the Social Security account was diverted during World War II.

While Rhode Island has money available for highway construction—realized through bond issues voted by the people—the state has been notified that if this money is used for Interstate highway construction, it will not be replaced by the Federal government on the 90-10 percent sharing schedule.

It is easy to say "Better sit back and wait for your money." But what happens to the Rhode Island labor force—both state employed and privately contracted—while the road work is halted? What happens to the trained machine operators, draftsmen, engineers, and supervisors? What happens to the contractors, who have invested in heavy equipment to make the roads?

Only 17 states in the nation are actually hurt by the Federal highway cutback. Rhode Island is one! Only nine states have constructed roads in advance of schedule. Rhode Island is one!

Rhode Island, with 15 percent of the 1968 fund already expended, is exceeded only by Maine—which has spent half of the 1968 allotment. The average throughout the nation is an expenditure of 82 percent of the 1967 allotment!

What can we do? Right now a quick letter or telegram to our Senators in Washington

will help make them aware of the plight in Rhode Island.

We are being penalized for progress!

HOW TO FINANCE NONCOMMERCIAL TELEVISION

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have read the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television to develop public noncommercial television facilities. Although I am delighted that there is movement toward utilizing television for high quality cultural, educational, and entertainment programming, I am appalled at the recommendation of the Carnegie Commission for financing the new development.

The commission has endorsed an excise tax on the sale of new television sets which would eventually amount to 5 percent on the sale of each set. I urge that we consider as an alternative the obtaining of the necessary finances through meaningful fees to be paid annually by radio and television stations for licenses granted to them by the Federal Communications Commission. I consider the failure of the Federal Government to charge such fees the big giveaway of the 20th century, and I might add that since four of the 15 members of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television have or had strong connections with the commercial television industry it is hardly surprising that the commission did not recommend this type of financing.

The airwaves are a natural resource owned by the people of the United States, and I think it shocking that our Government literally gives away these valuable assets. One can imagine the outcry that would result if the Federal Government gave away other natural resources it might own, and then told the fortunate donee to charge for these resources what the traffic will bear.

Most enterprises which are licensed and regulated by governmental bodies, whether State or local, pay fees for their privileges even though they are merely given the right to operate and, unlike the broadcasting industry, are not given virtual monopolies. Even barbers and liquor sellers are thus charged. Public utilities such as electric companies, telephone companies, and transportation companies at least have their rates regulated. Only the broadcasting companies escape the payment of meaningful license fees as well as the regulation of their rates.

In 1962, I introduced a bill which would have charged broadcasters annual fees which would have produced annual revenues of over \$20 million a year, but my proposal never even received hearings by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which it was referred. Subsequently, the Federal Com-

munications Commission did decide to charge radio stations \$50 and television stations \$100. These sums are so small as to be laughable, and do not even approach the cost of the Federal Communications Commission in licensing and regulating the industry.

Broadcasters can be expected to oppose my proposal. Naturally, they would like to continue to enjoy the present system. However, I am sure that if at the outset they had been required by legislation to pay an initial fee and annual renewal fees to the Government, they would still have sought their licenses vigorously.

I have noticed that one major network has announced that it will make a voluntary gift to sustain the proposed educational television system. This is laudable indeed, but I believe that the financial needs will be such that voluntary contributions will constitute an adequate and dependable basis on which to proceed.

I believe that the consumers of this Nation will be most grateful if the proposals I have made are ultimately adopted.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE MAIL SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, providing our servicemen overseas with the best possible mail service is of continuing concern and a matter of high priority to me and to the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. General Westmoreland has given good mail service a priority ranking only behind "bullets, beans, and bandages," and we certainly have given support to his judgment. In the last Congress we were responsible for the enactment of two laws, Public Law 315 and Public Law 725, that together are now operating to achieve this high priority for good mail service to our Armed Forces.

Nevertheless, certain inequities and problem areas do remain and I am therefore today introducing new legislation that is designed to completely round out our efforts to see that all servicemen serving in remote overseas areas have the benefits of fast, efficient, and less expensive mail service. The ranking minority member of our committee, the Honorable ROBERT J. CORBETT, of Pennsylvania, who was a cosponsor of our earlier efforts, is today also introducing a bill identical to mine.

The new bill contains three significant and important provisions:

First, We would extend the free mailing privilege for letters and sound-recorded communications to all servicemen in overseas areas and to all who are hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces as a

result of disease or injury incurred while on active duty.

Under Public Law 89-315, only servicemen in combat areas as designated by the President, and those who are hospitalized as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas combat area, can qualify for the free mailing privilege.

Extending this privilege to all servicemen overseas, and to all servicemen hospitalized by reason of disease or injury incurred while on active duty, is simply a matter of equity and fair treatment. In addition, it would remove several problems associated with the earlier law, such as where a serviceman loses his free mail privilege whenever he is rotated out of a combat zone for rest and relaxation, and where we now have arbitrary distinctions between forces serving in Vietnam and those serving in adjacent Thailand and other noncombat areas.

Essentially we would give the free mailing privilege primarily in recognition of the fact that the serviceman is serving in an overseas area vast distances from home, rather than in recognition of the fact that he may be in combat.

Second. The bill would create a new category of airlift mail for parcels weighing up to 30 pounds that are mailed at or addressed to any Armed Forces post office. The parcels would be transported by air on a space-available basis upon payment of the regular surface rate of postage plus a special uniform airlift fee to be fixed by the Postmaster General, which is expected to be not more than \$1.

The most persistent and widespread complaint we receive from servicemen and from their families and friends is directed at the high cost of sending parcels by air parcel post. While our earlier legislation did provide an airlift at surface rates for parcels up to five pounds, under existing law parcels over that weight, if sent by air, must be paid for at the high air parcel post zone rates.

For example, a constituent of mine in Buffalo must now pay \$8.08 to mail a 10-pound package to Vietnam by preferred air parcel post service. Under the new provision in my bill, the same 10-pound package would be mailed for approximately \$3, and it would be transported by airlift on a less preferred service basis all the way from the point of mailing in Buffalo to the point of delivery in Vietnam.

Third. In last year's military mail law, Public Law 725, the Congress provided, among other things, an airlift from the United States to designated combat areas for certain news value publications, particularly news magazines and hometown newspapers. The third important provision of my bill would extend the airlift to this category of mail matter to all Armed Forces post offices in any overseas areas. Servicemen separated from their homes by an ocean of distance in Europe and elsewhere deserve to receive their hometown newspapers as quickly as those who are fighting in combat areas. The fact that a man is or is not in combat should not determine the speed by which news from his hometown reaches him.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are going to put up over \$72 billion next year

for our defense effort, a substantial part of which will go to pay for the "bullets, beans, and bandages" needed by our servicemen. I am confident the American people will want us to maintain the same high priority for improved communications with our servicemen through enactment of this legislation.

COMBATING AIR POLLUTION

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the President yesterday outlined a bold, new program for combating air pollution. I agree with his proposals for a national effort to come to grips with this growing menace, for the atmospheric poison that now plagues so many areas is no respecter of State boundaries.

I have witnessed the effects of air pollution too often to feel that we can ignore this problem in the hope that it will go away. I have heard too much talk and seen too little action on this matter. We must act now, while we can, to defeat this menace before it overwhelms us. That is what the President is now asking us to do.

We must stop talking in general terms and get down to specifics.

We must deal swiftly with the problem of poisoned air moving from sources in one jurisdiction to threaten the lives of people in another. The air and all that it carries with it will not respect manmade boundaries, and accusations between jurisdictions will not solve the problems for which the people are paying.

We must induce industries to control the emissions from their plants and to cooperate with the air pollution laws. For an industry to invest large sums of money to clean up the air in its locality, only to be faced with the fact that a competitor has made no such investment is unfair and self-defeating.

The proposed national emission standards would solve this problem. They will give industry a sound basis for their air pollution control programs and allow them to plan for the future.

I believe that the enactment of this legislation is absolutely necessary if we are to breathe easy once again in this Nation.

DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANLEY] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this past Saturday evening, January 28, it

was my great pleasure to join with a great number of people from my community at the Stanley Pennock Post No. 2893 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Solvay, N.Y., to tender honor to an outstanding member of both our community and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the retiring fifth district commander, and my good friend, Francis A. O'Connell. Commander O'Connell has long been active in the arena of veterans affairs, consistently exerting his energy in the direction of aiding the veteran and his or her dependents, thus it was most fitting that he be recognized in this very deserving manner.

One of the highlights of the program was a speech presented by the winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy Oratorical Contest. In this day when we hear so much about delinquency, it is so refreshing to observe a young man, just 17 years of age, whose philosophy, in my judgment, typifies that of the vast majority of American youngsters. Unfortunately, we read and hear so little about young Americans in this category, as opposed to the massive public information associated with the small minority of young Americans classified as delinquents.

The young man to whom I refer is Mr. Kevin Quinn, of 106 Rutledge Street, Syracuse, N.Y., the son of Mr. and Mrs. William M. Quinn. Kevin is a student at Christian Brothers Academy, in Syracuse, and has enjoyed previous oratorical successes in having been a winner of an Optimist Club oratorical contest as well as one sponsored by the National Catholic Forensic League.

In Kevin, I believe that we have a truly outstanding citizen in the making, and I am confident that every community in this Nation is blessed with a fair share of young Americans who embrace the ideals and philosophy of Kevin Quinn.

The topic of Kevin's address was "Democracy—What It Means to Me." I was most impressed with its content and would like to share it with my colleagues, as follows:

DEMOCRACY—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME (By Kevin Quinn, Christian Brothers Academy)

Arthur Wellesley, later the Duke of Wellington, once remarked that, "The battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton." Some have disputed this observation, especially since it was found that Eton had no formal playing fields in 1815. But of course, that wasn't what Wellesley meant. He was simply saying that the schoolboys of one decade must often become the defenders of freedom in the next, and that the preparation they receive in their youth is the foundation of their adult endeavors.

Every generation has its own particular challenge. In 1815, it was Waterloo. In our century, two world wars have been fought to safeguard freedom. The challenge of our generation is coming. It will be larger perhaps than any before it; for now, having obtained democracy, we are charged with preserving it.

The battles will be fought on many fronts: the battles of space and medicine, the battle for individual liberty and national purpose, for equal rights in an unequal world, for freedom from poverty, disease and despair. For self-determination in Asia and determination of self in America, for progress while retaining tradition, for a world in which men disagree yet still discuss, for *life*

salvaged from slums, liberty unshackled from the trap of socialism, and happiness realized as well as pursued, for all these—for democracy—we will fight. These are the Waterloos and the Normandies of tomorrow, and it is now that we must prepare.

When President Kennedy was alive, he often spoke to youth groups throughout the country. Occasionally his listeners would ask, in response to the challenge posed in his inaugural address, what they could do for their country. And he always answered the same: "Read history." John Kennedy himself had a great sense of history. After his death, his wife said of him, "You must think of him as this little boy, sick so much of the time, reading in bed, reading history, reading the Knights of the Round Table, reading Marlborough. For Jack, history was full of heroes. And if it made him this way—if it made him see the heroes—maybe other little boys will see." ". . . Maybe other little boys will see."

We, the youth of America, certainly have much to be proud of in our history, and knowing the price at which democracy was purchased by our forefathers ought to make it more dear to us. So perhaps this is our part in preserving democracy, to become the best of what we already are—students, because "the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton."

ABC AND I.T. & T. MERGER

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the following editorial concerning the approved merger of the American Broadcasting Co. and the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. The editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, January 28. This late action by the Department of Justice has further complicated matters for the Federal Communications Commission which had last month sanctioned the merger of these two companies.

The editorial follows:

DELAY ON THE ABC-I.T.T. MERGER

The Justice Department has put on a baffling performance in its recent effort to block a proposed merger of American Broadcasting Company and International and Telegraph Corporation.

As Senator Morton of Kentucky pointed out in a floor speech, Justice remained aloof while the Federal Communications Commission held public hearings on the case. Although given the opportunity to testify, it elected to remain silent. As recently as last month, Senator Morton noted, Justice wrote the FCC it did not have sufficient grounds to stay the merger, although it belatedly did question the move.

But 48 hours before the merger was scheduled for a green light this month, Justice asked the FCC for a delay. In doing so, the department suggested the merger might be harmful to competition in the broadcasting industry.

This line of reasoning is puzzling. As anyone in the broadcasting industry knows, ABC is not only the smallest of the three television networks but is up against com-

petition with formidable diversification. The National Broadcasting Company is owned by Radio Corporation of America and has enjoyed a huge advantage because of this, particularly in development of color programming.

Senator Long of Louisiana, who served for many years as chairman of the Senate Small Business panel's subcommittee on monopoly, is in a good position to judge the matter. In supporting the FCC's approval of the merger, he notes that ABC "up to now has had difficulty in competing with the other two giants," and that combining it with ITT's resources in electronics would make its capital structure "parallel to that of the other two networks."

Perhaps the oddest statement put forth by Justice was the suggestion that the merger "threatens the independence and objectivity of ABC's news and public affairs reporting." If the department really wants to raise that gratuitous question, what about ABC's corporate competitors, who are embroiled in everything from book publishing to defense and space electronics, phonograph records, computers, and the New York Yankees? Does every broadcasting company's news integrity automatically come under a cloud of suspicion when it merges with an unrelated business? To believe this is absurd.

Senator Morton terms the Justice Department's move ill-conceived. At the least, it strikes us as displaying a superficial, poorly-reasoned and badly-timed approach.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOSMER, for February 1 and 2, on account of official business in district.

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. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUILLLEN (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 20 minutes, February 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KUPFERMAN (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON), for 30 minutes, February 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CORMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DICKINSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. JONAS to revise and extend his remarks and to include tables during his special order of today.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. EILBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. WALKER.

Mr. BRINKLEY.

Mr. MINISH.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 1, 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:

298. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July to November 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

299. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise and modernize procedures relating to the licensing by the District of Columbia of persons engaged in certain occupations, professions, businesses, trades, and callings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

300. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting the ninth annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia Stadium, and the 19th annual report and financial statements of the Board's operation of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966, pursuant to the provisions of section 10, Public Law 80-605, as amended, and section 10 of Public Law 85-300, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

301. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., Washington, D.C., transmitting a copy of a balance sheet as of December 31, 1966, pursuant to 37 Stat. 979; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

302. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to amend further section 1011 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

303. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the 21st annual report of the Agency's operations under the Federal Airport Act, as amended, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, pursuant to section 18 of the act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

304. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit a husband and wife to file a joint petition in ordinary bankruptcy and chapter XIII (wage earner) proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

305. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Act to authorize courts of bankruptcy to determine the dischargeability or nondischargeability of provable debts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

306. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting the report on positions in grades GS-16, 17, and 18 as of December 31, 1966, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5114(a); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

307. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8346 of title 5, United States Code, to permit the recovery by the Government of amounts due the Government in the settlement of claims against retired civil service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 16, 1966, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Burwells Bay, Isle of Wight County, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted April 9, 1957; no authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been adopted for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of section 107 of the 1960 River and Harbor Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 53. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of small business (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution to continue the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:
H.R. 4206. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of community programs for patients with kidney disease and for conduct of training related to such programs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BELL:
H.R. 4207. A bill to authorize the Legislative Reference Service to make use of automatic data processing techniques and equipment in the performance of its functions; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:
H.R. 4208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such costs within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that certain income derived from manufacturing plants established on Indian reservations shall not be subject to tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRASCO:
H.R. 4210. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROWN of California:
H.R. 4211. A bill making a supplemental appropriation to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CASEY:
H.R. 4212. A bill prohibiting the use in the District of Columbia of firearms in the commission of certain crimes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4213. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:
H.R. 4214. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:
H.R. 4215. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4216. A bill to amend the act of October 4, 1961, relating to the acquisition of wetlands for conservation of migratory waterfowl, to extend for an additional 8 years the period during which funds may be appropriated under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CURTIS:
H.R. 4217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of dividends paid by certain corporations which hold obligations of States and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that contributions and gifts to foreign charities shall be deductible from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the deduction of certain expenses paid or incurred in a search for a business or investment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage basic research in science by the allowance of a tax credit for contributions and other expenditures for basic research in science; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:
H.R. 4221. A bill relative to age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWNING:
H.R. 4222. A bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4223. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DULSKI:
H.R. 4224. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter-mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:
H.R. 4225. A bill to establish a National Commission on Older Workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ERLÉNBOERN:
H.R. 4226. A bill to provide for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political

subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHELMAN:
H.R. 4227. A bill to provide for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:
H.R. 4228. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:
H.R. 4229. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the suspension of assistance to any country which does not protect American property and the rights of American citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4230. A bill to authorize the erection of a statue of Queen Isabella of Spain in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GARMATZ:
H.R. 4231. A bill to amend section 27 of the Shipping Act, 1916; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:
H.R. 4232. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for expansion and development of social work manpower training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:
H.R. 4233. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:
H.R. 4234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize an incentive tax credit allowable with respect to facilities to control water and air pollution, to encourage the construction of such facilities, and to permit the amortization of the cost of constructing such facilities within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:
H.R. 4236. A bill to establish certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4237. A bill to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:
H.R. 4238. A bill to provide for the establishment of an International Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:
H.R. 4240. A bill to establish an Armed Forces Medical, Dental, and Allied Sciences Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:
H.R. 4241. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOSMER:
H.R. 4242. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use

of any facility in interstate and foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 4243. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for optometrists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4244. 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. JARMAN:

H.R. 4245. A bill to extend the fourth-class mail rate for books and educational materials to photographic prints mailed to and from amateur photographers and nonprofit photographic exhibitions, photographic societies, and photographic print study groups; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4246. 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.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4247. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 4248. A bill to strengthen State and local governments, to provide the States with additional financial resources to improve public elementary and secondary education by returning a portion of the Federal revenue to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4249. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4250. A bill to preserve the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966, to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4252. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes, with States and their political subdivisions out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4253. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the transportation of mail at no cost to the sender to and from the United States and combat areas overseas as designated by the President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 4254. A bill to authorize a program of research, development, and demonstration of electrically powered vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4255. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the

supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to increase the unsecured loan limit that a member can borrow from a Federal credit union; to require each Federal credit union to establish an education committee; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4256. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal- or State-chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4257. A bill for the establishment of a Civilian Aviation Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 4258. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4259. A bill to authorize the preparation of plans for a memorial to Woodrow Wilson; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4260. A bill to establish a system for the sharing of certain Federal revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend the Older American Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide an 8-percent across-the-board benefit increase, and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the reduction in the manufacturers excise tax on automobiles from 7 percent to 2 percent shall take effect on April 1, 1967, instead of on April 1, 1968; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend section 118 of title 28, United States Code, to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania shall be held at Easton, Philadelphia, and Reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4267. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt servicemen from the excise tax on transportation by air; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum amount of retirement income which may be taken into account in computing the retirement income credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4269. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for an older Americans community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and

workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4271. A bill to strengthen intergovernmental relations by improving cooperation and the coordination of federally aided activities between the Federal, State, and local levels of government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4272. A bill to amend section 110 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the preservation of total disability ratings under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration where such ratings have been in force for 15 years or more; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4273. A bill to prescribe the size of flags furnished by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to drape the caskets of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.R. 4274. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to make certain metropolitan areas eligible as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHWENGLER:

H.R. 4276. A bill to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to require reasonable bonds from packers in connection with their livestock purchasing operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4277. A bill to provide for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4279. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 4280. A bill to establish a National Commission on Public Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4281. A bill to provide that chief judges of circuits and chief judges of district courts shall cease to serve as such upon reaching the age of 66; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 4282. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to eliminate certain requirements with respect to effectuating marketing orders for cherries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 4283. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit a woman to become entitled to full wife's insurance benefits after attaining age 65 even though she became entitled to reduced old-age insurance

benefits (or disability insurance benefits) before attaining that age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 4284. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 4285. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties with respect to the maintenance of lists of Government employees in connection with fund solicitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4286. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 4287. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION:

H.R. 4288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 4289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 4290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4291. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 4292. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 4293. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4294. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of construct-

ing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4297. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 4299. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 4301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 4302. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4303. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to per-

mit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 4306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.R. 4307. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 4308. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4309. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGL:

H.R. 4311. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4313. A bill to permit the transfer of 100 acres of feed grain base from Yankton County, S. Dak., to Hughes County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4314. A bill to authorize the release of certain quantities of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4315. A bill to provide for the popular election of one member of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4316. A bill to create an independent school board in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4317. A bill to extend the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and to increase the annual authorization for such act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to expenses of plastic surgery and hypertrichology; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 4319. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt State-conducted lotteries from the taxes on wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter-mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 4321. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4322. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution through the establishment of air regions and standards applicable thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4323. A bill concerning a Federal Tax Fairness Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLNBORN:

H.R. 4324. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4325. A bill to permit the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter mailed in a State where lotteries are legal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt State-conducted lotteries from the taxes on wagering; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4327. A bill to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the fields of law enforcement and of correctional treatment of law violators; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4328. A bill to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933 to provide for accounting at the expiration of a rate suspension; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to clarify the status of National Guard technicians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4331. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for more effective prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution through the establishment of air regions and standards applicable thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4333. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously a Congressional Medal of Honor to John

Fitzgerald Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4334. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code to toll the running of the statute of limitations against tort claims of persons under legal disability or beyond the seas at the time their claims accrue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4335. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, in order to prevent the use of work measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4336. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 4337. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to eliminate the percentage depletion method for determining the deduction for depletion of oil and gas wells; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4338. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to make permanent the present matching requirement applicable to the college work-study program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 4339. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for an older Americans community service program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4340. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emissions from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4341. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4342. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments to an individual under a public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs shall not be counted as income for pension until the amount of payments received equals the contributions thereto; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4343. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance to the present maximum (27½ percent) for all minerals produced in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4345. A bill to enable the Commissioner of Education to assist States to carry on education and training programs to strengthen public administration in the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4346. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relative to the unlawful seizure of fishing vessels of the United States by foreign countries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4347. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude from that

act's minimum wage coverage persons employed in agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4348. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude agricultural employees from the minimum wage provisions of that act for 2 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 4349. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from \$200 to \$500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4350. A bill to amend the act of August 27, 1954, relative to the unlawful seizure of fishing vessels of the United States by foreign countries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the Congress to the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLNBORN:

H.J. Res. 238. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last week in October of each year as National Water Awareness Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.J. Res. 239. Joint resolution declaring the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year to be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers and the reading of the Bible in public schools or other public bodies in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.J. Res. 241. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a joint United States-Mexican commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.J. Res. 242. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National CARIH Asthma Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to invoking the rights of article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution establishing a Congressional Commission on the Role of Congress in Foreign Policy and Intelligence Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because

of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution to provide early appropriations for Federal educational programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. Res. 193. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of air pollution in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H. Res. 194. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Export Control Act of 1949, and related acts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H. Res. 195. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit the presentation and recognition in the Hall of the House of holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H. Res. 196. Resolution amending the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H. Res. 197. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Standards and Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H. Res. 198. Resolution relative to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee making an investigation and study of certain policies of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 199. Resolution authorizing Members of the House of Representatives to employ during each summer one student congressional intern; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to requesting Congress to restore to the State of Montana for expenditure the full amount of Federal funds authorized in the Federal Aid Highway Acts of 1964 and 1966, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 4351. A bill to provide for the free entry of a pipe organ for the use of St. Mark's Cathedral, Seattle, Wash.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Pinto Querub and her minor son, Isaac Albert Pinto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Lidia Di Bartolomeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Antonio Escobedo-Romo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS (by request):

H.R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Milena D. Ristanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 4356. A bill for the relief of Marco Ferraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Cutala; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4359. A bill for the relief of Raffaello Di Maggio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Guarino Zanotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Yung Ja Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Krotzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4363. A bill for the relief of George W. Payne and Jo Nam Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4364. A bill for the relief of Markos P. Keloudis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Sema Bronstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Gomberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Nachman Bench; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 4368. A bill for the relief of John Barbarich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Kyung Hee Park Grady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Sandy Kyriacoula Georgopoulos and Anthony Georgopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Curatolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Filippo Badalamenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLENBACK:

H.R. 4374. A bill to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Hampton Hardwood Corp. of Newport News, Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Hamid Mowlana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Armetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Antonio d'Angelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Angelou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4380. A bill for the relief of George Georgiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4381. A bill for the relief of John Marinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Domenico Calderone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Rosa Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Lidia Maria Ascencion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4385. A bill for the relief of Sheng Tong and Sheng Mee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4386. A bill for the relief of Visitacion

Enriquez Maypa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4387. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kyung Nam Cho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 4388. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mirjam Mathe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4389. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bronislava Zbrozek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4390. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aniela Musial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4391. A bill for the relief of Maria Myslewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4392. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mario Russo and Mauro Giuseppe Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stefania Scislowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4394. A bill for the relief of Miss Lola Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4395. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Giron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Rizos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sadashiv V. Phansalkar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4398. A bill for the relief of Enni Rosa-Tezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (by request):

H.R. 4399. A bill for the relief of Chieh Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4400. A bill for the relief of Natalie Ann Doloris Mary Sergenti (also known as Lee Carry, Ligela Caravias, and Lygia Panagiotis Karavias); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Alfredo I. Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4402. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Nartey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4403. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Porcello and Gaetana Porcello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 4404. A bill for the relief of Hubert Ashe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 4405. A bill for the relief of Albert C. Arduini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 4406. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lothar A. Koeberer, his wife, Mrs. Agnes Koeberer, and his minor child, Agnes Koeberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4407. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mohammed Nasir Shakh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 4408. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orn Arnar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4409. A bill for the relief of Gianfranco Magro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4410. A bill for the relief of Vedat Fahreddin Arkay and Mohadder Arkay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4411. A bill for the relief of Pierr Bolos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4412. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Laura Pizzitola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4413. A bill for the relief of Dr. Carmelita Teves Carriaga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4414. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos Saifandaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4415. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Shismenos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4416. A bill for the relief of Francisco Petrunaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 4417. A bill for the relief of James Yu-Wan Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Dr. Francisco Bankuti and his wife, Ana Marta Esther Silbersdorff de Bankuti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 4419. A bill for the relief of Barbara Zakrzewska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4420. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Gilmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4421. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marcella Bean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4422. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Patti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4423. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sara Darvish and her daughters, Frida, Zoya, and Violet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4424. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Shimon Beatus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4425. A bill for the relief of Farid Sellim Tawfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Namur and their two children, Joseph and Marie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ferdows Maddahl, her daughter, Ruth (Fahim), and her son, Fred (Faramars); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4428. A bill for the relief of Dr. Iuminada L. Stantos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4429. A bill for the relief of Domenico Perrotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4430. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonino Baiardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Garma Alony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4432. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4433. A bill for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Phillip Antoun Morcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Nazih Moussa Berri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Adelaide Laura Roncati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Carmine A. Barletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jinks Einstein Walter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Angel Saghbazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Viviane Rubin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Deward E. Quarles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Southwest Hospital Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 4443. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously Congressional Medals of Honor to Lt. Col. Virgil L. (Gus) Grissom, Lt. Col. Edward H. White II, and Lt. Cmdr. Roger B. Chaffee; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLFF (by request):

H.R. 4444. A bill for the relief of Elena Afo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H.R. 4445. A bill for the relief of Aurek Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

20. By the SPEAKER: Petition of We, the People, Phoenix, Ariz., relative to supporting legislation which asks the President to withdraw from the United Nations' embargo of Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

21. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., relative to tax relief for homeowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Introduces Legislation To Pave Way for New York Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to first, permit lottery tickets to be mailed in the U.S. mails in States where they can be legally sold; and, second, exempt bets placed in State-run lotteries from the Federal wagering tax.

As things now stand, the imminent New York State lottery will be hindered by two aspects of Federal law. In the first place, while State-run sweepstakes are exempt from the Federal tax on wagering, State-run numbers lotteries are not. The first of my bills would exempt bets placed in State-run lotteries from the Federal tax on wagering.

My second bill would deal with another absurd situation. It is presently illegal to mail lottery tickets. This is stupid, because as the Post Office well knows, thousands are being mailed out of New Hampshire—where they can be legally sold—each year. And then there are the Irish sweepstakes. My second bill would allow lottery tickets to be mailed from States where they can be legally sold. This will avoid the situation whereby a substantial volume of mail

from New York and New Hampshire is outlawed.

I have asked my 40 colleagues in the House of Representatives from New York, and also our two distinguished Senators, to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital Emerges From Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1967

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today a junior high school graduation exercise was brought to an abrupt halt by a bewildering boom and black-out.

Today, January 31, 1967, marks the 10th anniversary of the air crash over the Pacoima Junior High School playground, in my district in the San Fernando Valley. This tragic mid-air collision brought sudden death to three youngsters, Ronnie Brawn, Yvonne Eleanor, and Robert Callan, who only moments before were enjoying a class recess outdoors.

Out of the shadow of this tragedy has emerged the triumph that is Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital. This great

community health center serves as a memorial to those youngsters who died that day and further honors their broken bodies by embracing a concern for the whole of man—physical, mental, social, and spiritual.

In its 6 years, the hospital has met the around-the-clock emergency needs of the 32,466 persons in its area. It has developed special medical service departments, including a pulmonary function disease laboratory, a nuclear medicine department, inhalation therapy department, and a physical therapy department.

Pacoima Lutheran Memorial Hospital has focused government and community resources on all aspects of mental health care. Prevention and education, as well as treatment are major activities in its new mental health center.

The hospital has been serving the spiritual needs of its patients and personnel with its chaplain, O. W. Mieger, and, under a mental health staffing grant, is developing a program to educate and train the spiritual leaders of the community in mental health.

The staff of Pacoima Memorial Lutheran Hospital recognizes that the problem of sickness, disease, and accident is not self-contained. It has sought to understand the needs of the people of the community. This past summer the hospital had three health care students surveying the Pacoima community to determine the availability, accessibility, and acceptability of its services to the persons who need them.